Founded by students at the University of California at Berkeley in 2002, Mobilize.org is an all-partisan organization dedicated to educating, empowering, and energizing Millennials to increase our civic engagement and political participation. We show Millennials how public policy impacts our lives, and conversely, how we can impact public policy.

Mobilize.org believes that Millennials have the untapped ability to amass political power and encourage organizations and institutions to appreciate and earn our participation. Our programs, partnerships, and events are reflective of our belief that Millennials can have a profound and long-lasting effect on public policy.
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"And they are the 'millennials', with the clean slate and new day that implies: born in the 1980s, the richest generation in history, the best educated, healthiest, the first to grow up knowing nothing of war, famine, disease and poverty."

--The Economist, December 23, 2000

“We, the Millennial Generation, are uniquely positioned to call attention to today’s issues and shape the future based on the great legacy we have inherited.”

--Democracy 2.0 Declaration
Executive Summary

“We, the Millennial Generation, are uniquely positioned to call attention to today’s issues and shape the future based on the great legacy we have inherited.”

--Democracy 2.0 Declaration

This is the story that Mobilize.org, with our partners, funders, advisors and friends, is telling. The story of Democracy 2.0, a movement of young people not just contributing to, but building the democracy that we will inherit, not as the leaders of tomorrow – but as the citizens of today.

Whether negative or positive, the media has seemingly come to judgment on the Millennial Generation. Thomas Friedman, in an October 2007 New York Times article, identified the Millennial Generation as Generation Q, the Quiet Americans, indicating a lack of activism amongst its members. In a 60 Minutes report in late 2007, Millennials were divided into two camps, with some Millennials compared to the Greatest Generation, indicating they were hard working and had the tools to get things done, while other Millennials were described as “incorrigible.” Mark Bauerlein has dubbed the generation “The Dumbest Generation” in the title of his book criticizing the generation.

As proud members of the Millennial Generation, we beg to differ. We think we have another story to tell — not just one of words but of action that is changing entire communities across this country for the better.

Mobilize.org was founded on the campus of the University of California, Berkeley by David B. Smith, a millennial, frustrated with the rising cost of college education. From a hard fought campaign on that campus that resulted in a moratorium on tuition increases and a $90,000,000 bond being passed for more affordable student housing, Mobilize.org began. We are now a group of over 35,000 young people, spanning all 50 states and over 225 campuses (high school and college), with victories on campuses as well as the local, state, and national levels.

Our mission statement reads the same as it did six years ago on the campus of UC Berkeley: Mobilize.org is an all-partisan organization that works to educate, empower and energize Millennials to increase our civic engagement and political participation. We work to show Millennials how public policy impacts our lives, and more importantly – how we can impact public policy.

I am impressed because they are so much more optimistic and idealistic than they should be. I am baffled because they are so much less radical and politically engaged than they need to be.

In conversations, meetings, and events with thousands of diverse young people across the country in recent years, we have seen, first-hand, the passion and desire among Millennials to “do something” about the problems and concerns they see on their campuses and in their institutions and communities. But there are few opportunities for them to come together as representatives of their generation and tell the world what they think about issues, politics, government, and the world—and how they would make them better.

Until now.

In 2007, Mobilize.org launched an unprecedented effort, Democracy 2.0, to engage thousands of young people in raising their voices and making change. It had become clear to us that members of the Millennial Generation were looking for something to do next, steps that could be taken beyond participation in the current political process.

By engaging members of the Millennial Generation in technologically-savvy deliberative dialogue, based on well-established models, we created the Democracy 2.0 Declaration, which serves as a basis for the identification of key issues impacting our generation. The process enabled members of the generation to take the next critical step: working together to effect direct, citizen-centered, and innovative action. It is this action that forms the basis of Democracy 2.0.

Democracy 2.0: Millennial-Generated Change to American Governance was developed by members of the Millennial Generation in an effort to reflect the six years of Mobilize.org's civic engagement work, focusing on the last twelve months of survey/group research and experience in the field with fellow members of our generation.

This report will explore the process of Democracy 2.0, sharing research on members of the Millennial Generation conducted from July 4, 2007, to January 1, 2008. Through the implementation of the Democracy 2.0 Survey, the Democracy 2.0 Summit, and the Party for the Presidency, Mobilize.org took the input of thousands of members of the Millennial Generation into developing Democracy 2.0.

Much has been said and written about the Millennial Generation. Now, it is our turn to share what democracy WILL look like in the 21st century.

From Top to Bottom: Andrea Kalsow (CA), David Hammill (NY), Andrew Feldman (MA), and Benji Kim (CA).
“Democracy is an unfinished project. It’s time we upgrade.”

-- Democracy 2.0 Declaration
WHAT IS DEMOCRACY 2.0?

“For over six years, we have been working towards something, interchangeably called empowerment, youth representation, authentic voice, etc. It was not clear until we came up with Democracy 2.0.”

– David B. Smith, Founder of Mobilize.org

David, along with other founding members of the organization, felt that much of the partisan bickering, dirty campaigning, and lack of outreach to young people from campaigns and elected officials demonstrated that decision makers in government were not setting themselves up to make the best decisions for the Millennial Generation.

Mobilize.org began as a forum for all-partisan dialogue, where young people could come together, learn from each other, and arrive at some sort of consensus on important issues, focusing on common sense solutions.

