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ABSTRACT

With the highest number of people in poverty in United States history, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, there is a growing need for non-medical or social services (housing, food, energy assistance, education assistance) for America’s most vulnerable. Not only does the sheer number of needs to be addressed create a problem, but this growth in social need is costly to the government and taxpayers.

Faith Based Organizations (FBOs) have historically provided both critical social services and shaped the policies that serve America’s poorest communities. Because of their theological underpinnings and self-imposed mandate to serve, FBOs are often best positioned to understand the needs of and be reliable for long-term service to the poor. With the advent of “charitable choice” in 1996, the United States Government made an unprecedented investment in faith-based organizations (FBOs) towards the purpose of providing better social services to communities across the country. The U.S. Government made this investment as part of a long-term solution to serve those most in need, without fully understanding the sustainability of this solution and whether there would be a consistent impact. And yet, at the same time, FBOs struggle with providing dedicated time and resources needed to sustain long-term services, even with the supplement of government funding. For those most in need of housing, food, education, child care, and
a myriad of other services, there needs to be a sustainable path to pairing and providing public, private and faith-based social services.

This thesis will use historical and theological context to understand the role of, potential impact of, and barriers to faith-based organizations’ ability to serve the poor and shape policy. Next by using a “network approach” outlined by Jeremy Rifkin in The Third Industrial Revolution, applying basic organizational management and development principles (e.g. ensuring staff is trained) and using more established FBOs with strong track records as a model, this thesis will outline a structure for FBOs to follow to meet a goal of consistent, sustainable and higher quality services to the poor. With more consistent measurements and structures the FBO sector has the potential to be a model for social service provision in the United States. Faith-based organizations can become the places where America’s most vulnerable can consistently have their basic needs met, giving them a chance to get out of the tragic cycle of poor health and poverty.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Food, housing, energy, employment, education, childcare and other non-medical (or social) needs should be easily accessible to everyone regardless of income, yet for many Americans they are elusive amenities. Not only are these the basic needs required to live a full and prosperous life, but they are critical to life expectancy and overall health. For example, adults ages twenty-five to fifty who have a college degree will on average live five years longer than those with less than a high school education. And at every age, the more highly educated enjoy better health: seventy-five percent of college educated adults report being in very good or excellent health, compared to forty percent of those with less than a high school education (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation 2008). Yet, education is not easily accessible beyond twelfth grade or guaranteed for America’s poorest.

For food, energy and housing there are equally startling statistics. Food-insecure\(^1\) children, now numbering seventeen million in the United States, are ninety-one percent more likely to be in fair or poor health than their peers with adequate food, and thirty-one percent more likely to require hospitalization (Cook 2009). There is no easy way for

\(^1\)According to Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, “food-security” has four dimensions: 1) food availability; 2) food access; 3) food utilization and 4) food stability. To be food secure, a population, household or individual must have access to adequate food at all times. They should not risk losing access to food as a consequence of sudden shocks (e.g. an economic or climatic crisis) or cyclical events (e.g. seasonal food insecurity). The concept of stability can therefore refer to both the availability and access dimensions of food security. In recent years, food as a human right has come into focus of many organizations. (FAO Policy Brief)
Americans with food insecurities to connect with government programs or other resources to meet this basic need.

Historically, faith-based organizations (FBOs) have provided both critical social services and helped shape the policies that enable better service provision to America’s poorest communities. Often located in the very heart of where these services are needed, FBOs “are, too frequently, the only non-governmental institutions to which the very poor can turn in part because they often are the only institutions over which [the very poor] exercise a degree of control” (Dionne and Chen 2001, 10). In addition, FBOs are often aligned with service provision at a deeper level, because their theological foundation provides a “call to service” that permeates the structure, governance and workforce of the organization. At the same time, the theological foundation and often self-imposed mandate to serve position FBOs to both understand the needs of and be reliable for long-term service to the poor, yet the theological foundation and desire to serve can often be at odds with the actual impact of an organization’s services.

The advent of “charitable choice” in 1996 marked a landmark policy, loosening the regulations for faith-based organizations to gain access to federal money. This policy was built on a precarious history of Supreme Court opinions and legislation eventually pointing to the need for and the constitutionality of government partnerships with faith-based social service providers. This policy led the United States Government to make an unprecedented investment in faith-based organizations towards the goal of providing better social services to communities across the country. Through three presidential administrations, the focus on faith-based organizations and partnerships has grown
strong, and over the past sixteen years, the amount of federal dollars going to faith-based organizations has increased dramatically.

Though President Bush is often credited (or criticized) for making faith-based organizations front and center of policy, President Obama is also a strong supporter of faith-based organizations and issued a new Executive Order. Executive Order 13279: . . . set forth the principles and policy-making criteria to guide federal agencies in formulating and developing policies with the implications for faith-based organizations to ensure equal protection of the laws for faith-based and community organizations, and to expand opportunities for and strengthen capacity of faith-based and other community organizations to meet social needs in America’s communities. (Interagency Working Group on Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Partnerships 2012)

President Obama, in providing substantial federal dollars as part of his policy, has shown that FBOs will continue to be part of the social service provider landscape. FBOs are part of his administration’s response to an increase in social needs in the United States, as will be discussed in Chapter Two.

Even with the increase in federal support and funding, there has been little increase in the proportion of congregations involved in social services, in receipt of public funds for their social service work, or in collaborations with the government (Asomugha, Pitkin Derose and Lurie 2011, 54). The U.S. Government made an investment in FBOs as part of a solution to serve those most in need, without fully understanding the sustainability of this solution and knowing whether there would be a consistent impact or “return on social investment.” In addition, the FBO sector is not structured, and often not motivated, to provide easily accessible outcome data, as will be discussed in Chapter Three.
The theology and belief system of faith-based organizations\(^2\) directly impacts their structure and management. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 also impacted FBOs staffing structures (to be discussed in Chapter Three). As will be discussed in Chapter Four, measuring effectiveness of FBOs can be extremely difficult for various reasons from not having enough or consistent volunteers to track and manage data to the very theology that calls an organization to serve regardless of degree of impact, undermining the will to have outcome measures – it is enough “to do good.” Although Timothy states “Tell them to do good, to be rich in good works, to be generous, ready to share, thus accumulating as treasure a good foundation for the future, so as to win the life that is true life” (New American Bible\(^1\) Timothy 6:17-19), there is no directive to measure the outcome of “good works.” And yet, even if there is incentive to provide good data, many FBOs struggle to provide the time and resources needed just to sustain long-term services, even with the supplement of government funding.

For those most in need of housing, food, education, child care, and a myriad of other services, there needs to be a sustainable path to private, public and faith-based social services. This access is critical both to the health of Americans and to the health of the United States economy, as will be explored further in Chapter Two. Based on history, mission, values, and proximity of faith-based organizations to those with significant social service needs, there are roles for both well-established and smaller faith-based organizations to play in advocacy and / or as service providers.

\(^2\) This thesis will focus primarily on Christian, Muslim and Jewish faith-based organizations.
Stephen Monsoma wrote in *Pluralism and Freedom*,

... there is evidence faith-based organizations often fill a niche that either government or large, secular social service agencies would have a hard time filling. This is the case largely for two reasons: first, faith based organizations often have grass-roots contacts, networks, and structures on which they can call in providing needed services and, second, they have faith-rooted beliefs into which they can help to motivate and encourage. (Monsma 2012, 42)

Faith-based organizations have a role to play in the social service landscape and, as federal funding would indicate, and consistent federal funding better enables FBO’s long-term sustainability. The issue remains of how FBOs are best founded, managed and sustained to truly be considered part of the social service solution in the United States.

With the recent downturn of the economy, a growing social need in the U.S. and without a sustainable structure to meet that need, the federal government and other secular service agencies should partner with FBOs to provide for America’s neediest. The question is how can the social service sector, in partnership with government and private entities, enable faith-based organizations to operate at their full potential? Through understanding the history, theology and beliefs that often inform an FBO’s mission, structure and governance, and by understanding the actual landscape of need and FBO providers, it is clear why this question has to be answered. To attempt to answer these questions this thesis will outline the potential FBOs have to improve the individual lives of America’s neediest and better advocate for America’s neediest as a whole, explore the major challenges that face FBOs in providing services and meeting their potential, while applying Jeremy Rifkin’s network approach as described in *The Third Industrial Revolution* as a means to overcome the inherent challenges in the current FBO sector so that FBOs can reach their potential. Creating an approach that respects the theological
foundations of FBOs and better positions them to have impact will better warrant the significant investment of dollars and time currently being invested into FBOs.
When persons are lacking the income, education, housing, or social care (for example) that they ought to have, or when they have fallen below some minimum level, they meet the defined requirements of “social need” (Baldock, Manning and Vickerstaff 2007). Social services include facilities and benefits such as education, food subsidies, health care, and subsidized housing provided by a government or another provider to improve the life and living conditions of the children, the disabled, the elderly, and the poor in the national community (Liberia Economic & Social Development 2010). In the United States, social needs are met through a diverse set of resources from government run (e.g. the Department of Health and Human Services) to non-profits and for-profit organizations. To better understand why faith based organizations should play a role in the social service landscape, four key issues need to be briefly explored: 1) the growing population in need of social services; 2) the importance of meeting social needs for a healthy population; 3) the cost of the failure to meet social needs for both families and the government; 4) the lack of consistency in delivery and availability of basic resources.

According to the U.S. Census bureau, in 2011 the official poverty rate was 15.0 percent, meaning there were 46.2 million people in poverty. This is the highest number of people in poverty in U.S. history. Poverty is not evenly distributed between age: the poverty rate in 2011 for children under age 18 was 21.9 percent, the poverty rate for people aged 18 to 64 was 13.7 percent, while the rate for people aged 65 and older was 8.7 percent. After three consecutive years of increases, neither the official poverty rate
nor the numbers of people in poverty were statistically different from the 2010 estimates (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). While this seems like good news, the poverty rate in 2010 was the highest since 1993.

America’s poorest are not the only class with increasing social needs. Middle-class Americans are “increasingly concerned about their own economic security as well. Economic inequality has increased in the U.S., and the middle class has lost ground. Over the past twenty-five years, the middle class has become increasingly insecure financially (i.e., less able to weather a job loss or serious medical crisis)” (Braveman, Egerter and Mockenhaupt 2011, S13). In addition to a growing population in need of basic resources, a middle class that has more unmet social needs leads to the growth of a population that is at risk for becoming unhealthy.

Meeting social need is critical, not only as a basic right, but also because a lack of non-medical resources is linked to poor health. Over the past five years, two commissions – one sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and another by the World Health Organization - closely explored the link between social needs and poor health. Both Commissions produced multiple studies bringing to light the urgency in the United States and abroad to more clearly and directly address the growing social needs felt by the poor and middle class. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Commission was a bi-partisan group of “diverse experts” called The Commission to Build a Healthier America. Their purpose was and is to increase the level of awareness of the connection
between social need and poor health:

Although medical care is essential for relieving suffering and curing illness, only an estimated 10 to 15 percent of preventable mortality has been attributed to medical care. A person’s health and likelihood of becoming sick and dying prematurely are greatly influenced by powerful social factors such as education and income and the quality of neighborhood environments. These *social determinants of health* can have profound impacts. For example: poor Americans are more than three times as likely as Americans with upper middle-class incomes to suffer physical limitations from a chronic illness. (Robert Wood Johnson Foundation 2009)

For nearly every social need, education, housing, food, early childhood development and more, there is a documented link to poor health. For example, babies born to mothers who have completed fewer than twelve years of schooling are nearly twice as likely to die before their first birthdays as babies born to mothers who have completed sixteen or more years of schooling (Braveman, Egerter and Mockenhaupt 2011).

Around the same time the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Commission came out with “Obstacles to Health,” the World Health Organization (WHO) released a study looking at social determinants of health. The WHO felt that the report by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Commission was “too political,” meaning not direct enough (Marmot and Bell 2011). The WHO report by their Commission on Social Determinants of Health, states: “Social injustice is killing people on a grand scale. . . This unequal distribution of health damaging experience . . . is the result of a toxic combination of poor social policies and programmes, unfair economic arrangements and bad politics” (Commission on Social Determinants of Health 2008). Both reports agree on social determinants of health (social or non-medical needs) as a critical issue for both social justice and economic sustainability.
A population that is not healthy costs the United States more. The economic case for solving social needs is two-fold. First, overall spending on healthcare is disproportionate to the U.S. health outcomes. While the overall economy declined by 1.1 percent from 2008 to 2009, total health expenditures rose by 5.7 percent, without adequate improvement in health outcomes. Annual per capita medical care expenditures in the U.S. are higher than those in any other nation, and if current trends continue medical care costs in the U.S. will reach more than 19 percent of the Gross Domestic Product by 2019 (Braveman, Egerter and Mockenhaupt 2011). Even though the United States spends more per capita than any other nation, “the U.S. ranks poorly on measures of health: its world ranking on infant mortality has slipped from 18th in 1980 to 25th in 2002; for life expectancy it has slipped from 14th to 23rd; and by some measures it does even worse” (Marmot and Bell 2011). Since only ten to fifteen percent of preventable mortality has been attributed to medical care, if the United States wants to rank higher in health metrics, there need to be better systems to address the social determinants of health.

The second part of the economic case relates to the economics of families and social mobility. While the associations between poorer health in childhood and poorer health later in life have been recognized for some time, there is increasing evidence of how poorer socioeconomic circumstances in childhood can lead to both poorer socioeconomic circumstances and poorer health in adulthood. Transmission of health across generations is also strongly influenced by social factors. Economists have shown how family income in one generation shapes family income in the next (Braveman,
Egerter and Mockenhaupt 2011). This lack of social mobility is often due to the difficult choices faced by those with social needs. The strain of unaffordable housing or even the need to pay monthly utility bills has been linked with decreased spending on health and health care, including delays in seeking preventative and routine medical care, not adhering to medication, and using emergency departments for primary care, which drives up the cost of care for both the patient and the medical system (Miller, Pollack and Williams 2011). These practices create a cycle of not having enough public resources to meet basic social needs which leads to an increased financial burden on the families who, in turn, have to make tough choices that are often antithetical to being healthy. These choices can include skimping on medicine and / or basic resources, which leads to those families getting sicker (or at least not better) and an increased spending on medical care by the family and the system.

The issue of not meeting social needs in the United States is urgent, costly and the population in need is outstripping the resources available. The 2011 Catholic Charities USA Annual Report underlines this increase in need:

Catholic Charities USA conducted an online survey of its membership during October 2011 to measure programs and services provided between July 1, 2011 and September 30, 2011. Responses were received from 62 local agencies from 33 different states. These agencies serve an estimated 4,176,536 clients. The majority of agencies reported an increase in requests for help relative to the previous quarter from the working poor (80%), families (66%), homeless (60%), and the middle class (59%). These trends did not vary substantially across regions or between agencies that self-identified as serving primarily urban, suburban, or rural populations. More than 88% of local agencies report that they maintained a waiting list or had to turn people away for at least one of their programs or services. (Catholic Charities USA Annual Report 2011)
According to the Department of Health and Human Services, this upward trend in social need over the past few years is well-documented across social service sectors.

In addition to having more need than available resources, resource providers (defined here as any governmental or non-governmental organizations providing basic non-medical resources to those who lack them) are constantly shifting. Community resources frequently change their availability, staff, location, and eligibility rules because of fluctuations in strategy, budgets, and other factors. Using San Francisco as an example metropolitan area, according to the IRS, there are more than 2,100 resources providers in and around San Francisco that exist to help families solve critical food, housing and child care needs. Based on Health Leads’¹ experience in New York, Providence, Boston, Chicago, Washington, DC and Baltimore, forty percent of these services changed their contact information or service locations in the last year, while another twenty percent of these services are completely new. That means in a given year, only forty percent of services remain consistent, without a clear path for families to access these resources. The resource map in cities across the U.S. looks very similar (Health Leads. Inc 2012). Some of these shifts are due to the characteristics of the organizations that provide connections to resources (e.g. organizational staff has high turnover), like faith based organizations, which will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Both the WHO and RWJF Commissions had tangible answers to addressing the “epidemic” of not systemically addressing social determinants of health. The WHO had

¹ Health Leads, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) located in 6 cities to mobilize college volunteers to connect patients and their families with the basic resources they need to be healthy. With Health Leads, doctors can “prescribe” resources such as food, housing and heating assistance – just as they do medication. Patients take their prescriptions to the clinic waiting room, where volunteers help “fill” them by connecting patients to community services.
three major areas of focus in their recommendations: 1) improve the conditions of daily life: the circumstances in which people are born, grow, live, work, and age; 2) tackle the inequitable distribution of power, money, and resources: the structural drivers of those conditions of daily life: globally, nationally, and locally; 3) measure the problem, evaluate action, expand the knowledge base, develop a workforce that is trained in the social determinants of health, and raise public awareness about the social determinants of health (Commission on Social Determinants of Health 2008). RWJF called for more detailed need-specific actions but similar themes emerged of tackling the structural drivers that create need, improving daily life (especially of children and schools), and raising public awareness of social needs.

In addition, RWJF, the Department of Health and Human Services and several other organizations and foundations focused on social determinants believe that a community-wide collaboration is necessary to solve the problem of social needs going unmet. In a RWJF report, the Commission suggests:

Building a healthier nation will require substantial collaboration among leaders across all sectors, including some—for example, leaders in child care, education, housing, urban planning and transportation—who may not fully comprehend the importance of their roles in improving health. This Commission challenges individuals, communities, employers and unions, the business community, media, faith leaders and congregants, philanthropy and government officials at all levels to work together on promising strategies and solutions. (Commission on Social Determinants of Health 2008)

While both Commissions call for country-wide policy change (and the WHO was more explicit in this recommendation, calling for a redistribution of wealth in many countries), both also focused a number of recommendations within and from the communities where America’s neediest live. These recommendations ranged from schools providing better
meals and educating children about health, better public housing, better food availability community-wide, to programs to help families with alcoholism, as well as job placement and other types of support (Commission on Social Determinants of Health 2008). While local government and local community-based support cannot take the place of the federal government, it is often the local community and local community organizations that best understand the growing needs of their community members’ needs, since they witness it through the day to day service provision.

In the United States, social needs are growing and are inconsistently provided for. The problem is urgent not only because there is an increase in people who are homeless, jobless, hungry and more, but also because these unmet social needs are linked to poor health, which in addition to being a problem for those individuals is costly for both families and to the healthcare system. In order to better provide consistent services there will need to be a multi-pronged collaborative approach that involves the private sector, the communities these services are provided in, and state and federal government. FBOs have long been a part of the social service landscape providing direct service in local communities, and on a national level in advocating for better social policy. FBOs are a vital prong to meeting social needs in the years to come.
CHAPTER THREE
AN “EXCESSIVE ENTANGLEMENT,” HISTORY AS MEANS TO UNDERSTANDING PRESENT DAY

This thesis uses Stephan Monsma’s definition of faith-based organization:

I use the term “faith-based organization” to refer to the religiously based or religiously oriented organizations that provide health, educational, or social services to the public. I do not use the term to refer to religious congregations in their core religious celebrations and rituals. Instead, the term includes an enormous variety of religiously based organizations . . . Included are both programs run directly by churches or other religious congregations or groups of congregations and program run by organizations that, while not formally affiliated with any religious congregations are rooted in a commitment to certain religious beliefs and values. (Monsma 2012, 2)

Monsma’s definition affords the broadest view of faith based organizations’ potential to serve social need in the United States.

The United States history with religion, religious freedom and faith based organizations is complicated and it provides insight into why FBOs struggle to provide consistent services. If the theological backbone of FBOs provides the answer to the question of “why” FBOs are well-positioned to serve those most in need (to be discussed in Chapter Four), the past two hundred and fifty years provides the “how” FBOs have and / or have not been well-positioned to serve those in need. Although the constitutionality of government support of FBOs is not an explicit topic within this thesis, a high-level understanding of this decades-old debate about the constitutionality of providing funding to religious organizations provides a better understanding of why the structure of FBO service providers is inconsistent across the sector. It also provides context for understanding why, due to inconsistent policies, a lack of impact measurement is
prevalent in the FBO sector, even though the United States has counted on FBOs to provide services for decades.

History also demonstrates which of the longer standing FBOs have helped pave the way for current policy as well as the growing emergence of FBOs as a viable service provider (to be discussed in Chapter Four). While a comprehensive history of FBOs in the United States, the relationship between government support of FBOs and FBOs’ influence on policy would be too much and unnecessary to address here, a basic understanding of key points in United States history is essential to understanding the current situation of FBOs. A patch work of constitutional history, First Amendment jurisprudence and key legislative developments provides the context necessary for a richer understanding of both the barriers faced by and potential of FBOs today.

**Founding Fathers and the First Amendment: the Beginning of a 250 Year Debate**

Due to the more recent groundswell of government aid to FBOs and “loosening” of FBO related policy, the issues and debates about government support of religious service providers is often thought of as a modern-day issue. Although President Bush’s policy shift towards faith-based services was dramatic (to be discussed in Chapter Five), and there has been a significant increase in dollars going to FBOs (particularly to smaller FBOs), the United States has a long-standing history of partnering with and supporting FBOs. FBOs are by no means new to the social service provider landscape. From the earliest days of the United States, religiously influenced organizations and services have played a critical role in providing services for Americans. The major fluctuation has been
how government aid has been distributed and the perception of the constitutionality of that support.

. . .but it does not capture our government’s long and respected tradition of accommodating the religious beliefs and activities of its citizens and of cooperating with religious groups in the provision of social services. For decades, federal dollars have reached religiously affiliated organizations through Medicare, Medicaid, Pell grants, the GI bill, and a host of other programs. Indeed, if you go back to the earliest days of America, you would see the federal government giving money to faith-based groups to provide services to those in need. So the idea that faith-based organizations can deliver social services without violating the U.S. Constitution is neither new, nor is it some sneak assault on church-state separation. (E. J. Dionne 2004, 212)

Understanding both the history of FBO related policies and the history of some of the long-standing FBOs provides insight into the current day landscape and the impact of FBOs. The former begins with the founding fathers and is established in several landmark opinions by the Supreme Court vis a vis support of FBOs and religiously affiliated organizations.

The United States relationship to religion and religious freedom stems from the beliefs of the founding fathers as born out in Article VI of the Constitution, and later in the Bill of Rights. These documents and additional letters authored by and between the founding fathers (particularly Jefferson and Madison) shaped the path for how the United States would support and regulate faith based social services. The first place religion is mentioned in the Constitution is Article VI, section 3: “but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States” (U.S. Constitution, art. 6, sec. 3). Further clarification of the United States’ official policy towards the relationship between “church and state” was only later included as part of the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment truly encapsulated the founding fathers’ strong
beliefs around religion as separate from the branches of government and government having no jurisdiction over an individual’s religious choice.

The Bill of Rights was not originally included in the Constitution in 1787. In a letter from Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, Jefferson expressed his dislike that the Bill of Rights was not included, especially as it related to the relationship between church and state. Jefferson believed that clarity about the relationship of church and state was absolutely essential given their experience with the English government in the early days of the colonies:

I will now add what I do not like [about the Constitution]. First the omission of a bill of rights providing clearly and without the aid of sophisms for freedom of religion, freedom of the press, protection against standing armies. . . .Let me add that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference.” (Hofstadter 1958, 114)

The first amendment was later passed in 1789, clearly articulating what Jefferson stated to Madison two years prior, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof”1 (U.S. Constitution, Amend. 1, Sec. 1). Through this statement and subsequent letters, Thomas Jefferson and the founding fathers shaped how the Judicial, Legislative and Executive Branches viewed and acted on the First Amendment.

Jefferson further defined the First Amendment of the Constitution through the idea of “separation of church and state,” taken from Thomas Jefferson’s letter to the

---

1 The “establishment clause” and the “free exercise clause” stem from the first amendment and are what are often referred to in Supreme Court cases regarding religious freedom and religious institutions.
Danbury Baptists in 1801 and cited by justices, policymakers and citizens alike today.

Jefferson wrote:

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties. (Jefferson 1802)

Interpreting “separation of church and state” and deciphering the establishment and free exercise clause relationship to each other and FBOs is at the crux of a historical whiplash. As Robert S. Alley writes in his introduction to The Supreme Court on Church and State, this letter has been at the center of Supreme Court law:

In supplying the massive literature on church and state matters in this country, the Court has relied heavily on the founders James Madison and Thomas Jefferson. Not only have the justices focused upon the role of these men in the evolution of the First Amendment, they have also regular related their decisions and dissents to Jefferson’s 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association. . . . In truth, the Court’s words on Religion Clauses since 1947 are hardly comprehensible apart from that particular historical perspective. (Alley 1988, 3)

A letter written over a century ago continues to heavily shape United States law and policy regarding faith-based organization.

In “Founding Faith: Providence, Politics, and the Birth of Religious Freedom in America,” Steven Waldman writes that there was no cleanly articulated and unified belief on behalf of the founding fathers on what separation of church and state meant, or even a
belief the First Amendment should only apply to the federal government.

For one thing, Madison reluctantly had to concede that the First Amendment would only apply to the federal government, not to state or local governments, which could aid—or even oppress—religion as much as they wanted. We tend to forget (now that these men are demigods) that they were also politicians. Madison’s task was to assemble a coalition, and if we look at the other men who shaped the Constitution and the First Amendment, we find a wide variety of views, including some strong advocates of government-supported churches. In the Constitution, the original intent was, intentionally, murky. (Waldman 2009)

The founding fathers were trying to reconcile a common desire to have a clearly articulated policy in place to ensure religious freedom with their individual and religious beliefs (not very different from the today’s debates). Jefferson’s words in 1801 and the founding fathers’ beliefs set the stage for the United States Governments’ relationship towards and with FBOs for the next two hundred years.

Stephen Monsma provides historical context to the founding fathers and their desire for government to be uninfluenced by the church and for freedom of religious choice. Monsma argues that, though the founding fathers did not want government to be influenced by or responsible for religious activities, church and religion still contributed a great deal to the founding fathers’ sense of community and communal responsibility. Monsma paints the picture of early Americans having a strong religious life and community: “They saw religion outside of support for a generalized sense of concerns of government. Thus to ignore the role of collectivities in the lives of the faithful and to wall religion off from government would do no harm to religion, since it operates in an individual, private sphere. This attitude is still prevalent in the United States today” (Monsma 2012, 66). The founding fathers had a strong belief in separation of church and state, yet some of them lived in religious communities that took care of the neediest often
due to their religious beliefs. As Waldman wrote, “In other words, they were spiritual enough to care passionately about religious freedom, but not so dogmatic that they felt duty-bound to promote a particular faith. This combination led them to promote religious freedom rather than religion” (Waldman 2009, 10). Much has been written on the founding fathers, their beliefs and intentions for the long-term blueprint for church-state relations. Where one sits on the political aisle usually influences one’s answer to the founding fathers’ intention. Regardless of politics, the founding fathers most likely never fathomed such large populations of those with needs living in such disparate secularized communities where their needs could go unmet due to prohibitive costs or lack of community-centered care.

After the passage of the Bill of Rights, all three branches of government have struggled to reconcile a “wall of separation” with communities that have grown too large to take care of their neediest, and the rising costs and complexity of meeting basic resource needs of all citizens. This struggle has been based on a foundation that was laid in a very different period with a set of different needs.

The second crucial change in the situation from the founding era is that the strict separation, no-aid-to-religion principle that emerged out of the founding era was an answer to a different question than the one the United States faces today. . . but the issue the United States is facing today is not that the funding or regulation of religious congregations in their core religious rituals and ceremonies but of the funding and regulation of religiously rooted organizations that are providing educational and other human services to the general public. (Monsma 2012, 69-70)
In particular, the past fifty years has demonstrated a period where the executive, judicial and congressional branches have been trying to reconcile the founding fathers’ intent and the changing landscape of needs in the United States.

**The Supreme Court’s First Amendment Whiplash: To Support or Not Support FBOs**

While there are many Supreme Court cases that involve interpreting the First Amendment (and therefore the Establishment and Free Exercise clauses), there are several opinions that are important to understanding the current FBO landscape and FBO’s ability to have impact. These are: *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940), *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971), *Bowen v. Kendrick*, 487 U.S. 589 (1988), *Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819 (1995).\(^2\)

Originally, the Free Exercise clause was only applicable to the U.S. Congress, leaving state and local governments with the freedom to abridge it (as long as there was not a Free Exercise clause in the state’s constitution). In 1940, the Supreme Court held in *Cantwell v. Connecticut* that, due to the Fourteenth Amendment, the Free Exercise Clause is enforceable against state and local governments (Cornell University Law School 1992). In this case, the Court held that the government has no role in determining religious truth. The Court also held that the peaceful expression of beliefs—including religious views that might offend some citizens—is protected by the First Amendment from infringement by state governments as well as the federal (The Bill of Rights

---

\(^2\) These cases are reviewed by either Daly and Monsma or both. Using their work and other articles (cited in the bibliography), I determined these were the cases that best laid the foundation for how FBOs are viewed currently.
In another important aspect of his opinion, Justice Roberts created what would become a universal rule of First Amendment jurisprudence; namely, that although a state may regulate the time, place, and manner in which groups hold public meetings or engage in solicitation, it may not ban them altogether or discriminate on the basis of the content of the message (Urofsky 2011). This case is helpful in understanding how and why in later years the government would need to carefully negotiate providing aid to FBOs that provided social and religious services.

The next case in First Amendment jurisprudence that provides insight into current day FBOs is *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947). It is in *Everson* that the establishment clause gets clarified and the idea of “no aid to religion” becomes cemented.

The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. . . No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the religious affairs of any religious organization or group and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect “a wall of separation between church and State.” . . . That wall must be kept high and impregnable. *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)

With Justice Hugo Black’s opinion it seems clear that the funding of religion is forbidden. This opinion would later lead to policy that required any FBO to separate their social services from religious services. Ironically, *Everson* affirmed a policy providing state aid for both public and parochial school students (Daly 2009, 45). Both Daly and Monsma mark *Everson* for clearly establishing the idea of “no aid to religion” and for laying the ground work for “equal treatment” doctrine that is the biggest influence of today’s policies (to be discussed later) (Daly 2009, 45; Monsma 2012, 62).
Everson also reinforces the powerful yet “murky” path the founding fathers created with the First Amendment. Justice Black wrote:

These words of the First Amendment reflected in the minds of early Americans a vivid mental picture of conditions and practices which they fervently wished to stamp out in order to preserve liberty for themselves and for their posterity. Doubtless their goal has not been entirely reached; but so far has the Nation moved toward it that the expression "law respecting an establishment of religion" probably does not so vividly remind present-day Americans of the evils, fears, and political problems that caused that expression to be written into our Bill of Rights. Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)

Over one hundred and fifty years later, the circumstances that led to the Bill of Rights were still evoked with passion, as if the United States could return to the days where England ruled and religious beliefs were considered a matter of the state.

In Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971), a critical “test” was established to ensure that the “primary effect” of any government aid to religious institutions must be one that “neither advances nor inhibits religion.” The Court determined that a 1968 Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which enabled the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to reimburse non-public schools (most of which were Catholic), for the salaries of teachers who taught secular material in these nonpublic schools, secular textbooks and secular instructional materials, violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment (Daly 2009, 44). Justice Burger’s opinion included:

The District Court concluded that the Act violated the Establishment Clause, holding that it fostered ‘excessive entanglement’ between government and religion. In addition two judges thought that the Act had the impermissible effect of giving ‘significant aid to a religious enterprise.’ (Lemon v. Kurtzman 1971).³

³ It is also interesting to note that the passion that was apparent at the founding of the United States and the creation of the First Amendment once again appears in the opinion of a Supreme Court Justice. Notice the use of the word “evil” by Justice Burger, “Ordinarily political debate and division, however vigorous or even partisan, are normal and healthy manifestations of our democratic system of
The ruling was “analytically transformed into a screening point for even remote or incidental religious effects, so that any such effects disqualified aid even when the main effect was secular” (Daly 2009, 44-45). This case was considered part of the era of “strict separationist” where “even modest forms of indirect aid” were thrown out (Daly 2009, 44).

The next era of the Supreme Court First Amendment rulings was that of “equal access” or “equal treatment” and paved the way for current-day policy. One of the fundamental cases in this era was Bowen v. Kendrick in 1988, in which the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Adolescent Family Life Act, a federal law stipulating the eligibility of religious organizations for government contracts in sex education (Daly 2009, 44). With Bowen and several other cases in that era, “equal treatment or neutrality among religious and secular groups and activities trumped a rigid ‘no aid to all things religious’” (Monsma 2012, 63). The “equal treatment” concept opened a door for FBOs to compete for government contracts as “third party” service providers.

The opinions of the mid-1990s took a turn from a more strict view of separation of church and state to a broader interpretation. This shift along with some key legislation opened the door for FBOs to get support in providing services. The idea of “equal treatment” was pushed even further with Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 515 U.S. 819 (1995). In Rosenberger the court determined that when the University of Virginia provided financial support to various student government, but political division along religious lines was one of the principal evils against which the First Amendment was intended to protect” (Lemon v. Kurtzman 1971).
publications, it was unconstitutional to not fund the religious publication as well (Monsma 2012, 63). This opinion along with two others paved the way to the policies that enabled funding FBOs alongside non faith-based service providers.

In recent rulings, the Court has increasingly loosened its interpretation of the separation of church and state. For example, states are allowed to provide financial support for secular services on parochial school property (Agostini v. Felton 1997) and supply educational materials and computers for secular-oriented programs in parochial schools (Mitchell v. Helms 2000). Justice Sandra Day O'Connor's concurrence in Mitchell v. Helms was the decisive vote, and her opinion in this case cautions that the state may not provide funds for religious indoctrination—a principle that resonates in the current debates on faith-based initiatives. (De Vita and Wilson 2001)

The First Amendment’s jurisprudence history provides insight into why present day policy makers still struggle with how or how not to support FBOs. This is only part of the story.

**Beyond the Court: Faith and FBOs Benefiting From and Shaping Policy**

The Supreme Court and founding fathers were not the only entities to shape the path for current day FBOs. Several historically significant pieces of legislation outside the Court impacted government support of faith based social services, often created by the president himself. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and Johnson all played noteworthy roles in enabling faith-based organizations to take a more central role as service providers.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal was a turning point for the United States for multiple reasons. The two reasons related to FBOs are: first, the New Deal’s significant religious underpinnings in its approach to caring for the poor and underserved; second, its sweeping acknowledgment of a need for and the creation of
government social services. The “rise of the New Deal, with its many aid programs and significant public spending, was a watershed in the structure of poor relief and social services. . .” (Daly 2009, 33). Influenced by the Catholic social teaching, the New Deal cemented the need for government to create and regulate social policy for the benefit of those with less means in the United States.

When Roosevelt came into Executive Office in 1933, the United States was in a fiscal and social slump, “every moving part in the machinery of the American economy had evidently broken. Banks, farms, factories, and trade had all failed” (Rauchway 2008, 63). Roosevelt needed to make the sweeping changes he promised during the election, “During his campaign Roosevelt has emphasized that Americans wanted action and action now. Between March and June of 1933, the New Deal delivered. Fifteen major pieces of legislation established new agencies from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration through the innovative Tennessee Valley Authority” (Brown 1998, 163). The New Deal established standards for many social programs, including child labor and creating a “living wage,” Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) and Social Security. It also reinforced major faith-based social service organizations as intermediaries for aid including larger faith-based organizations like Catholic Charities (to be discussed further in Chapter Four). The New Deal changed the face of social services both in terms of what services the government should be expected to provide and with whom the government was willing to partner to provide them.

With the foundation of the New Deal and the rulings of the Supreme Court, funding to FBOs in the past five decades has been significant, particularly where there is
a social need to be met. The Congress under President Truman provided substantial and long term support to faith-based organizations. After World War II, in an effort to make health care improvements in the United States, the federal government began to provide aid to local and state welfare efforts as part of The Hill-Burton program. Some of the aid for hospital construction was provided to religiously affiliated hospitals.

As of 1960, more than 1,600 religiously affiliated hospitals (including 889 Catholic hospitals) had received Hill-Burton funds totaling approximately $330 million. In one survey of 407 religious social service agencies, 290 reported that receiving tax dollars by way of subsidies or purchase of service contracts. On a denominational basis, including Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant agencies, all but Southern Baptists had more agencies receiving tax dollars than not. Sixteen of the agencies reported receiving public funds amounting to 50 percent or more of their operating budgets. (Daly 2009, 36-37)

This act, in its original form, lasted until 1975 when it became part of the Public Health Service Act, a United States federal law enacted in 1944 (U.S. President 1944).

Through the Economic Opportunity Act (as part of his “War on Poverty”) and the Civil Rights Act, President Johnson provided a foundation for the expansion of the FBO-government partnership and autonomy for FBOs in that partnership (at least in terms of hiring). The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 included several social programs to promote the health, education, and general welfare for the impoverished. Although most of the initiatives in the Act have since been modified, weakened, or rolled back, its remaining programs include Head Start, and Job Corps.

Within the Economic Opportunity Act, President Johnson enabled churches and parochial schools to be eligible for aid, but with “blanket restrictions on religious use of funds and on religious discretion of screening clients or staff” (Daly 2009, 38). This decision to both allow parochial schools and churches to access aid, yet restrict how they
used the funds, became part of the blueprint for how government aid could be used by religious institutions. This also reinforced the idea of “government by proxy” whereby public services are outsourced to private organizations (Daly 2009, 38). Through partnerships with the government many of the larger non-profits (faith based and secular) helped create a model for government outsourcing of services.

Another key piece of legislation to impact FBOs and government policy towards FBOs was the Civil Rights Act. The Civil Rights act enabled FBOs to maintain religious autonomy in hiring while providing services. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In section 702 of the Civil Rights act, religious organizations were exempt from Title VII for those personnel which were responsible for religious activity. This was broadened by Congress in 1972, enabling religious organizations to be exempt from the employment provisions of the Civil Rights Act as they relate to nondiscrimination based on religion. Then in 1987, the Supreme Court unanimously upheld this exemption in the case of *Corporation of Presiding Bishop v. Amos* (Monsma 2012, 79). Being able to hire not only mission-centered but well qualified employees is one of the greatest challenges for any service provider. The ability to hire well is one of the single most significant levers to achieving greater impact (e.g. serving more clients; providing high quality services) in an organization. It is often a struggle for smaller non-profits (religious and secular alike) to hire employees with the right expertise and who are also aligned with their belief system or mission (to be discussed in Chapter Six).
Through the Supreme Court’s opinions, a broadened sense of government responsibility for meeting social need and greater support from the government to social service organizations, aid to FBOs has risen significantly and FBO’s dependency on these dollars has risen as well. According to Steven Monsma, “as of 1993, 65 percent of Catholic Charities’ revenue was drawn from government sources. For the Jewish Board of Family and Children’s Agencies, it was 75 percent, and for Lutheran Social services it was 92 percent.” As Lew Daly indicates, some of this funding led to “increasing secularization of the large social-welfare agencies, and these agencies, in turn, increasingly monopolized government funding” (Daly 2009, 39). What also has historical grounding is the lack of oversight provided when government funds are provided to faith-based institutions providing social services. Though the agencies would receive funding, this funding did not come with regulations on actual impact to those in need (to be discussed in Chapter Five).

It has been a long road for the three branches of government both to interpret the original thinking of the separation of church and state and to adopt and evolve this concept as the United States population and relationship to religion, and social needs evolved. With the advent of “charitable choice” in 1996 (to be discussed in Chapter Five) and today’s policies set forth first by President Bush and then by President Obama, the road took a very distinct turn. In the years to follow, the lack of clear and consistent policies, and lack of a coherent structure within which these organizations serve the poor directly influences the effectiveness of FBOs today (to be discussed in Chapter Six). Monsma argues that the ebb and flow of FBO support led to a distinct legacy for FBOs,
“the lack of a thought-out, carefully considered theory that defines the place of religion and religious associations in the public life of the nation” (Monsma 2012, 57). Decades of debating instead of creating best practices and regulations for government partnerships with FBOs created a shaky foundation at best. Monsma goes on to articulate that this history has orphaned FBOs.

In terms of the patterns of thought typical of most Americans – and especially the academic and media elite – faith-based policy positions and faith-based human service organizations are rendered, as it were, orphans. There is no rich vein of political and social theories, concepts or political traditions that faith-based organizations can draw upon to define their place in the public life and defend their right to an institutional autonomy that guarantees their religious freedom rights. (Monsma 2012, 58)

Though Monsma is not concerned with the long-term effectiveness of FBOs, his argument does provide insight into why FBOs are not able to reach their potential as best-in-class service providers. With no traditions, consistent regulations or even guiding philosophies, both the partnerships with government and FBOs and the management of FBOs themselves are not consistent and often are uninformed. This development begs the question of why the United States should partner with FBOs to provide such critical services? This question can be partly answered by the strength in mission and the strength of the larger-standing FBOs that helped pave the way for today’s policies and today’s faith based organizations.
CHAPTER FOUR
THEOLOGICAL INFLUENCES ON FBOS AND HISTORICAL INFLUENCES OF FBOS ON POLICY

With a shaky historical foundation and widespread criticism, why argue for FBOs as a key player in the social service landscape? Why should the government continue to provide aid to FBOs? For two reasons: first, for decades, established FBOs that have provided services and influenced policy to better provide resources for those in need. The established FBOs not only provide proof that FBOs can impact policy and people, but they provide models of how FBOs can be a consistent provider within the social service landscape. Second, the theological underpinnings of the social justice theory on which most FBOs are founded provide a drive to serve that goes deeper than basic service providers. This chapter will explore both of these reasons.

Each year, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* publishes the “Philanthropy 400,” which looks at the top philanthropic organizations and charities in terms of their philanthropic worth (both private giving and government giving and grants). In the 2012 report, among the top four philanthropic organizations in the area of social services were United Way Worldwide (raising $3.9 billion) at number one, the Salvation Army at number three (raising $1.7 billion) and Catholic Charities at number four (raising $1.6 billion). Others in the top rankings were the YMCA at number eleven (raising $823 million), at number twenty-five Lutheran Services in America (raising $516 million) and the United Jewish Federations of North America at number sixty-two. Of the top 100 philanthropic organizations overall (including social services, education, health and
United Way was number one, Salvation Army was number three, and Catholic Charities came in at number four. Twelve of the top twenty-five philanthropic organizations were created as and/or are still operating as faith-based organizations (Chronicle of Philanthropy, 2012). The larger, more established FBOs in this group are among the wealthiest and most established non-profits in the United States.

Catholic Charities (formerly the National Conference of Catholic Charities) has a one hundred-year history in the United States, playing a role in both direct service and influencing social welfare policy: “Its ability to continue to attract financial and human resources and to sustain grassroots services and legislative advocacy makes the Catholic Charities network a significant asset for the poor in contemporary America and underscores the importance of the private sector in American welfare” (Brown 1998, 9). Catholic Charities’ mission is “to provide service to people in need, to advocate for justice in social structures, and to call the entire church and other people of good will to do the same.” It has a broad reach of 1,735 branches in the United States and 240,000 volunteers servicing over 7.8 million people yearly (Catholic Charities USA 2012).

Catholic Charities was founded in 1910 out of a need to better serve Catholic immigrants, then numbering fifteen million and nearly half living in poverty. Founded on the Catholic University campus, the National Conference of Catholic Charities (NCCC) was originally promoted the creation of diocesan Catholic charities bureaus, “to bring about a sense of solidarity” among those in charitable ministries, and “to be the attorney for the poor.” What became an annual conference started with “four hundred delegates from twenty-four states who were largely laypeople, representative of women and men...
who had founded the many charitable institutions in various ethnic communities, of the Vincentians, and of Catholic academics and public figures concerned about the poor in this society. President Taft hosted the closing ceremonies at the White House” (Catholic Charities USA 2012). Many of the activities of the various Catholic organizations that first comprised NCCC were focused on meeting the local needs of and providing direct service to poor Catholic immigrants: “For most Catholic immigrants, the reality that awaited them here was poverty, the struggles of assimilation, and religious and ethnic prejudice” (Rev. J. Bryan Hehir 2010, 2). In the early years, Catholic Charities was “principally a local-indeed parochial-ministry,” and it was not until the 1920s that it transitioned from a parish-based ministry to a “professionally organized diocesan-wide ministry” (Rev. J. Bryan Hehir 2010, 25). This became the foundation for the organization to both provide extensive direct service and impact policy.

Catholic Charities and the affiliated clergy, lay people and associated networks are often attributed with influencing the New Deal and being an intermediary in providing relief services at the time of the New Deal (Brown 1998, 165; Catholic Charities USA 2012), professionalizing the role of social worker as provider of services to the needy (Brown 1998, 9) and raising awareness and helping advocate for better public education (Brown 1998, 31) among other accomplishments. According to the “Chronicle of Philanthropy” two-thirds of its budget is by way of government grants and funding.

Similar to Catholic Charities, The Jewish Federations of North America is rooted in the struggle of Jewish immigrants in America in the mid-1800s: “A multiplicity of
Jewish relief and welfare groups struggled at first in these cities to ‘take care of their own,’ feeding the hungry, sheltering the homeless, securing jobs, and treating the sick and elderly” (Jewish Federations of North America 2011). As a response to issues during this period of time, the Jewish community in Boston created a centralized organization in 1895, which became the “Combined Jewish Philanthropies.” Jews in other cities began to follow suit and created similar “federations.” The “federations” title is relatively new, as the “Combined Jewish Philanthropies” became the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare. In 1999 the council first merged with the United Jewish Appeal to become the United Jewish Communities and then in 2009 became the Jewish Federations of North America. In 2013 there are nearly two hundred “federations” across North America and three hundred “networks.”

The Jewish Federations focus on four main issues: Jewish continuity and identity, maintaining social policy and human services, securing necessary financial resources, and redefining the Israel-Diaspora relationship (Jewish Federations of North America 2011). Some of their entities’ budgets are comprised of up to 70 percent government funding and contracts, and according to the Chronicle of Philanthropy they have fallen from being the second largest philanthropic organization in 1992 to sixty-second in the 2012 report. Much of their work was focused on settling Jewish refugees, most notably during the persecution of Jews in World War II (Jewish Federations of North America 2011).

Lutheran Services in America is relatively new as an organization. Officially founded in 1997 through combining several other major Lutheran networks (formally the Association of Lutheran Social Ministry Organizations which included the National
Association of Lutheran Ministries with the Aging). Similar to The Jewish Federations and Catholic Charities, Lutheran Services in America is rooted in over a century of individual Lutheran communities reaching out to and serving those in need (most notably by creating orphanages) (Lutheran Services in America 2013). As an “umbrella” organization Lutheran Services provides its affiliates with capacity-building support that includes helping affiliates find funding, governance and leadership training and support, program development support and free or discounted materials and journals to help local leaders meet mission. Today, Lutheran Services in America serves over six million people per year with three-hundred and ten member organizations that cover a variety of services including health care, aging and disability supports, community development, housing, and child and family strengthening (Lutheran Services in America 2013).

These three larger faith-based social service organizations are a few of the more established giants. Also included (and with similar founding histories) are The Salvation Army, The United Way, Boys and Girls Club of America, Goodwill Industries, and Habitat for Humanity, all multi-million or billion dollar organizations providing much needed direct service and often with an advocacy arm trying to influence policy to better the lives of their clients. These larger organizations were trail-blazers in terms of garnering government support, creating large sustainable organizations that consistently provide services to the poor and influencing policy. The larger organizations have similar structures with local chapters providing direct services to local communities and an organizing umbrella or national organization. The national organization or umbrella organization provides support using prescribed structures for the local entities, guidelines
on how to sustain operations through streamlined fundraising, and sometimes national 
autonomy is asserted over the kinds of services that each local entity can provide. Though 
the larger organizations are less maneuverable (and often more secularized) than smaller 
FBOs, they rarely face the issues of capacity that smaller FBOs face, yet those receiving 
large parts of their budgets from government support or contracts can be at the mercy of 
government whim and public scrutiny. These structures will be discussed more in 
Chapter Seven as possible models where lessons have been learned that can be applied to 
the smaller congregation-based FBOs.

Because of the work of these organizations, the current FBO policy has a 
structural foundation to stand on. Though some of the larger FBOs are considered largely 
“secular” today, much of their origins and ability to sustain operations over time can be 
traced to their theological roots. The theological roots of the larger FBOs both created the 
urgency with which they were founded and helped sustain their services for the following 
decades. Calling on their communities to “give back” as part of their religious duty, these 
organizations created a system grounded in theology and social justice theory that 
enabled them to endure through decades of internal and external challenges and often 
have significant impact on the well-being of those in need (at least where the impact is 
measured).

Similar to gaining a historical perspective on FBOs in order to better understand 
the potential for FBO impact, gaining an understanding of the theology that fuels FBOs 
provides insight into both why they are a critical part of the social service network and 
why they are limited in their effectiveness. As previously discussed, faith based
organizations are well positioned to serve the poor because of both access to those in need and their mission and theological underpinnings:

. . .there is evidence faith-based organizations often fill a niche that either government or large, secular service agencies would have a hard time filling. This is the case largely for two reasons: first, faith-based organizations often have grass-roots contacts, networks, and structures on which they can call in providing needed services and, second, they have faith-rooted beliefs into which they can tap to motivate and encourage. (Monsma 2012, 42)

Theology provides strength to FBOs as service providers, enabling their day-to-day work to be a mission to be fulfilled. The Salvation Army, Catholic Charities, Jewish Federation, YMCA, Lutheran Services of America, Boys and Girls Club and many more all have roots in faith and theology. Each one of the larger and more successful organizations began fulfilling a mission defined by the religion of their founders and their initial clients.

This mission-driven strength crosses multiple faiths and types of organization (type in terms of size and services provided) and can be a powerful motivator:

Persons who are part of the select group of the religious traditions represented here (Christian, Jewish and Muslim) are motivated by moral imperatives to serve and beliefs that they are accountable to God. This finding is not surprising because the call to service emanates from mono-theistic faith traditions whose roots are intricately tied. . . These great traditions are reflected in the study themes called (1) Moral Imperatives to Serve, and (2) Accountability to God. (Boddie and Cnaan 2006, 268)

For Jewish-supported organizations such as The Jewish Federations and Hadassah, Lutheran organizations such as Lutheran Services in America and arguably the Salvation Army, Catholic organizations such as Catholic Charities or Muslim organizations such as the Islamic Social Service Association and Arab Community Center for Economic and
Social Services (ACCESS), the moral imperative to serve those in need is embedded in scripture, doctrine and social justice theory, even if their reasons slightly differs.

While providing a detailed background for the theology-based social justice theory of Catholics, Evangelical-Lutherans\(^1\), Jews and Muslims would be unnecessary, gaining an overview of some of the tenets of each religion (and some of the similarities) that helped them create successful FBOs sheds light on why they are well-positioned to serve, as well as on how they operate. In addition, the theology not only influences mission and desire to provide services, but it can often impact the actual structure of the faith-based services: “For faith-based organizations, founding practical theology influences what stakeholders are named into these [governance structure] bylaws and how the organization’s guidance systems are structured” (Adkins, Occhipinti and Hefferan 2010, 175). It is often the structure (or lack thereof) that impedes an FBO from having greater impact on those utilizing their services and leads to a lack of consistency in their service provision (as will be discussed in Chapter Six). With either outcome, better understanding this founding theology (and their similarities and differences) provides insight into FBOs and their current and potential strengths and weaknesses.

The Jewish Federations and associated community groups were founded based on the teachings of the Torah, Talmud and Rabbinic teachings. In *There Shall Be No Needy: Pursuing Social Justice through Jewish Law and Tradition*, Rabbi Jill Jacobs carefully explains the roots of Jewish social justice as seen in biblical text and rabbinical teachings.

\(^1\) Lutheran Services of American includes Evangelical-Lutheran services. For the purpose of showing differences in social justice theory and how social justice theory impacts FBOs, this chapter will focus on Evangelical-Lutheran social justice theory.
This multi-pronged approach to defining social justice is also reflected in Catholicism and Islam. All three religions view the poor as one’s “brother” or responsibility and a critical part of following their faith.

In Judaism, Deuteronomy is often looked to as one of the biblical texts that prescribe how to look at and treat the poor: “You shall surely open your hand to your brother, to the poor and the needy in your land” (Deut. 16:20). Using Deuteronomy and rabbinical teachings as a base, Rabbi Jacobs explains the concept of *tzedakah* as the expression of mercy on the poor, the recognition of the poor person as your relative and the commitment to sustaining your community (Jacobs 2009). The other concept in Judaism that is closely associated with social justice in the Jewish tradition is *tikkum olam*, commonly thought of as “to fix.” Rabbi Jacobs warns her readers that the uses of *tikkum olam* are varied, “the words themselves defy easy translation” and that it is only in the past sixty years that this has become a “popular” term as part of Jewish social justice theory (Jacobs 2009, 25). This is observed by Mario Cuomo in his article, “In the American Catholic Tradition of Realism” in *One Electorate Under God* (edited by E.J. Dionne Jr., Jean Bethke Elshain and Kayla M. Drogosz). Cuomo argues for the universalism of *tzedakkah* (defined as “the obligation of righteousness and common sense that binds all human beings to treat one another charitably and with respect and dignity”) and *tikkum olam* (defined as “we come together as human beings in comity and cooperation to repair and improve the world around us”) and that these concepts are also “the essence of Christianity, founded by a Jew and built on precisely that principle” (E. J. Dionne 2004). While Rabbi Jacobs may not agree with the direct translation, Cuomo is
correct in that the Jewish foundational concepts of social justice are similarly woven in both Muslim and Christian religions.

What differs between religions can be who are taken care of and how they are taken care of. An important vehicle for social justice theory in Judaism is education and it is considered just as important as action.

The Jewish theology of charity, justice, and support for those in need comes from a combination of the Torah and the Talmud (the Hebrew scriptures and commentary on them), and is regularly reinterpreted in Jewish communities and their institutions. It starts with a moral sense of responsibility for the community and each other, taught through a combination of family practices and religious education. (Adkins, Occhipinti and Hefferan 2010, 172)

Rabbi Jacobs explains that it remains unclear if the instruction to take care of the poor refers to all poor or just to the poor of Jewish heritage (Jacobs 2009). The Jewish Federations also grappled with this question and how to focus their mission, ultimately landing on having a goal of preserving “Jewish identity and heritage” to be at the same level as that of social services, carried out through education. This debate included questioning if they should continue supporting Jewish nursing homes and other Jewish service organizations if there was no longer a need for separate nursing homes due to anti-Semitism. Now that those of Jewish heritage could be seen and go anywhere for their care, there was less need to provide support for this kind of service (Jewish Federations of North America 2011). This decision demonstrates the tension between serving a broad constituent base versus serving those of the same faith. This theme will be discussed in Chapter Six and can directly impact an FBO’s funding and effectiveness.
In terms of theology influencing structure, Jewish law also directly impacts how Jewish services are structured and, therefore, their overall effectiveness. Jewish organizations tend to be highly professionalized, a strategy that can be interpreted as secularization. However, this emphasis on trained professionals connects to Talmudic lessons describing the provision of high quality service in order to help someone to become a contributing member of society (Adkins, Occhipinti and Hefferan 2010, 182). This practice gives Jewish services a clear advantage, as will be seen in Chapter Six.

Catholic Charities and other major Catholic social service providers are rooted in Catholic social justice thought. The encyclical *Rerum novarum* is often considered the start of modern Catholic social thought; but Catholic social justice thought spans much further and can be seen as early as the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Catholic social justice thought is built on the teaching of the Bible and in writings of both lay people and ordained (not to be confused with Catholic social teaching, with is primarily under the authorship of popes or bishops).

. . . this dating is misleading if it gives the impression that prior to 1891 the papacy ignored social topics. Indeed Leo himself issued a number of papal letters, called encyclicals, on political matters that predate *Rerum novarum*. Without doubt, however, it was the 1891 encyclical that inspired a deeper and broader commitment by church members to the social questions of the time. (Himes 2005, 3)

Catholic Charities, in recollecting their history of the organization, includes the letter *Rerum novaram* as a major milestone leading to their foundation (Rev. J. Bryan Hehir 2010). This encyclical was a turning point for Catholic social thought. Another turning point came with some of the writings of Vatican II “emphasizing the dignity of the human person” (Massaro, s.j. and Shannon 2002, xv). These turning points are significant
because they called for Catholics to care for those in need, no matter what faith they may hold.

As Mario Cuomo writes, the underpinnings of Catholic social justice thought are closely related to (and built on) Jewish teachings. Further showing the commonalities of social justice theory in “Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy,” the United States Catholic Bishops wrote, “The focal points of Israel's faith—creation, covenant, and community—provide a foundation for reflection on issues of economic and social justice.” For Catholics, particularly Catholic Americans, social justice theory balances personal faith, advocacy and action: “. . .American Catholics have come to a greater appreciation of pluralism and public policy debate informing a moral judgment addressed to a particular set of historical circumstances, a judgment that is provisional yet authoritative” (Massaro, s.j. and Shannon 2002, xvi). Nowhere is this more true than in finding ways to take care of the needy in the United States.

Though there are hundreds of biblical texts, documents, letters and analysis that explain why providing care for the poor is core to being Catholic, there are two recent documents that address this directly and are relevant to the urgency of the issue. One is the aforementioned letter from the United States Catholic Bishops, “Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy.” In the letter the bishops address many social issues, but the poor are a central theme, and the bishops emphasize the problem and the urgency for a multi-pronged approach:

Harsh poverty plagues our country despite its great wealth. More than 33 million
Americans are poor; by any reasonable standard another 20 to 30 million are needy. Poverty is increasing in the United States, not decreasing. (10) For a people who believe in "progress," this should be cause for alarm. These burdens fall most heavily on blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans. Even more disturbing is the large increase in the number of women and children living in poverty. Today children are the largest single group among the poor. This tragic fact seriously threatens the nation's future. That so many people are poor in a nation as rich as ours is a social and moral scandal that we cannot ignore. (United States Catholic Bishops 1986)

Though this letter was written in 1986, it still applies to present day issues surrounding poverty and justice.

The bishops also address how a solution to better care for the poor needs to be developed. Not only have they called for a solution that involves the entire community – private business, local community and state and federal government, but the bishops call for both direct service work and advocacy:

The Church has a special call to be a servant of the poor, the sick, and the marginalized, thereby becoming a true sign of the Church's mission—a mission shared by every member of the Christian community. . .We must also be reminded that charity requires more than alleviating misery. It demands genuine love for the person in need. It should probe the meaning of suffering and provoke a response that seeks to remedy causes. True charity leads to advocacy. (United States Catholic Bishops 1986, 87)

As discussed, Catholic Charities and other Catholic organizations incorporate this mandate (one of many) into their mission and day to day actions. It is this faith-based mission that provides the extra layer of urgency and need to provide critical services.

In “‘Economic Justice for All’”: Ten Years Later,” Archbishop Rembert G. Weakland addressed the fall of communism, the globalization of the economy, loss of faith in government and issues around the poor and unemployed, all with an eye towards
how the bishops might re-write their letter in 1996. In a harrowing statement, he ends with, “They would see that most of the domestic issues are the same as they were 10 years ago, but the conditions are worse... The problems have grown more intractable, and the effects of wrong moves can be even more disastrous. I am sure the bishops would say that there is now more need for guiding principles than there was 10 years ago” (Massaro, s.j. and Shannon 2002, 170). The prevalence of the issues described provides an urgency that keeps many Catholic churches and organizations serving their constituency. The history of Catholic social justice theory and the prolific writings of ordained and lay people have provided a rich backdrop for these services to be carried out. The social justice tradition of Church-directed service has enabled Catholics to build best practices and strong organizations serving and advocating for the poor. This development of systems over time provides a distinct advantage for the larger Catholic FBOs.

Founded in 1988 from three separate and well-established North American churches: The American Lutheran Church, The Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and The Lutheran Church in America (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 2013), the Evangelical-Lutheran Church is newer to developing its flavor of social justice theory. Though it has a much shorter history than that of Judaism and Catholicism, the ELCA social justice theory has similar themes and a similar urgency in the call to action. The church states:

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America addresses social concerns as a witness to God’s just and loving purpose for all of creation. It does this by equipping and nurturing members for their calling in the world, encouraging learning and moral deliberation around social concerns, developing and enacting
social teaching in the form of social statements, and interpreting and applying social policy. (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1999)

While the issues addressed in the collection posted by the church are similar to that of Judaism and Catholicism, the body of literature is less extensive and the approach is different.

In 1999, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America issued a twenty page statement called “Social Statement: Sufficient, Sustainable Livelihood for All” which addressed numerous social justice issues including: unemployment, corporate responsibility, economic crisis, developing countries and poverty, and poverty domestically (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1999). It calls for both personal dedication to eradicating issues of poverty and for government intervention:

. . . government to provide adequate income assistance and related services for citizens, documented immigrants, and refugees who are unable to provide for their livelihood through employment; adequate, consistent public funding for the various low-income services nonprofit organizations provide for the common good of all; scrutiny to ensure that new ways of providing low-income people with assistance and services (such as through the private sector) do not sacrifice the most vulnerable for the sake of economic efficiency and profit. (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1999, 13)

It also “called for” direct giving to service organizations such as Lutheran World and Federation, Lutheran World Relief (Evangelical Lutheran Church in America 1999, 19).

While Judaism’s and Catholicism’s bodies of writing come from centuries of discourse (and learning) about how the faithful should conduct themselves in service of social need, Evangelical Lutherans have a crisper, more streamlined answer but a shorter, less tested tradition. Most documents date back to the late 1980s and the church is still forming guidance on issues such as criminal justice and justice for women (Evangelical
Lutheran Church in America 2013). Evangelical social justice theory has a shorter history of practical application and the actions are less prescribed within church doctrine there is an impact on how their FBOs are operated:

> Evangelical organizations frequently make reference to the concepts such as divine “appointment” and “intervention,” reflecting a belief that much of their work occurs through the hand of a higher power. The success of these organizations is rarely measured in quantifiable terms. Traditional metrics of self-evaluation such as charts and graphs are often rejected; rather emphasis is placed on the relationships that are formed and the effect the work has on the lives of clients served. (Adkins, Occhipinti and Hefferan 2010, 172)

This point is not made to indicate that Jewish or Catholic FBOs are all well-run and have clear outcome measures, it just demonstrates how founding theology and social justice theory can have a direct impact on the service and structure of an FBO.

Though American-Muslim FBOs are smaller in number (to be discussed in Chapter Five), Muslim religion and culture have equally explicit teachings, through the Qur’an, including social justice theory as does Catholicism and Judaism evolved from different texts and with clearer boundaries than those of Judaism and Catholicism. Muslim social justice theory demonstrates how a founding theology can actually limit both scope of services and reach of FBOs, as the social justice theory is largely prescribed as Islam calling for Muslims to care for the needy, but primarily those in need within their sect.

The founding theology of FBOs is often at the heart of the effectiveness debate. Another way theology can limit FBO effectiveness is through issues surrounding strict hiring practices and limitations placed on the services an FBO is willing to provide due to their religious beliefs. The larger, longer-standing FBOs provide insight into the
challenges of being a service provider in a largely secular and broad network because they have years of on-the-ground learning, such as lessons on keeping a faith identity and yet receive government support. There is a trend of increasing secularization as some larger FBOs receive more and more government funding. These FBOs are left in a precarious position, having to choose between upholding their own beliefs and financially sustaining the organization. For FBOs to be a reliable part of the social service network there needs to be ways to both preserve the theological foundation that provide strength to the services, and not limit the services or restrict whom the organization is willing to serve. Some of these issues were resolved with the faith-based policies of Presidents Bush and Obama but other aspects of this issue are left unresolved, leaving FBOs vulnerable to both losing their religious identity or becoming so immersed in their religious identity that they have less impact on those they are trying to serve. Regardless, there is a strong case for FBOs as a viable part of the social service solution.
CHAPTER FIVE

FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS TODAY: RELEVANT POLICY, CURRENT LANDSCAPE, AND CRITICISM TO THE INCREASED ROLE OF GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF FBOS

The last seventeen years have been a transition point for government support of FBOs. This transition started with “Charitable Choice” laws, which were part of the 1996 Welfare Reform efforts. President Clinton signed the Charitable Choice laws during the period of 1996-2000. These laws were designed to give people in need choices among the charities offering them services. The Charitable Choice laws apply to four Federal programs: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) and the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) programs (both overseen by the Administration for Children and Families at the United States Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)); programs for substance abuse and mental health (overseen by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) at HHS); and the Welfare-to-Work program (overseen by the Department of Labor) (White House Faith Based and Community Initiatives 2001). Controversial and precedent setting, the Charitable Choice laws opened up a whole new door to funding for faith-based organizations.

The Charitable Choice laws had to be constructed in a way that both built on and adhered to the rulings of the Supreme Court that were previously discussed: because of cases such as Bowen (1988), the door was open to having FBOs provide services as long as there was not “excessive entanglement” of the social service being provided and the
religious services provided (as explained in *Lemon*). In addition, thanks to Bishop FBOs could maintain autonomy in hiring.

One of the biggest precedent setting aspects to Charitable Choice was that the government could provide money directly to sectarian religious congregations, meaning they did not have to set up a separate 501(c)3 for their social service programs (OpenSource Leadership Strategies, Inc 2004, 6). To ensure that the opening of federal funds to FBOs was within the bounds of the law, Charitable Choice laws had the following provisions as they related to the religious nature of FBOs:

- Protect the religious autonomy and character of faith based organizations that deliver public service
- States are required to deal with religious organizations “on the same basis as any other non-governmental provider without impairing their religious character”
- Faith based providers cannot discriminate against beneficiaries and beneficiaries must have access to non-religious providers if desired or if no religious provider is available
- Charitable choice provides for autonomy over corporate structure, governance, trusteeship, and so on, as well as control of mission – “control over the definition, development, practice and expression of religious beliefs.” And the FBO retains control over employment policy. (Daly 2009, 58-59)

Charitable choice paved the way for the next two presidents to create broad-sweeping policies regarding partnering with and providing funding to FBOs.

Some of President Bush’s more controversial policies during his time in office were those centered on faith-based organizations. In 2001, almost immediately after taking office, President Bush created the White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives in order to “. . .help the Federal Government coordinate a national
effort to expand opportunities for faith-based and other community organizations and to strengthen their capacity to better meet social needs in America's communities . . . to establish policies, priorities, and objectives for the Federal Government's comprehensive effort to enlist, equip, enable, empower, and expand the work of faith-based and other community organizations to the extent permitted by law” (U.S. President 2001). President Bush also created satellite offices in seven federal agencies: Agency for International Development and the Departments of Agriculture, Education, Justice, Labor, Health and Human Services and Housing and Urban Development with E.O. 13279. President Bush signed E.O. 13279 nearly two years later. Executive Order 13279 included clear principles that addressed the benefit of partnering with FBOs, stating, “The Nation's social service capacity will benefit if all eligible organizations, including faith-based and other community organizations, are able to compete on an equal footing for Federal financial assistance used to support social service programs.” E.O. 13279 also clearly stated that “the Federal Government must implement Federal programs in accordance with the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution.” The guidelines follow closely in the footsteps of the Charitable Choice guidelines around protecting the autonomy of FBO governance, ensuring eligibility for any person in need (no matter the religious affiliation) and upholding regulations restricting government support to the social services, not to include the religious services (U.S. President 2002).

Though the initiative did not immediately generate new dollars for FBOs, it did open up a stream of funding previously unavailable to certain FBOs, especially to those
that did not have separate 501(c)3 entities for their services. In *God’s Economy*, Lew Daly hails Bush’s policy as innovative: “It was also a major innovation in presidential history: never before had a dedicated infrastructure been established for the purpose of helping religious groups participate in a government aid program” (Daly 2009, 60). This innovation paid off, literally. By 2003, nearly $1.1 billion of funding became available to FBOs of all kinds. By 2008, the following occurred:

…thirty-five states and more than one hundred cities had designated an office or individual to serve as a liaison with faith-based groups. Some of the actions resulting from these changes include modifying contract processes, encouraging contractors to subcontract with religious groups, and providing capacity-building grants and technical assistance. (Daly 2009, 64)

It was clear that President Bush was enabling a much broader impact for FBOs.

Major criticism of Bush’s FBO policies flowed as freely as the dollars. The criticism was focused on several major areas including Bush’s policies muddling the separation of church and state. Some fundamentalists claimed that the government was “meddling in religion and the possibility that cults and fringe religions plan might benefit from Bush’s plan.” (Daly 2009, 61) Criticism also focused around the fear that Bush was trying to privatize the social sector, therefore minimizing the role (and responsibility) of government, and that opening up funding to smaller FBOs would take away from some of the larger, more established (and more secularized) FBOs such as Catholic Charities. These will be discussed at the end of the chapter.

**President Obama Continues the Trend**

Similar to President Bush, and with a backdrop of critics, in his first few weeks of taking office President Obama signed two Executive Orders: Executive Order 13498,
which changed the name of Bush’s FBO office to The White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships and established a twenty-five member advisory council called “The President’s Advisory Council for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships” (U.S. President 2009). President Obama retained much of the structure of President Bush’s office including satellite offices in twelve government agencies, all with the goal of government agencies working together with religious and community groups that deliver social services (U.S. President 2009, 220). President Obama sent a clear message about government’s desire to partner with FBOs by also using executive power rather than creating legislative policy. This decision was surprising to many more left-leaning supporters of the President, and similar to President Bush, President Obama received both heavy criticism (especially from those that were concerned about separation of church and state) and support.

In 2010, Obama provided clarification of President Bush’s original policy through Executive Order 13559, “Fundamental Principals and Policymaking Criteria for Partnerships With Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Organizations.” (U.S. President 2010) The Advisory Council created, “A New Era of Partnerships: Report of Recommendations to the President,” in which were a proposed set of recommendations to “clarity the legal foundation of partnerships and a new set of fundamental principles to guide agency decision-making in administering federal aid support to faith-based and neighborhood organizations” (Interagency Working Group on Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Partnerships 2012, 4). In Executive Order 13559, President Obama incorporated these recommendations, amending Bush’s Executive Order 13279. With
Executive Order 13559 came several major recommendations to improve the separation of religious activities and social services, to promote better adherence to grant guidelines (e.g. agencies that provide grants have more transparency on polices affiliated with the grant), and emphasize that an FBO could maintain “religious identity” while still avoiding “excessive entanglement between religious bodies and government entities” (as seen in *Lemon*). In addition, President Obama established an “Interagency Working Group on Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Partnerships” that was charged with reviewing and evaluating existing regulations, guidance documents, and policies (Interagency Working Group on Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Partnerships 2012, 5-6). With the amendments to Executive Order 13279, President Obama cemented the fact that FBOs would be a critical part of the service provider landscape but also acknowledged to many of the critics of President Bush’s policies that there was need for more regulations when it came to funding FBOs. However, absent from the amendment was any recognition of the need for regulations regarding impact or effectiveness of FBOs, as the focus was once again centered on separation of Church and State.

The gap in effectiveness measures was further highlighted in a recent report issued by the Advisory Council. In 2012, The Interagency Working Group report focused on a set of recommendations that helped enforce the amended E.O. 13279. This fifty page document was, once again, heavy on further defining how to regulate FBOs with respect to separation of church and state or “excessive entanglement” and unbelievably light on any recommendations, models or training materials for how FBOs could better provide services or build their own capacity. There was extensive material on how to train,
monitor and test FBOs and their employees on their understanding of using government funds in compliance with constitutional principles and a better definition of the role of intermediary agencies in providing funds to FBOs. Also included were further guidelines on FBO’s rights to protect their religious identity.  

By those most critical of government support, the report was considered insufficient, again not because there was a lack of guidance on effectively providing services, but because the church-state lines were still not clear enough. One article focused on separation of church and state felt that it was not direct or strong enough, “The Interagency Working Group’s report is a muddle that fails to track the recommendations it was ordered to follow. It seems unlikely that federal agencies will be implementing regulations any time soon” (Posner 2012). Most of the criticism of government support of FBOs remains focused on church-state separation with little acknowledgment of the fact that millions of dollars are going to FBOs and there without a clear understanding how those dollars are enabling increased services to the needy or, even more, helping eradicate poverty.

What both Presidents’ policies did was set a precedent for using the executive branch to create policy for a highly contentious area, and they opened up funding to a set of FBOs that had never received government support. It was almost as if the larger, more well-known FBOs or secularized FBOs had captured the market for the many years leading up to President Bush’s policy. These new policies broadened the FBO landscape.

---

1 These are my findings after reviewing the documents and the training materials included. Granted, the purpose of the document was more centered on enforcing separation of church and state. The lack of any kind of guidance on impact or capacity beyond the first amendment was glaring.
Billions of dollars have been awarded to FBOs in the past fourteen years, all towards improving services and policy for those in need. While this could be seen as a brilliant innovation towards government partnering with communities to ensure the United States has a better social service provider network, it also received significant criticism from those of all political and social backgrounds.

**Criticism of Increased Funding and Partnerships with FBOs**

While this thesis contends that government-FBO partnerships will ultimately benefit those in need in the United States, it is important to explore criticism of the recent increase in funding and partnership, beyond the more mainstream criticism that these policies are unconstitutional. The constitutionality of these policies is not an explicit topic in this thesis. Recent criticism against the policies of both Presidents Bush and Obama has come from liberals and conservatives alike. The next section will explore four areas of criticism: first, the inherent bias against non-mainstream religions; second, the diversion of dollars from larger FBOs with proven track records; third, FBOs as a replacement for government social services (which does underpin some of the original thinking of Bush’s policies); and fourth, the lack of proven effectiveness of FBOs.

One of the first places President Obama’s policies were put into action was through the stimulus package of 2010. According to an article published by POLITICO on December 3, 2010: “at least $140 million in stimulus money has gone to faith-based groups.” The article then told the story of the Obama administration encouraging faith-based organizations to apply for stimulus dollars. The article laid out dollar amounts...
going to various religions: at the time of the article $90 million of stimulus funding went to Catholic groups, Protestant groups received at least $45 million, Jewish groups received at least $6 million and Muslim groups received less. For the purposes of this thesis, using the same website that POLITICO did (Recovery.gov, provided by the government to track stimulus spending) it is clear that the FBOs that traditionally received government support (Christian and Jewish FBOs) were provided at the same level of support or had an increase in stimulus money: Catholics and Protestants only received a few million more than what was reported in 2010. There was a significant jump for Jewish groups to $33 million and Muslim aid stayed mostly stagnant, with only $685,000. This imprecise illustration of the distribution of aid tells the story of one of the many criticisms of Bush and Obama’s support of FBOs and how the “open stream” of funding only goes to both already established and popular mainstream religions versus less “popular” or FBOs of religious organizations that have not traditionally received support, such as Muslim FBOs.

As illustrated above, one of the major challenges to the Obama and Bush policies is the inherent bias built in against those religions that are not considered “mainstream” religions. This bias has also been studied as part of looking at immigrant services in Connecticut:

The need for initiatives beyond those offered by traditional providers has generated calls for other faith-based organizations to assist in providing post-resettlement services. Churches, Muslim associations (like the Muslim Coalition of Connecticut), and mosques (like Muhammad Islamic Center of Greater Hartford…) have responded. However, Christian and Jewish faith groups continue to dominate as service providers in the Hartford area. . . and have greater access to funding for resettlement services, including those mediated through the
Unfortunately, there are few guidelines for the disbursement of funds to a diverse set of religious organizations. Without guidelines and without an established precedent of government support, Muslim organizations are at a disadvantage. Add to that disadvantage the negative perception many Americans have about Muslims. In 2010, Gallup performed a poll called, “Religious Perceptions in America: With an In-Depth Analysis of U.S. Attitudes Toward Muslims and Islam” and found that more than four in ten Americans (43 percent) admit to feeling at least "a little" prejudice toward Muslims -- more than twice the number who say the same about Christians (18 percent), Jews (15 percent) and Buddhists (14 percent). In an additional question asked in this poll asking Americans to express their overall view about each of the four religions evaluated, Islam was the most negatively viewed (Gallup, Inc 2010).

If the United States is dedicated to providing services to all of those with needs, the immigrant populations that are not affiliated with mainstream religions but do prefer religious-based service providers have just as much need as their counterparts. These populations can (and do) receive services from some of the more secularized FBOs (e.g. Catholic Charities). If part of the original intent of the policies around FBOs was to ensure there was not a bias against FBOs, there needs to be a way to ensure that a religiously diverse set of FBOs provides services, including those that have not traditionally received government support.

Another argument against the recent policies enabling a broader group of FBOs to receive funding is that they will take away from more established FBOs with stronger
track records. If there are effective organizations that have established the capacity and experience in delivering services, the policies of the past fourteen years could weaken their position as social service providers. As David Saperstein writes in his article, *Appropriate and Inappropriate Use of Religion*:

The pitfalls are magnified by the government’s refusal to increase existing funds. The [charitable choice] money will necessarily be taken out of the strong, successful faith-based entities such as Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, and Jewish Federations and distributed among the approximately 350,000 churches, synagogues, and mosques in the United States that may decide to seek government funding. If one-tenth of those eligible apply, there will be 35,000 pervasively sectarian institutions competing with each other for limited government grants. That kind of competition will undermine the fabric of religious tolerance that has served our nation so well and dilute, if not altogether eradicate, funding for the long-standing, effective, religiously affiliated social service programs. (Dionne and Chen 2001, 303)

Though it would be hard to demonstrate how money has been diverted from larger organizations to smaller FBOs, especially in a period of government cutbacks, it does seem (as evidenced in Chapter Four) that the larger FBOs (Catholic Charities, Lutheran Services) are still strong in their philanthropic success.

Another major criticism of the recent policies on FBOs is that the policy is a sign that the government is trying to totally privatize social services and is trying to back out of its role and responsibility as a social service provider. This criticism stems from closely examining the authors of some of the original Charitable Choice and Bush’s policies and their distaste for “big government.” Both Jason Hackworth in *Faith Based: Religious Neoliberalism and the Politics of Welfare in the United States* and Lew Daly in *God’s Economy* provide historical context for the original idea of some of the early policies and their conservative roots.
Hackworth explains the various roles an FBO could play: “The literature reveals that FBOs are positioned and understood in at least four ways: as extensions, enhancements, catalysts, and alternatives (both regressive and progressive) to government based welfare” (Hackworth 2012, 24). Using Hurricane Katrina response and Habitat for Humanity as some of his examples, Hackworth spends many pages demonstrating why FBOs cannot replace government services and furthermore, that most FBOs do not have the capacity or the desire to replace government services, even if that idea has been endorsed in recent policy and political rhetoric. Hackworth is not alone in his assessment: in Not By Faith Alone, Julie Adkins paints an even more direct picture:

Without the involvement and commitment of governments, FBOs have neither the political, the economic, not the social capital to do the work that we as a society are asking them to do. I do not suggest that government involvement guarantees that social problems will be solved – witness the truly awful city-run shelters cited in the first section of this chapter. I do suggest that government abdication guarantees that such a problem will not be solved. (Adkins, Occhipinti and Hefferan 2010, 103)

Because of the conservative roots of the movement there may be more fear than truth in the idea that federal and state governments are going to leave social services to FBOs or just to the private sector. Yet, this criticism is prevalent and needs to be addressed.

Though the original Charitable Choice legislation may have roots in anti-big government sentiments, an “FBO only” solution is not an effective solution or a solution at all given the present need of underserved Americans. Government also has a role in setting policy and guidelines so that all Americans can have equal access to services, a role that only a governing body could fulfill.
E.J. Dionne further makes the practical point around why an “FBO only solution” is not a solution by demonstrating that a pure-FBO solution cannot actually substitute for government support:

But, make no mistake: while faith-based organizations can supplement and strengthen public social service programs, they can by no means substitute for government support. To dramatize the point, just consider that even if all 353,000 religious congregations in America doubled their annual budgets and devoted them entirely to the cause and even if the cost of government social welfare programs was magically cut by one-fifth, the congregations would barely cover a year’s worth of Washington spending on those programs and never even come close to covering total program costs. (Dionne and Chen 2001, 274)

To provide for America’s neediest, collaboration is necessary between government, FBOs and the broader community (private and public). When political rhetoric gets mixed with actual effectiveness data, ideas can be mistaken for impact. It is only by looking closely at actual impact and effectiveness that a clear picture can be drawn of how FBOs should work in concert with the federal government.

Lastly, the most problematic of the criticisms of the increased support of FBOs by the government is the fact that little is known about FBOs’ impact on those in need. Many questions have yet to be answered about the quality and consistency of services, the actual impact on recipients of FBO services and if FBOs really are a long-term answer to the issue of providing for America’s neediest.

But our lack of knowledge is even more embarrassing. We do not know if faith-based social services are at all effective, and when compared to secular (private, public or nonprofit) social services, if they are performing equally, better or worse. . . Trust and widespread support are important politically and do serve as indirect evidence that faith-based social service are generally helpful, but this kind of evidence is no substitute for formal, rigorous studies of efficacy and efficiency of those services. (Boddie and Cnaan 2006, 9 and 11)
There is little evidence of the effectiveness or the lack of effectiveness of FBOs. And what is known about their impact is usually based on a study of one service in a single city. Part of the reason such little evidence exists is that most of the resources supporting FBOs and related policy is spent ensuring that FBOs are administering services so as to comply with the Constitution.

Because the focus of the debates and time spent on creating policy and structure have been spent on the question of separation of the church and state, not nearly enough time or resources have been spent on trying to understand if FBOs are effective as service providers or even how they can become more effective, if they are an already established service provider. Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore, Richard C. Hula and Laura A. Reese address this issue in their book, *Reinventing Civil Society: The Emerging Role of Faith-Based Organizations*. The authors actually do complete an impact study but not without reminding their reader (at least in ten different places) that little evidence exists for FBO effectiveness:

> Faith-based nonprofits have been providing social services for decades and were receiving public funding long before the political visibility of the Bush administration’s Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. Yet the outcomes and implications of this role and the integration of faith-based organizations in the governing fabric of communities has surprisingly not been the target of as extensive a body of research. (Jackson-Elmoore, Hula and Reese 2011, 7)

It is alarming that even with the increase in government funding, time dedicated to supporting FBOs, and strong calls for ensuring that FBOs respect the constitution, there is little interest in ensuring that FBOs are having an impact on serving more of America’s poorest populations with consistent services.
CHAPTER SIX

POTENTIAL IMPACT: THE POTENTIAL IMPACT FOR FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS, THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR REALIZING THAT POTENTIAL, AND POSSIBLE BARRIERS

Providing social services in the United States will take a multi-pronged approach that includes both government and the private sector. Faith-based organizations are a critical ingredient to the private sector service provision. Over the past fifteen years significant time, legislation, guidelines on policy, and money has been invested in FBOs as service providers.

There is tremendous potential for the FBO sector to both meet the basic resource needs of Americans and to help advocate for changes to the system that is not meeting their needs currently. This direct service and advocacy work should focus on eradicating poverty and improving health, education and overall standards of living. The potential is seen through the actual numbers these FBOs currently serve and the ability they have to work together to understand and advocate for not only the needs and direct service to but also to advocate for better systems to service America’s neediest.

The combination of services provided by the larger FBOs (Catholic Charities, United Way, Lutheran Services in America and others) and the smaller congregation-based FBOs (based on the service providers of the 1500 congregations that Mark Chaves surveyed in his National Congregations Study II), FBOs as a sector have the potential to serve millions of America’s neediest per year. This is a tremendous asset to the social service landscape. The recent legislation has moved to better support these service providers through funding and “technical assistance” or training and services to help
these organizations better function. In order for the FBO sector to better serve clients and have the possibility of creating system-wide change, several barriers need to be addressed.

There are five potential barriers to FBOs and the faith-based sector fulfilling their potential as service providers: 1) Focus: religion’s adverse impact on outcomes; 2) People: the human capital barrier (which includes governance and management issues); 3) Tools: the infrastructure and measurement barrier; 4) Outside support: the suffer in silence barrier; and 5) Diversity and Inclusion: the usual suspects barrier.¹ Each of these barriers is not only a potential threat to the reliability of an FBO and the sector as a whole, but it is a threat to the people they serve (their “clients” or those utilizing the services provided by the FBO). By exploring these barriers and possible solutions, the sector can develop a system to enable FBOs better serve their clients.

**Focus: Religion’s Adverse Impact on Outcomes**

As discussed in Chapter Four, faith is a huge asset to FBOs and the founding theology has the potential to deepen the investment of both those that work or volunteer at an FBO and the people they serve. The founding theology plays a critical and significant role from enabling a deeper commitment of volunteers and staff to creating the urgency for advocating for the needy on a federal level. But religion can also act as a barrier that leads an FBO to take on more than they can or should professionally or theologically handle.

¹ While some may argue that fundraising should be on this list, my belief is that inability to raise funds is a symptom of the issues of human capital (the right skilled fundraisers) and infrastructure (the right tools to do the fundraising and outcomes to make it a lucrative investment).
This first example of this is seen through congregations who become service providers without having a separately run organization. When a congregation-based service provider decides to expand its focus to serve the poor it can often be a secondary mission, although important to the underlying faith. In fact, congregations are rarely solely focused on providing quality social services as demonstrated by the amount of staff and volunteer time dedicated to it. In Mark Chaves’ article, “Testing the Assumptions: Who Provides Social Services?” (a chapter in *Sacred Places, Civic Purposes*), Chaves discusses the varied and short-term focus of social services provided by congregations. When discussing the staffing realities of most congregation-based social service providers (to be discussed further in the human capital section below) Chaves writes, “The basic picture is clear: although most congregations participate in some sort of social service activity, only a small minority actively and intensively engage in such activity” (Dionne and Chen 2001, 288). When a congregation is pulled to both run the daily operations of services and other worship activities, providing social services is often secondary. This can have direct impact on quality of service, consistency of service, and if the service will enable the person being served (client) to change their situation.

Chaves further illuminates the point by explaining that congregations are also not as focused on the long-term well-being of their clients such as long-term eradication of poverty, attainment of education, and/or improvement in health that can be the outcome of those in need getting connected with critical social services, “In other words, congregations are much more likely to engage in activities that address the immediate
needs of individuals for food, clothing, and shelter than to engage in projects or programs that require sustained involvement to meet longer-term goals” (Dionne and Chen 2001, 298). This lack of focus or “jack of all trades” aspect of congregation-based social services needs to be taken into account when considering these types of FBOs as part of the social service solution. It is not to say they are not reliable, but understanding their limitations is critical to providing a suite of services to the poor. There is a need for short-term services (like clothing and soup kitchens) but those services need to be paired with services that help a person or family change their situation.

Religion can also lead to lack of focus when religion is seen as the primary goal and services as secondary. This question is not related to the issues of the First Amendment, but instead looks at how religion can have an impact on outcomes by an FBO’s theology becoming more important than serving the client. This happens in several ways in all sizes of FBOs.

The larger FBOs in trying to provide all services to all people (especially if required to do so due to government grants and contracting) run into issues when their religion prohibits the service they provide. Catholic Charities has run into this issue on several fronts, especially around same-sex adoptions. In 2012 the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops released a “fact sheet” called, Discrimination Against Catholic Adoption Services: Religious Liberty Under Attack: A Concrete Example, where they explained the situation of Catholic Charities and same sex adoption:

In 2006, Catholic Charities of Boston, which had been one of the nation’s oldest adoption agencies, faced a very difficult choice: violate its conscience, or close its doors. In order to be licensed by the state, Catholic Charities of Boston would have to obey state laws barring “sexual orientation discrimination.” And because
In a similar situation to Boston, in 2011, Illinois Catholic Charities shut down their adoption services. An article from the Boston Globe reported:

"Catholic Charities in Illinois has served for more than 40 years as a major link in the state’s social service network for poor and neglected children. But now most of the Catholic Charities affiliates in Illinois are closing down rather than comply with a new requirement that says they can no longer receive state money if they turn away same-sex couples as potential foster care and adoptive parents. (Goodstein 2011)

Note the same story but slightly different language. This reflects the two different viewpoints: For Catholic Charities the issue was about religious freedom rather than serving families, for the secular reporter it is about serving families. Similar to congregation-based social service providers being keenly aware of what they can handle as far as capacity, all FBOs, especially those providing multiple services, need to come to agreements at a governance and management level about what their religion will and will not allow before providing the service and then having to revoke it. If they do revoke services there needs to be a plan to ensure families are getting their needs met absent that organization as a service provider. This did not happen in the case of Catholic Charities in Illinois.

Religion as the primary focus and services as secondary also is seen in how theology can sometimes influence staff (full-time or volunteer) to act in ways that do not put their clients’ needs first. In *Faith-based social services: Measures, assessments, and effectiveness*, Stephanie Boddie and Ram Cnaan studied the effectiveness of faith-based
organizations in addressing issues stemming from urban poverty. A large part of their findings surrounded the impact of religious beliefs (their study represents Christian, Jewish and Muslim faiths) on operations and outcomes. While they (like Dionne, Daly, Monsma and others) provide findings on how religion can deepen commitment of staff and other positive benefits, they also provide findings on how religion can undermine both governance and operations:

Similarly, if a faith-based tradition interprets God’s call to mean that social service providers cannot give up on another person, no matter what that person does, then this has incredible consequences for how staff relates to clients... If having tried one’s best to serve is a motivator, then effort and process become more important than outcomes... for many of these individuals in faith-based organizations, mission and accountability to God trumps secular or professional expectations. (Boddie and Cnaan 2006, 280-281)

Drawing clear expectations about where religion can and should influence the staff of and services provided by an FBO are necessary to the FBO operating at its full potential. Yet, this is more complicated than the one-size-fits-all types of support often recommended by traditional consultants and other agencies providing technical assistance or capacity-building support to non-profits.

In their conclusion, Boddie and Cnaan warn of studying FBO effectiveness devoid of understanding the specific faith of the provider because “the interpretation of beliefs form the assumptions that guide practice in faith-based organizations” (Boddie 2008, 283). In Not by Faith Alone: Social services, social justice, and faith-based organizations in the United States Julie Adkins, Laurie Occhipinti, and Tara Hefferan make a similar statement, “...academic scholars cannot hope to understand FBOs without understanding the theological ground on which they based their actions and
interventions.” And in “The Role of Faith in Christian Faith-Based Humanitarian Agencies: Constructing the Taxonomy,” Laura Taut further warns not to consider Christian FBOs as similar in faith and therefore faith’s impact on operations, “Thus, the purpose of this taxonomy is to highlight not only simply the fact that there is variation and faith impacts the structure and operations of faith-based agencies, but, more importantly, also to emphasize that such variations have implications for the success of humanitarian efforts in the field” (Taut 2009, 347). Based on their studies it is clear that paying close attention to the theology that underpins FBOs is critical for both the FBO and those that support and fund them. This starts with human capital and finding the right people for governance and full time and volunteer staff roles.

**People: The Human Capital Barrier**

Human capital is one of the most important assets of any organization, especially a non-profit organization. Finding the right people for governance, management and staff (volunteer and full-time) is time consuming and takes expertise to execute well. FBOs are not only looking for staff and employees who want to serve the client population and have the skills to do so, but also staff that are good matches for the mission and who value the same principles as those of the FBO. As discussed in Chapter Three, FBOs are allowed to hire based on religion affiliation, which can further narrow their pools and make it harder to find full or volunteer talent that can provide services at the professional level needed.
In *Good to Great*, Jim Collins lays out what an organization needs to do if they want to go from average to being best-in-class in what they create or the service provide.

His first ingredient is well-matched people:

The good-to-great leaders understood three simple truths. First, if you begin with “who,” rather than “what,” you can more easily adapt to a changing world. . . . Second, if you have the right people on the bus, the problem of how to motivate and manage people largely goes away. The right people don’t need to be tightly managed or fired up; they will be self-motivated by the inner drive to produce the best results to be part of creating something great. Third, if you have the wrong people, it doesn’t matter whether you discover the right direction; you still won’t have a great company. Great vision without great people is irrelevant. (Collins 2001, 42)

When Jim Collins adopted his book (originally written for for-profits) to non-profits he added three points to the three above about getting the right people “on the bus” or in an organization:

First, the more selective a process, the more attractive a position becomes – even if volunteer or low pay. Second, the social sectors have one compelling advantage: desperate craving for meaning in our lives. Purity of mission – be it about education young people, connecting people to God . . . feeding the hungry, serving the poor . . . has the power to ignite passion and commitment. Third, the number-one resource for a great social sector organization is having enough of the right people willing to commit themselves to mission. The right people can often attract money, but money *by itself* can never attract the right people. Money is a commodity; talent is not. Time and talent can often compensate for lack of money, but money cannot ever compensate for lack of right people. (Collins 2005, 16-17)

In larger organizations and for-profits finding, training, and retaining talent is a full-time job. According to Mark Chaves, National Congregations Study II, of the 1,506 congregations he studied only forty-seven percent have two or more staff people and thirteen percent have no paid staff (Chaves 2008). This means that careful attention needs to be paid to those select fulltime and volunteer staff that provide services.
Where this is often felt most is in finding the right people to lead and/or govern an FBO. Often with the “jack of all trades” aspects to non-profits and especially FBOs, a focus on the right leadership and governance is not present, as the focus is on the direct service. Any person in a governance role or leadership/management role (if those exist) in an FBO needs to have the skills required to lead, needs to understand that part of their role is to help garner funds and support, and needs to have a clear understanding of what their role is in terms of ensuring the services provided are done so with the utmost professionalism and care. Often the person that takes a governance role at the beginning of an organization’s trajectory is a different person than the one needed as the organization grows and serves more clients.

There comes a point in any organization’s or service provider’s trajectory where relying on leadership and governance that is pulled in many directions does not enable the vision setting and management needed, if they are considering becoming a long-term service provider. In the book, *Growing Pains*, Eric Flamholtz and Yvonne Randle explore all the major areas that an organization experiences pressure and pain while trying to grow. One of the major areas they focus on is leadership and governance, stressing how critical it is for any organization or company to create a strong management as a foundation for growth:

> It is at this stage that the organization must make a transition from an entrepreneurship to what can be termed an entrepreneurially oriented, professionally managed firm. This means that the organization, while still maintaining its entrepreneurial spirit, will need to develop the infrastructure and professional management capabilities require to continue its growth successfully. (Flamholtz 2000, 35)
Often the governance of an FBO is made-up of volunteers without the expertise to govern. Those in governance positions need to have a clear vision and skills to help the FBO reach its goals around providing consistent and high-quality services, especially since much of the fulltime staff will be on volunteer basis.

In addition, a skilled person in a governance or leadership role will have a focus on the fundraising (or “development”) efforts of the FBO. This is a critical role, just as important as providing strong leadership and operational skills.

Enough good examples exist to make it clear that well-positioned congregations can make significant contributions to community development. To succeed, they need a professionally staffed, independent, nonprofit development organization, which can be supported by one or more congregations. They need a long time horizon. They also need to be committed to staying in the community. And they need to understand that development is a demanding, time consuming process. (Dionne and Chen 2001, 137)

If fundraising is left to staff (volunteers or fulltime), the very people providing services will be distracted by both the action of and fear around not having enough funding. It does not mean that staff cannot play a role in bringing funds into the FBO, but that should not be their focus.

As mentioned by Dionne and Chen and many other FBO “experts,” professional staff is critical to service provision. Professional staff needs: 1) clearly defined roles, 2) related skills and training, 3) commitment to the mission through a concrete commitment of time that will be provided to the FBO. Depending on the size of the operation the staff does not (necessarily) need to be full-time, but they do need to be skilled at the roles they are asked to perform or if they are unskilled, they need comprehensive training. Many organizations have depended on well-trained volunteers for their core services (e.g. City
Year, Catholic Charities, American Red Cross). These volunteers are usually trained by full-time staff of highly skilled practitioner-volunteers. Because of the vast experience within the FBO sector, there is a rich set of learning about hiring, management governance and training. This learning needs to be more easily accessed by FBOs with less experience in these areas.

**Tools: The infrastructure and Measurement Barrier**

The third barrier to an FBO’s success as a quality service provider is not having the right tools with which to manage their operations. Tools is a broad term and can encompass technology, training (already addressed above), management systems, and systems to both set and manage measures of impact and effectiveness. Together with human capital, infrastructure is the other key ingredient of building strong capacity for an FBO. This is a barrier because building this kind of infrastructure and using professionalized tools requires both skills and expertise that smaller FBOs may not have readily available.

One critical tool for FBOs to reach their potential is a consistent and easy to measure set of metrics that look at both the reach of an FBO and the outcomes of its services. These types of measures better enable government and other funders to understand if FBOs are a worthwhile investment as social service providers and for the FBO themselves to understand how to improve services. As discussed in Chapter Five, systematic and consistent measurement is necessary to understanding if FBOs are a viable part of the social service landscape. “While public debate on the appropriate role of faith-based organizations has been extensive and often quite heated, resolution of key
issues has been difficult due to a lack of reliable data on what faith-based organizations do and how they do it. Indeed, the information base for secular non-profits is hardly any better” (Jackson-Elmoore, Hula and Reese 2011, 7). Part of the reason the sector has been remiss in creating clear metrics is there is no requirement put on FBOs from their own governance, funders or the recipients of the services to do so.

Because most social services are free or significantly discounted the recipients of services often have little control over the quality of those services, unless an FBO engages in active surveys or other types of measurement. In addition, measuring effectiveness has not been a priority for funders of FBOs (especially government). In Faith-based social services: Measures, Assessments, and Effectiveness, Stephanie Boddie and Ram Cnaan directly address this issue:

Unless prodded by notoriety about some program, there appears to be very little political inclination or capacity of units of government to evaluate the programs they support. . . .Yet even if one could obtain all the desired measures, different outcome components would be valued very differently and for different reasons by clients, assorted providers and sponsors. Although the agents that deliver social services may be nonprofits or for-profits, the fact that most social services, just like primary and secondary education in many cases, are not sold to their recipients, but granted to them, fundamentally affects every aspect of that provision. (Boddie 2008, 44-45)

Even simple measures such as clients served per quarterly or annually would both help the FBO better understand the capacity they need and enable a funder to know the “return” on their dollars invested (or donated) to the FBO (for example for every dollar “invested” or provided to the FBO by a grant, there are XX clients served). The governance of successful organizations often require basic metrics and develope ways to measure clients served and sometimes even client satisfaction. These are the types of
outcomes that are put into an “Annual Report” that helps the FBO garner more funds and better convey the quality of their services leading to a sustainable cycle of funding based on strong results or an understanding that dollars are spent wisely.

In addition, understanding the impact of a service (e.g. if a family actually attained a resource, how they perceived the quality of the service provider) not only helps the family in need change their situation but that type of information can help an FBO better ascertain how to improve their services. Boddie and Cnaan outline three “Axioms” that need to be adopted by all FBO service providers:

Axiom 1: If something exists, then it has the potential to be measured. Axiom 2: If something can be measured, then the practitioner is in a better position to do something about it. Axiom 3: If a client problem can be validly measured, then the social worker is in a better position to effectively help the client and to see whether the efforts are followed by improvements to the client’s life. (Boddie 2008, 74)

While creating useful metrics and, if warranted, a longer-term evaluation can be daunting for a small under-resourced FBO, there are examples from other organizations that can be used. In order for the FBO sector to operate at full potential and reach clients, there needs to be a widely-adopted agreement that measurement is important. This needs to start with the governance of the FBO and be intrinsically believed by the staff and funders. The belief in measurement should be as strong as the belief in founding theology because measuring effectiveness is what leads to more and higher quality services to those in need and ultimately leads to the ability to provide services to even more people with needs.

Another type of infrastructure that should be available to and used by all FBOs is the tools and infrastructure related to budgeting and fundraising. Government grants and contracts to FBOs often require project budgets (as seen in the guidelines created by The
White House Interagency Working Group on Faith-Based and Other Neighborhood Partnerships produced in 2012). This does not mean that FBOs use or even know how to conduct on-going budgeting. According to Chaves’ “Second Wave of the National Congregations Study” only seventy-five percent of the congregations that participated have a formal written budget (Chaves 2008, 432). That number needs to be further discounted for reporting bias. Having a basic operating budget that is used for quarterly or monthly reporting should be a basic requirement for one hundred percent of the organizations providing social services. This reporting and budget oversight needs to be the responsibility of the governing body and at least one staff person and volunteer within the organization. Without a window into available funds, there can be no contingency planning or communications to the clients about where they can go if services suddenly are not available due to funding. Organizations such as The Management Center in Washington, DC can provide free tools and training to FBOs so that they can make these basic infrastructure investments.

Part of managing a budget is managing the fundraising. Again, to manage the often overwhelming task of ensuring enough funds are supporting an FBO, the congregation or organization needs the combination of the right human capital and the right tools. Considering the available dollars to FBOs and that much of charitable giving in the United States is religiously focused, compared to other types of non-profits, FBOs have the potential to garner enough funds to fulfill their social service provision commitments. Or if they are lower-resourced, the FBO will need budgeting and forecast
related fundraising tools to understand how they need to supplement the giving related to the congregation.

For example, of the total gifts given to charities, approximately two-thirds go to religious organizations. For the most part, these funds are given by members of particular congregations to support the service provided to themselves and other members of their congregations. Poor people contributing substantially to churches are not much help to these poor churches. (Oster 1995, 115)

Building the systems that both enable an FBO to get the most from their constituents and from other sources takes considerable skill and planning. A lack of this planning leads to a direct impact on those that are being served. Having skilled fundraisers on staff is nearly impossible for smaller FBOs, but often the human capital gap can be filled on a volunteer and / or governance level. Most congregations have staff dedicated to fundraising for the congregation, and the skills and time spent on raising money for the main congregation could also be provided for the service-provider arm. By identifying individuals that are skilled at fundraising and closely aligned with a religion and / or service, an FBO can then engage that person and invite them to be a part of their Board or to advise the leadership of the FBO.

Ensuring that FBOs have at least the basic technology, management and measurement tools is essential to being able to depend on them as part of the social service landscape. Infrastructure is usually built over time as an organization grows and often in reaction to systems breaking. Ideally, an organization pre-determines the kinds of tools it needs to grow. There are many larger FBOs that have built the tools for training, management, fundraising and measuring at least basic outcomes measures like clients served (e.g. Catholic Charities and Jewish Federations). Ideally, smaller FBOs could
learn from the larger, more established FBOs and non-profits. These larger FBOs could provide “technical assistance” to the smaller congregational-based FBOs so that they could grow in ways that does not stress their staff or threaten the quality of their services. It is this kind of capacity-building that is necessary to building a reliable sector, “Building organizational capacity and providing timely and adequate technical assistance to nonprofit organizations are essential to their ability to provide services in a systematic and sustained manner” (Jackson-Elmoore, Hula and Reese 2011, 35). The non-profit sector (secular and faith-based) is rich in learning and available support, even if it is not recognizably organized as such. Of course an FBO would first need to self-identify as needing capacity support which is related to barrier number five.

**Outside Support: The Suffer in Silence Barrier**

The next barrier is the “suffer in silence barrier” and is a systemic problem for the non-profit sector as a whole due to the reliance on funding from government or other outside foundations and individuals. The problem rests in the kind of support that FBOs (both smaller congregation-based and larger ones such as Catholic Charities) need to operate and the FBO’s willingness to admit that they need help instead of fearing they could lose funding or will not receive funding. The help exists and there are examples of both secular and FBO non-profits that excel in one or more of the areas above and often the federal government itself can provide capacity-building in the areas of human capital, governance, fundraising and more. Yet, often organizations (FBOs and secular) do not want to highlight an area in which they may not be highly functional for fear of losing
funding:

Although government organizations may have the skill sets and resources to provide technical assistance, nonprofit organizations that perceive that requesting assistance will jeopardize future finding options will be reluctant to seek support from the government. (Jackson-Elmoore, Hula and Reese 2011, 35)

Eventually, because of suffering in silence the core operations of the FBO will be compromised if the issue is not addressed. There needs to be a way that an organization can fully disclose where they need support, training or guidance without being penalized through funding or being branded as providing low-quality services. A solution is highly dependent on creating a network approach to support, to be discussed in Chapter Seven.

**Diversity and Inclusion: The Usual Suspects Barrier**

The FBO as a sector has a barrier related to who receives funding in terms of both religious background and which institutions or congregations – on both accounts it is “the usual suspects.” As discussed in Chapter Five, it is Christian or Jewish FBOs that are funded more regularly, and this aligns with the public’s view on who should get funded reflects the reality. The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life did a survey, Annual Religion and Public Life Survey, in 2001 and then updated it in 2008.

The public has continuously supported the principle of allowing houses of worship, along with other organizations, to apply for federal funds to provide social services. But there remains substantial opposition to the prospect of certain religious groups, notably Muslim mosques, taking on such a role. Solid majorities say Catholic churches (61%), Protestant churches (59%), evangelical Christian churches (55%) and Jewish synagogues (55%) should be able to apply for funding to provide services, though in each case more than a third is opposed. There is less support for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints applying for such funding (50% favor). And just 40% favor Muslim mosques applying for government funding to aid needy people; 53% oppose mosques applying for government funding, which is up somewhat from 2001 (46%). (Pew 2008)
Part of the reason Muslim FBOs receive less funding is due to their lack of knowledge of the funding system and that they are less focused on government grants (Adkins 2010, 154).

In “Muslims, Medicine and Mercy: Free Clinics in Southern California” Lance Laird and Wendy Cadge write about Muslim-run clinics, their unique assets as service providers and how other FBOs could learn from both the quality of service and how they elegantly and subtly weave faith into their organization (Adkins 2010, 110). Laird and Cadge discuss some of the barriers these clinics face especially in finding the right human capital for governance:

The difficulty of finding appropriate community members of a government board who also share the religious affiliation of the organization is less likely to be a problem for Catholic and Protestant FBOs than it is for religious minority groups. The particular concern for Muslim clinics about religiously appropriate financial decision making may set them apart from many Christian organizations, though it is possible that some Jewish faith-based organizations might share similar concerns. (Adkins 2010, 125)

While Muslim FBOs often struggle more than their more established counterparts, Laird and Cadge believe that it is “vital to consider the experience of the minority religious organizations” (Adkins 2010, 110). With the rich learning that could come from minority faith-based organizations and the growing need for social services, there needs to be a way to ensure these FBOs are part of the larger network in terms of financial and technical support.

Even among Christian and Jewish-based organizations, the bulk of the funding is going to the same group of organizations. Despite increased dollars going to FBOs over the past years, the number of FBOs receiving dollars has not proportionally increased
(Chaves 2001 and 2008). In order to have a social service network that represents and understands the diverse needs of its clients, FBOs need to have as varied backgrounds and founding theologies as the people they serve. By connecting FBOs who may know less about how to garner funds with FBOs who have excelled in this area, there could be partnerships to help broaden the landscape in terms of religious affiliation and diversity of the FBO pool. In addition, FBOs could partner around the services they provide instead of religious affiliation to diversify best practices about their services and funding for those services. This will be discussed further in Chapter Seven.

If solutions to each of these barriers can be built (and there is proof in larger non-profits and FBOs that these barriers can be overcome) the FBO sector could be a powerful vehicle to change the future of America’s neediest.

There are many simple, constitutional ways to achieve our common goals: using the tax system to encourage more charitable giving; providing technical assistance and staff training for all programs; sharing best practices; researching possible program improvements; diminishing or eliminating fees for all small organizations, including religious institutions, to establish separate (501)(c)(3) corporations. (Dionne and Chen 2001, 303)

What is needed is a more comprehensive and holistic approach to FBO providers as a sector.
CHAPTER SEVEN
A NETWORK APPROACH TO REACHING POTENTIAL

There are tangible solutions to the challenges described in Chapter Six. Currently, most solutions to these challenges are handled by individual FBOs and the people and organizations that support them. The larger and longer-standing FBOs have been able to learn from growth and experience through years of service, the volume of clients they serve, and simple trial and error. This provides the older and larger FBOs with a body of knowledge that helps more readily overcome the challenges associated with a developing organization or company. Many smaller FBOs do not have the benefit of having served a high volume of clients and many have not been in existence long enough to benefit from decades of learning. In addition, due to geography, type of service provided or differences in founding theology most FBOs are working in silos with little incentive to work together.

Given the challenges discussed in Chapter Six combined with increases in funding and dependency on FBOs to carry out critical services to those in need, there needs to be a new approach to both enable these organizations to thrive and grow so that they can serve more clients, and to measure their impact on the clients and on improving the overall system. One way to leverage the sector learning and the collective assets could be a “network approach.” Strengthening the sector could be done by building on the competencies and assets of the sector as a whole: multiple FBOs in a community with diverse learning, clients and feedback from clients, dollars and support provided by funders and other supporters, versus addressing the challenges by individual FBOs. This
could enable FBOs to mine the rich experience and learning of other FBOs, better understand clients’ perspectives on the services they receive, and leverage the collective knowledge of funders. By looking at the assets of the FBO sector as a whole, both the potential to impact and the potential to better operate can be reached. In *Faith-Based Organizations, Science, and the Pursuit of Health*, Asomugha, Pitkin Derose and Lurie write:

A similar type of research network could be developed to connect FBOs engaged in or interested in health-related research. Individual FBOs may serve relatively small populations but together reach large numbers of people. A national FBO research network could serve as a platform for developing and evaluating community-based approaches that improve health outcomes and eliminate disparities. There are few structures that link the various FBOs working in health and enable them to exchange ideas or combine data or experience on health promotion efforts, thus a national faith-based health research network could provide such a structure. Moreover, development of a national faith-based health research network could be responsive to the Obama administration’s dual interests in science and support for community-level faith-based initiatives. (Asomugha, Pitkin Derose and Lurie 2011, 52)

This solution can be applied not only to how FBOs share ideas or combine data, but a network approach could improve direct service delivery and provide a stronger foundation from which to advocate for those in need across the sector.

Joan Lombardi writes in *The Child-Care Landscape*: “Viewing faith-based groups simply as service providers ignores the vital role that the faith community plays in advocacy, including advocacy for better care and more public funding. We certainly would not want to lose that voice” (Dionne and Chen 2001, 215). Building an infrastructure that connects FBOs and leverages the assets of the sector will enable FBOs to improve their operations and therefore broaden and deepen their impact and create best practices on how to measure the impact of their services. In addition, a sector that enables
FBOs to have a collective voice for the people they serve could be a powerful tool for advocating on their clients’ behalf. Connecting these FBOs to each other, in order to leverage systems and learning to better connect families to the basic resources they need to be healthy, could save the United States healthcare system hundreds of millions of dollars (as discussed in Chapter Two).

A Network Framework: Jeremy Rifkin’s *The Third Industrial Revolution*

In *The Third Industrial Revolution*, Jeremy Rifkin provides a framework to solve what he describes as an urgent global energy crisis through the Third Industrial Revolution (TIR). The TIR demands a “network” approach, calling for an evolution of the behavior, practices and infrastructure that shaped the second industrial revolution that led to dependence on oil and gas. The framework for how Rifkin structures the TIR is both relevant and applicable to how FBOs could overcome some of the challenges discussed in Chapter Six, show a “return on investment” while strengthening the FBO sector and ensuring more of America’s neediest have the resources they need to be healthy.

Rifkin introduces his framework for how to solve the energy crisis and structure the TIR while weaving stories of tactical solutions developed by the cities and countries actually trying to use his methods. These stories provide rich context for even better understanding how the TIR approach can be used in the FBO sector. There is rich learning in Rifkin’s innovation of building a “network” to solve the energy crisis. The relevant aspects of his approach and framework include: 1) setting-up the urgency of the problem; 2) setting goals to solve the problem; 3) demonstrating the city, country or
global value of applying his solution; 4) creating the “master plan” with the right leaders; and 5) supporting the creation or refurbishing of infrastructure to implement the solutions (and therefore reach his goal).

**Setting Up the Problem to Ignite Action**

Rifkin’s argument for the TIR hinges on the growing likelihood of an environmental and economic crisis. Rifkin states “we have reached the outer limits of how far we can extend global economic growth of an economic system deeply dependent on oil and other fossil fuels” (Rifkin 2011, 14). Rifkin not only warns of a severe lack of economic growth, but he also warns of the dependency on oils and fossil fuels as a fast track to destroying the earth and its inhabitants:

What makes this period different is a growing probability of a qualitative change in the temperature and chemistry of the Earth, brought on by climate change, that could trigger the beginning of a mass extinction of animal and plant species and, with it, the very real possibility of a wholesale die-off of our own species. The critical task at hand is to harness the public capital, market capital, and especially the social capital of the human race to the mission of transitioning the world into a Third Industrial Revolution economy and post-carbon era. . . Only when we begin to think as an extended global family, that not only includes our own species but all of our fellow travelers in the evolutionary sojourn on Earth, will we be able to save our common biosphere community and renew the planet for future generations. (Rifkin 2011, 270)

Rifkin backs up his framing of the economic and environmental problem with pages of facts demonstrating how human beings are essentially poisoning the earth and the economy due to dependence on the infrastructure, economic systems and products of the second industrial revolution.

If solving the energy crisis and supporting the earth is not enough for his reader,
Rifkin also paints a picture of solving other social need through a TIR:

The single most important factor in raising hundreds of millions of people out of poverty is having reliable and affordable access to green electricity. All other economic development is impossible in its absence. The democratization of energy and universal access to electricity is the indispensable starting point for improving the lives of the poorest populations of the world. (Rifkin 2011, 63)

By demonstrating that the energy crisis will impact all aspects of a community and conveying both urgency and a sense of history, Rifkin is able to enroll those who will both want to solve the problem (because it directly impacts their quality of life) and who need to play a significant role for the TIR to work. Rifkin backs up his narrative both with science and with stories of governments mobilizing to act quickly in order to avoid disaster. The stories are powerful vignettes for both demonstrating why communities need to act fast and for providing best practices of what does and does not work in addressing the energy crisis. Rifkin’s work (in his book, his column in the Huffington Post and his speeches) helps build a larger base for understanding the problem and seeing that the solution is possible. The setup of an urgent and desperate crisis, paired with a tangible plan and evidence that a solution is possible, is a lever to get people to change behavior which is a critical part of his solution.

The need for a better equipped and more functional FBO sector may not be as wide-reaching or as widely understood as the energy crisis, but the urgency and economic cases are easily made (as seen in Chapter Two). What is missing, and can be learned from Rifkin, is the need for a platform to better build a base of supporters who understand the needs of America’s poorest, and who understand the potential of FBOs as a critical lever in meeting those needs. Because FBOs are often looked at in terms of religion, size or the
services they provide, they are less often seen as a unified sector that can solve a large social and economic problem. There needs to be a single message that hinges on the urgency of connecting families to resources and the need for better infrastructure to do so. Lack of either will lead to declining health status for families and a long-term economic decline due to an increase in health expenditure, a decline in higher-education, or other major social issues that are impacted (as discussed in Chapter Two).

This argument needs to be clearly articulated in multiple mediums alongside success stories of implementing solutions. In order for FBOs to be positioned as part of the solution of solving social need in America, there will need to be wide-spread behavior change (similar to the TIR). In order for this behavior change to take place people need to understand the urgency of the problem and that it is possible to solve.

**An Innovative and Actionable Solution**

Rifkin’s proposes a solution to the global energy problem with an innovative approach and one that is actionable in multiple scenarios and settings. Rifkin outlines a plan that calls for a new level and way of collaborating in order to solve the crisis. He wants all aspects of a city or country to work together to create “. . . an interactive network that is flat, distributed, and collaborative” (Rifkin 2011, 62). This approach enables any city or locality to leverage the resources and systems already in place and literally flatten the way energy is distributed:

> After a century of big energy companies dominating the economy, not to mention wielding influence over government policies and geopolitics of international relations, a new plan was being proposed that would democratize the production and distribution of energy by creating millions of mini energy entrepreneurs. As one observer remarked, this is all about “power to the people.” (Rifkin 2011, 48)
Rifkin’s approach is wholesale multi-level change to the standard way of operating: how current systems operate to provide energy (going to central places to get your soon-to-run-out sources of energy), how energy is consumed, the management systems that support and control energy, and he even goes as far to say that the educational structures around how we operate and interact with energy and the earth.

While the innovation of a network approach is directly applicable to FBOs, so is Rifkin’s planning process, starting with identifying a community leader, affected by the energy crisis, setting a bold set of goals, bringing together key stakeholders and tailoring Rifkin’s “master plan” to that community. Rifkin works with leaders from cities, counties and countries who self-identify as understanding and wanting a solution to the energy problem and often set a goal towards this end. Rifkin tells stories of first meeting with a leader or few key stakeholders interested in the problem and Rifkin’s solution (which they have often read about or seen him speak about) to talk through their unique version of the energy problem and their aspirations around solving it. Whether it be the ambitious goal of “20-20-20 by 2020” set by the European Union to have “a 20 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020, based on 1990 emission levels; a 20 percent increase in energy efficiency by the same year; and a 20 percent increase in the deployment of renewable energies, again by 2020” (Rifkin 2011, 64); or the goals of San Antonio, Texas trying to shape their “green agenda” (Rifkin 2011, 77), Rifkin works with each set of leaders to fulfill or shape their goals in creating their own TIR.

Once a leader or set of leaders identify the problem in their own community and the desire to solve for it, Rifkin works with them to get the right additional stakeholders
around the table. For Rifkin collaboration is first addressed locally, calling on local leaders to agree to change the way they distribute and manage energy. By starting with solving the problem as a local network, Rifkin paints a vision for more global collaboration through “regional alliances” that connect local leaders to each other around a common goal and can eventually cross borders and even continents, “What these transnational regional alliances suggest is that if continental union does come to North America, it’s not likely to be imposed by Washington; rather, it will grow out of regional political realignment that accompanies a cross-border TIR infrastructure” (Rifkin 2011, 187). This is a vision for a network without boundaries, similar to the internet, which enables communities to connect benefit from the energy assets of not only their local community, but communities across the globe.

Rifkin understands that a vision and an innovation is only as good as the plan to implement them and his TIR framework includes the detailed planning work that can make the vision a reality. Rifkin and his team work with each community and local leaders on a “master plan” that takes his basic TIR framework or “five pillars” and supports them in adopting the pillars to their locality, thus the “master plan.” The master plan incorporates all necessary stakeholders in a location – those that can provide energy, those that sell it (or could potentially sell it); leaders who can ensure policy gets enforced and those than can actually build the infrastructure to create the network that shares natural energy. Rifkin also provides a valuable lesson in flexibility in creating master plans and the rich learning his team and their clients do from the process:

Nicholas Easley, our head of master plan operations, likes to say that taking hold of master plans is like being strapped into a roller coaster for a wild ride. The
journey is exhilarating and full of surprises that require continuous mental repositioning along the way. The goal is to create infrastructure and an operable system for a new economic era, while keeping in mind the financials, including forecasting dependable return-on-investment schedules. The truth of the matter is that we’re all in one giant classroom, learning from each other as we go. (Rifkin 2011, 78)

This kind of approach to planning enables Rifkin to get a solution and product that will work for that specific community while gleaning learning that can be applied to other locations and gaining a better understanding of the skills and education needed to implement the solution.

Ensuring that the communities implementing TIR plan have the skills to execute the plan is another applicable ingredient to the FBO sector and is part of the larger behavior change that is necessary for TIR. Even with innovation and an actionable, tailored “master plan” there is no guarantee that the energy (or any) problem will be solved. Rifkin, through his stories and data around how the systems need to change, also addresses how current behavior and most importantly the outdated management of and approach to building and maintaining energy structures in communities and cities needs to change.

Rifkin sees education as a means to not only train on needed skills to start and maintain the TIR (e.g. installing solar panels to houses), he sees it as a means to gain a better understanding of the larger vision, the care that needs to be taken of the earth so human beings do not become extinct (“biosphere consciousness” as he calls it). Rifkin looks at education as a means to have more people gain an understanding of the depth of

---

3 I’ve significantly simplified “biosphere consciousness” for the purpose of this thesis
the energy crisis – through education he is enrolling them as soldiers in his war.

... installing solar infrastructure on campuses allow students to become familiar with the new TIR technology, creating a hands-on learning environment for acquiring the skills they will need in the emerging green economy. ... Exciting students about electricity and the power grid is priority number one. ... Students steeped in biosphere consciousness, however, will regard TIR professional skills not merely as vocational tools to become more productive workers, but, rather, as ecological aids in stewarding our common biosphere. (Rifkin 2011, 232-233)

Along with learning the “hard skills” of the TIR, Rifkin discusses the importance of lateral learning⁴ and integrating learning physically and intellectually with the environment.

Rifkin looks at lateral learning as a key ingredient to his network approach, “Distributed and collaborative education flows from the idea that when people reason together, their combined experience is more likely to achieve the desired results than when people reason alone” (Rifkin 2011, 244). According to Rifkin, lateral learning paired with learning assimilated within the actual environment (e.g. learning that is literally outside the classroom) leads to greater empathy between students and for the issues around the earth. This kind of integrated and flat educational environment not only enables the TIR to be a reality, but according to Rifkin, leads students to better steward the environment, its resources and other human beings. In addition, within schools Rifkin cites short-term impact around reduction in aggression, violence, and disciplinary action, and enabling greater cooperation among students and focus in the classroom (Rifkin

---

⁴ “Lateral learning redirects the fulcrum of power and authority in the classroom from hierarchical, centralized, and top-down to reciprocal, democratic, and networked. Students learn that they are each responsible for one another’s education. Being responsible means being attuned to each other’s thoughts, open to different perspectives and points of view, able to listen to criticism, eager to come to one another’s assistance, and willingness to take responsibility for the learning community as a whole. These are the very same qualities so essential to the maturation of empathy.” (Rifkin 2011, 247)
2011, 248). The idea of lateral learning and empathy could also directly benefit understanding and solving for social need in the United States.

Providing learning and work opportunities for American students that enable them to understand the need in America for better basic resource access would enable a broader understanding of the problem and direct service for those in need. Programs do exist towards integrating students into low-income neighborhoods in service of providing basic needs and demonstrating that there are careers in service of America’s neediest (e.g. Americorps VISTA. VISTA was founded as Volunteers in Service to America in 1965 as a national service program designed specifically to fight poverty in America to help provide the “46 million Americans in poverty today” ). Service learning programs and specific curriculum also exist to go along with High School or College students’ “normal” course of learning, yet these are usually created at the discretion of a school or institution as opposed to national mandate.

Rifkin makes the case for education as a critical lever to solving the energy crisis. Working with students and the education system enables a new generation of leaders who deeply understand the need for a TIR, but what about those already in power, those that Rifkin works with to create master plans? These groups (and those against the TIR) need to undergo significant structural and behavior change as well. One of the biggest changes needed for the TIR to be successful is a change in management behavior and structure, “The Third Industrial Revolution is bucking up against such an ingrained management style, that it is virtually impossible for executive leadership at the corporate suite level to imagine the alternative” (Rifkin 2011, 157). Changing the structure of those managing
energy and controlling the funding to invest in energy is another key ingredient to a successful TIR. This kind of management and governance focus is directly applicable and necessary to enabling FBOs to reach their full potential.

Throughout his book, Rifkin talks about the former industrial revolutions that have left most of the globe with the legacy of centralized, top-down management structures and beliefs of those managing those structures. Rifkin believes a new management system must match the new ways of garnering energy: “Just as elite fossil fuel energies are always harnessed centrally and distributed from the top down, renewable energies are, for the most part, best harnessed locally and shared laterally across contiguous regions” (Rifkin 2011, 184). In talking about many of his clients and the way governments fund and support the TIR, he cites learning to manage differently as one of the biggest barriers, yet critical to TIR success, “The most important challenge facing CPS [energy company in San Antonio] is transforming its business model and management style to accommodate the requirements of a new distributed-energy era managed by Internet communication technology” (Rifkin 2011, 94). Much of Rifkin’s work is propelled or thwarted by the leadership’s ability to change the way they manage, and he has just as many stories of when that leadership starts to show a change (such as in Europe or Asia) as when it does not even want to change (such as the United States). This willingness to move to a structure of “lateral power” is one of the single most important factors to a TIR being successful.

By evangelizing about the size and impact of the global energy crisis, providing a cost-effective and innovative solution and working with leaders on a nearly individual
basis to set goals and create a master plan, Rifkin is able to help transform some of the “old” way of behaving. This kind of multi-faceted approach is also needed for the FBO sector in their work to change the lives of those with significant need.

**Restructuring the Faith Based Organization Sector**

Using Rifkin’s framework could enable FBOs to have greater impact on improving the lives of vulnerable populations in the United States. His framework could help strengthen the sector to enable better service provision, leverage the collective knowledge of the sector to improve day to day operations, and provide a strong foundation to advocate across the sector for those with significant social need. Through applying Rifkin’s network approach the FBO sector could work towards tangible outcomes such as more and more consistent direct service to those with significant non-medical needs (as discussed in earlier chapters); unified advocacy where, based on their deep knowledge of the communities they serve and the resources available, FBOs work together to better advocate for more financial support or system change on behalf of America’s neediest; and an efficient and responsible distribution and use of money by funders and FBOs. These outcomes could pave the way for reducing the overall number of those with significant needs through both direct service and advocacy.

Rifkin explains in detail how he interacts with and helps local leadership come together around a common vision and set of goals in each of the geographies in which he implements the infrastructure for TIR. This step is equally important in communities that have FBOs providing a significant role in providing social services. To create a strengthened FBO sector and to provide better services, there needs to be a convening of
local “leadership” or those that care about and are responsible for the long-term success in serving its poorest members. These leaders should be in positions to provide money to strengthening services, change or create policy to make services more readily available and lead local behavior and thought so that a network approach is adopted throughout the community. There are several types of leadership necessary to the “team” that can enable FBOs to better meet their potential: governmental leadership focused on local social service provision (e.g. a representative from the Mayor’s office or a city council member that oversees social services, a representative from the local Health and Human Services or Social Services departments), the local funding community (e.g. those funders investing in FBOs, both private and governmental) and leaders of the FBOs. This group would need to first commit to a common vision of alleviating social need in that community, agree that creating a local network is the best way to meet this vision, and set goals around the kind of services they believe are most needed and how those services should be provided.

The basic goals towards enabling FBOs to reach their full potential as service providers within a community should be consistent, non-denominational and easy to understand. These goals first would require creating a local network of FBOs, community leaders and local government to commit to and carry out the following three goals: 1) Provide a high-quality and consistent services to vulnerable populations (as defined in that community’s poverty levels) through setting goals for number of clients served on an annual basis; 2) Through the network, provide the FBOs support in governance, staffing, expertise and technological infrastructure to better serving their clients on an on-going
basis; 3) Cross-network and community lateral learning to help meet the first two goals and educate the broader community about the problem of social need both in that community and the United States. In addition, the group would need to agree to a set of metrics by which to measure the effectiveness of the FBO service provision and the overall needs of the local community. The metrics should be simple and easy to measure, across communities and even state lines (See Appendix for sample metrics).

The funding community (locally and nationally, to be discussed later) could reinforce the creation of a local community-based network of diverse FBOs and local leadership committing to the share goals. Contingent on receiving a grant, the FBO leadership would agree to join the local network of FBO service providers and agree to process metrics that enable funders and management to understand that they are meeting and collaborating. By tying the joining of a network to funding, there would be a reinforcement of the importance to the local network committed to better serving those with social needs across the community. There are other metrics that should be tied to funding, to be discussed shortly, but the first step is to have FBOs and local leadership commit to joining the local network.

This group of leaders needs would need to meet regularly (e.g. a quarterly basis) to understand how FBOs are performing, how to better increase support (monetary and non-monetary), where there are gaps in service and where there can be increased learning across FBOs towards better services. By having a cross-section of community leaders, FBO leaders, and funders the group would become a type of local leadership “team” dedicated to providing better services to the underserved. The non-denominational nature
and common vision of this group can set forth the kind of behavior change needed to create a network approach to managing social services and therefore have a more powerful impact on those with needs.

**Meeting Goal One: Commitment to providing high-quality and consistent services to America’s Most Vulnerable**

The local leadership and FBOs first need to understand what services actually exist and what groups are utilizing them. FBOs have a unique understanding of both the needs of the people they serve and the resources available (e.g. housing, food, energy). By local leadership agreeing to collaborate across the local community (e.g. a town or city) FBOs could map the resources available in that community and where gaps exist in terms of actual services. With this “resource map” it would be easier to identify where services or funding to support services may be needed (e.g. if several FBO across a city have a consistent flow of clients with high food insecurity but between those FBOs they cannot serve all of the clients’ immediate needs, FBOs could collaborate to advocate or raise funds for more staff or more organizations that can meet immediate food needs in addition to supporting clients applying for food stamps or other services). This kind of information is invaluable both to city planners and for advocacy efforts. In addition they can work together to better pool resources and learning to better provide the direct service.

If successful in reducing those in need and / or advocating for better funded services the long-term impact and return on investment could be dramatic. From reducing health care costs by ensuring that clients have their non-medical needs met (as discussed in Chapter Two) to helping clients attain higher levels of education, networks of FBOs
across the United States could help reduce health care costs and boost those who go to college and therefore contribute more taxes over their lifetime. These kinds of outcomes and long-term return on investment could be invaluable to improving both individual lives and the health and economic well-being of communities. Similar to what Rifkin outlined, for both the near term outcomes and these long-term outcomes, behavior change will be critical.

While local leadership teams are forming, aligning government support (monetary and non-monetary) could be the next step to strengthening the FBO sector, providing better services and implementing a network approach. This is a critical step because of the amount of money the government provides to FBOs and because of the level of influence it can exert. Once the larger, national funders agree to a vision and goals, they need to implement this commitment through tying their dollars to these goals and metrics. Rifkin carefully lays out the data regarding government influence on major movements and the current and flawed thinking that the “unhampered free market” is what powers the American market and even the American dream:

The solution begins with acknowledging that all of the great leaps forward in American economic history have occurred only when government helped finance the critical energy and communications infrastructure and continued to underwrite its performance so that thousands of new businesses could grow and flourish. Indeed, I cannot conceive of any practical way to advance a new economic era for the country, absent a full and robust partnership between government and business at every level—city, county, state, and federal. (Rifkin 2011, 132)

This same kind of partnership is needed for not only better serving the needs of the underserved, but enabling FBOs to be part of the solution at their full potential.
Though local leadership needs to agree to a common vision, the tying of funding to this vision should be implemented at both the local and national level. Since there is already a central “agency” in The White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships, providing stronger guidelines for FBOs is possible. If the Office of Faith Based and Neighborhood Partnerships regulated funding of all agencies providing money to FBOs, there could be a major shift in the sector around measurement, advocacy and outcomes. They already regulate dollars to ensure there is proper separation of church and state (as seen in Chapter Five), but ensuring that America’s neediest are better served is just as critical as ensuring the constitutionality of how they are served.

In addition, the Office should require that any FBO receiving government funds had basic metrics in place such as: 1) number of people served (by month, quarter or annual); 2) types of need each client has; 3) ability for FBO to meet need (both the literal need filled and the client satisfaction rate); 4) number of full time volunteers and/or staff (See Appendix for a potential list of metrics). These metrics would be in addition to submitting a simple budget and could provide a baseline for the local leadership “teams” to measure local success. The FBO would agree to measuring these basic metrics and reporting on them quarterly to both the funder and their own governance. These types of metrics would enable funders (government and non-governmental) to understand the return on their investment (or funding), the consistency of and types of services provided and the resources that were dedicated to providing these services. In aggregate, these metrics could provide a window into the kind of services a community has need for and
provides, which could lead both the government (local and federal) and the funding community to better understand where they need to supplement resources.

**Meeting Goals Two and Three: Bringing Together Expertise and Building Infrastructure**

There needs to be a commitment from funders and FBOs to join together in order to provide FBOs support in building staffing, expertise and technological infrastructure to better serving their clients on an on-going basis and to ensure that lateral learning is taking place across the sector. The local “leadership team,” as supported by national funding, could create a vision for the local network needed to meet their goals. By having funders and support services (such as a non-profit consultant) as a part of the network, they could better understand the needs and realities of the FBOs so as not to set reporting targets in unreasonable ways and to better tailor the targets and goals for that community.

Smaller FBOs would have the potential to partner with a larger FBO to learn how to build infrastructure (for example training, technology, hiring best practices)and better measure services. As seen in Chapter Five, larger organizations such as Catholic Charities and the Jewish Federations have years of best practices, training and other learning to share with smaller FBOs. These best practices would have to be tailored to fit with that FBOs mission and theology, but the basics of building and managing an organization should be similar across founding theology.

The last piece the funding community and local leadership could influence is strong leadership and governance within FBOs or between smaller FBOs with similar missions. By requiring a baseline of training for any FBO leader (even those volunteer leaders within Church-run FBOs) and providing cross-organizational support groups, the
management of that FBO could be better stewarded. The benefit for the leader is gaining professional development that may not only help in the management of the FBO, but could be useful for their full-time job. In addition, there would need to be metrics set for number of clients served and number of volunteers used. When a certain number is reached, it would trigger more funds to hire a full-time leader and eventually a diverse Board or governing body separate from the religious institution that the FBO might have been founded under. In order to ensure consistency and quality of services provided, when an FBO reaches a certain size with a substantial number of clients there needs to be at least one person focused on how to do that well on a full-time basis. Similarly when an FBO reaches a certain number of clients the needs to the clients should have their own level of priority – separate from the critical priority of running that church, synagogue or mosque.

**Infrastructure For Meeting All Three Goals**

There are many ways a local network or broader networks can stay connected, learn and enable lateral learning especially with the support of technology. To create a robust FBO network technology could be used in a few ways, two of which are first to tie the FBOs together and second to better understand the local resource landscape. A requirement of an FBO network (especially when they become more geographically disperse) would be to create an on-line learning community that FBOs joined towards the goal of better serving their clients. This could enable lateral learning between FBOs without having to meet, and between funders, consultants and FBOs. If funders (government or non-government) invested in creating an app for a mobile phone or
website that could be a learning portal with a social media aspect to it, FBOs could connect, learn and find ways to collaborate no matter where they were. Joining this network could be part of receiving funding or part of opening in a certain community where a network is active. A site could be set-up to answer very specific questions on everything from the constitutionality of their services to how to train volunteers and staff. Professional networks like this exist in other sectors and learning could be applied: technology platforms like this already exist along with grants that support its such as Salesforce.com and their “force for change” grant.

In addition, a database (which could be connected to the learning portal) would need to house the actual resources available in local and nearby communities. Currently, many communities have local “resource databases” that pool or look at local resources (such as food, energy, housing, clothes) in aggregate. These databases could be adopted by a local network so that if a client went to one FBO looking for housing yet that FBO did not provide it, the volunteers or staff could easily (and for free) find a close-by resource (models exist in “211” programs and websites such as http://www.southsidehealth.org/). This could also be a resource for clients, if they have access, to better understand when an FBO is providing services, to rate their services and better make choices around their needs. Databases like this succeed when they were regularly updated with accurate information, and could be regulated by the local FBO network and supported as part of grants to that network.
Potential Unleashed

By educating and evangelizing the issue of social needs and the potential of FBOs, and aligning funders and the FBOs with a collective vision for outcomes and measurement, the sector itself could pave a path to bringing together the many FBOs that are providing services and significantly improve the sector as a whole. Unifying FBOs first within communities and then across communities will help strengthen the knowledge and economic position of FBOs compared to acting on their own. Add in funders of FBOs and organizations that support FBOs (with money or services) and across a community and a state, the collective voice and power to provide for those with significant social need are multiplied. As Rifkin writes, “But make no mistake about the potential economic clout if millions of little players were connected in distributed networks, and collaborated together across sectors and industries” (Rifkin 2011, 153) FBOs could start with community-based collaboration but eventually collaborate across communities, across states and even across borders.

A network is only as strong as its common goal and those committed to meeting that goal. If FBOs, funders and community supporters saw creating a network as crucial to their founding theology and mission in providing money and services, a network approach could be successful. Until the networks became robust enough (in terms of FBOs that joined and the behavior change needed to have FBOs collaborate across religions and ideologies) to start providing value, they would need to be highly supervised by funders and even larger FBOs. This would enable FBOs to better work with funders and funders to better track and understand how their dollars were being
used. Eventually, when FBOs come to better serve their clients, better understand their clients’ needs and see other FBOs as fellow advocates for those they are bound to serve, the network would become a powerful lever in meeting social need in the United States.
CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

With the highest number of people in poverty in United States history, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, follows a growing need for non-medical or social services (housing, food, energy assistance, education assistance). Not only does the sheer number of needs to be addressed create a problem, but this growth in social need is costly to the government and taxpayers. Two commissions – one sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and another by the World Health Organization – researched and documented the links between social need and poor health. The equation is simple: when a family lacks food, housing, energy or other basic needs they live shorter and unhealthier lives. In addition, medical care spending in the U.S. is higher than in any other nation, and is only increasing. Medical care costs in the U.S. will reach more than 19 percent of the Gross Domestic Product by 2019 (Braveman, Egerter and Mockenhaupt 2011). Even though the United States spends more per capita than any other nation, it is slipping in its world ranking on infant mortality and other health indicators (Marmot and Bell 2011). The lack of basic resource needs sends America’s most vulnerable into a cycle of poor health and poverty that is almost impossible to escape.

To address both the immediate social resource gap and the growing cost to the United States, a sustainable mixture of dependable private, public and faith-based social services is necessary to address the needs of America’s most vulnerable. Faith Based Organizations are a powerful vehicle and a critical part of this multi-pronged approach for short-term social service provision and longer-term advocacy for the most vulnerable
populations in the United States. FBOs have strengths that public and private organizations lack such as being located in and often created by the communities they serve, having a theological foundation that provides more incentive to serve the poor than their secular counterparts, and a long history within the sector of providing high-quality services. In addition, the last three Administrations have invested significant funding into FBOs as service providers.

The FBO sector, as a whole, has enormous potential to be a critical part of the social service landscape, but more significant investment has to be made in these organizations. Unstable governance, lack of skilled staff and management and often the founding theology of an FBO itself limit the ability for that FBO to provide consistent and high quality social services. In addition, as a sector, there is very little accountability for FBO governance, budget management and measurement of the services. These issues need to be addressed for FBOs to best serve America’s neediest, to justify the amount of dollars the United States Government has invested in FBOs and to help decrease the increasing cost of poverty in the United States.

Through using Jeremy Rifkin’s network approach and applying basic organizational development principles (e.g. ensuring staff is trained) FBOs can live up to their potential. FBOs can meet their potential by meeting three goals as a sector:

- Provide a high-quality and consistent services to vulnerable populations (as defined in that community’s poverty levels) through setting goals for number of clients served on an annual basis;

- Through a network approach such as Rifkin’s, provide the FBOs support in governance, staffing, expertise and technological infrastructure to better serving their clients on an on-going basis;
• Enable learning across the network and across communities to help meet the first two goals and educate the broader community about the problem of social need both in that community and the United States.

These goals outline the needed infrastructure to strengthen the FBO sector.

Funders of FBOs, community leaders (e.g. mayors), government leaders and leaders of FBOs and associated religious institutions need to agree to work together to strengthen FBOs. If federal and private dollars are tied to better measurement and goals such as these, and larger FBOs (such as Catholic Charities) agree to create a learning network, there can be significant progress made in strengthening the FBO sector. This sector has the potential to model social service provision in the United States and be a place for America’s most vulnerable to consistently have their basic needs met, giving them a chance to get out of the tragic cycle of poor health and poverty.
## Potential Metrics for Faith Based Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clients / Direct Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients served</td>
<td>At least quarterly</td>
<td>Provides understanding of volume of clients if served means seen by someone at the FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of and type of need client has (e.g. food, housing, education)</td>
<td>Each time a client is seen</td>
<td>Provides an understanding of the types and number of needs clients have, to better understand the resources needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs met by FBO</td>
<td>Each time a client is seen</td>
<td>Tracks if the FBO met the need (e.g. did they get food, clothing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td>Each time a client is seen</td>
<td>The FBO can create a survey to track client satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full time staff</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Better understand employees of FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of volunteer staff</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Better understand volunteers of FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of trained full time and volunteer staff</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>FBO would need to define “training” (e.g. one day orientation; read through manual) and then measure how many staff receive regular training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget compared to actual expenses (in dollars)</td>
<td>Monthly or Quarterly</td>
<td>Track actual spending to budgeted spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising goal compared to actual money raised (in dollars)</td>
<td>Quarterly Targets</td>
<td>Set annual fundraising goal and track goal quarterly to see if meeting goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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