This model was tested from 2002 to 2005 as we grew our network of Mobilizer Teams from one team at UC Berkeley to 75 teams throughout the country and through hosting a series of conferences, where the Mobilize.org team brought together the top youth leaders around the country to discuss and debate how to tackle some of the nation’s toughest issues. After each of these conferences, the Mobilize.org team and the young people they worked with would go back to campuses and communities across the country with extensive to do lists, and start working towards those changes.

In 2006, Cynthia Gibson of Cynthesis Consulting released a white paper in partnership with The Case Foundation entitled, Citizens at the Center, a paper which spoke to the exact types of dialogues and solutions that Mobilize.org had been working towards. It was shortly after this paper was released that Mobilize.org began our journey towards Democracy 2.0.

In October 2006, Mobilize.org gathered the top fifty activists in its nationwide network in Excelsior Springs, Missouri, to strategize about a “citizens at the center” approach as it related to members of the Millennial Generation. This team of activists, ranging from ages 16 to 28, came up with the idea for a national conference, a national declaration of principles about changing the political process, and an awards show to highlight and recognize members of the Millennial Generation for their best practices in effecting change.

These activists and thought leaders produced the vision that led to another conference in April 2007. At the Wingspread conference in Racine, WI, 30 leaders in the civic youth engagement field met for 3 days of discussing and deliberation resulting in the first use of the term “Democracy 2.0.”

Above: Citizens at the Center provided a basis for the Millennial-targeted Democracy 2.0 Project.
WHAT IS DEMOCRACY 2.0?

Democracy 2.0 developed out of the ideas that uniquely resonate with the Millennial generation in its view of governance and democratic participation: upgrade vs. revolution, open vs. closed, user-generated vs. consumed. The principles of Web 2.0 are adopted in our service, action and participation.

The idea was not a new one to the organization. Mobilize.org had been refining this model since its founding, along with various other organizations in the dialogue and deliberation field. While the Citizens at the Center report directed attention to this movement and gave these organizations common language, Democracy 2.0, it also gave the Millennial Generation language that resonated with its members and a model upon which they could build.

Top: Mobilizers strategize on a campaign for their high school campus.

Bottom: Mobilize.org's Vice President of Online Organizing Sergio Zuluaga talks to a Millennial about voter registration.
DEMOCRACY 2.0 SURVEY

Mobilize.org decided that the implementation of a nationwide survey would aid the organization in its mission to incorporate the collective voice of Millennials in defining and establishing Democracy 2.0. The organization decided to provide its own definition of Democracy 2.0, “Young people not only contributing to, but also building the democracy they want to inherit.” Over the next six months, this definition underwent dramatic changes as Mobilize.org integrated the collective voice of Millennials into Democracy 2.0.

Survey design was undertaken by a ten-member committee, including experts in the field of civic engagement from institutions such as Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning (CIRCLE) to members of the Millennial Generation working for other citizen-focused non-profit organizations such as AmericaSpeaks, America’s Promise, the Association of Young Americans, and Common Cause.

Mobilize.org’s Survey Committee worked to create a ten question survey using both quantitative and qualitative measures that a user could complete. The goals of the survey, to be administered both on and offline, were multiple:

- **To build some measures on which Mobilize.org could gauge quick assessments for use in our later research;**

- **To challenge Mobilize.org’s own interpretations of what “Democracy 2.0” meant to the generation; and**

- **To gather a diversity of characteristics on the questions addressing the traits of the Millennial Generation.**

The committee began the process design of the survey by determining its three primary areas of focus:

- **What is and is not working with our democracy;**

- **What defines the Millennial Generation and how this may help to improve our democracy; and**

- **What does “Democracy 2.0” looks like in application.**

This format enabled the organization to quickly measure and report the sentiments of its respondents to the survey, while allowing respondents to be creative and unbound by Mobilize.org’s pre-created answers. Further, it allowed certain questions in the survey to be turned into a blog format, inspiring discussion and debate about the qualitative questions. These discussions online, coupled with those offline, gave the organization the information it needed to move forward and to hold its Democracy 2.0 Summit.
The Mobilize.org team, comprised of eight members, began the survey distribution process at colleges and universities throughout the United States. Mobilize.org’s team also targeted members of the 16-18 age demographic, distributing surveys to high school students.

In regards to the survey’s online administration, Mobilize.org partnered with other Millennial Generation organizations to get a diverse pool of online survey respondents. Partner organizations included Youth Service America, YouthBuild, the Roosevelt Institution, the Student Association for Voter Empowerment, the Association of Young Americans, and Vision XY. The survey was also distributed through the University of California at Berkeley Political Science Department and numerous other academic listservs.

Survey questions included:

1. **How successful do you think our society is at addressing its most important problems?**

2. **How much of a role do you think people like you have in helping to address our society’s most important problems?**

3. **How much of a role do you think people like you should have in helping to address our society’s most important problems?**

4. **Overall, do you feel that government is serving the public interest?**

5. **Please provide at least one example of where you feel government is properly serving the public interest.**

6. **Please provide at least one example where you feel the government is failing to serve the public interest.**

7. **Do you think our generation is uniquely positioned to help our society address its most important problems?**

8. **Please provide at least three characteristics, traits, or defining values of the Millennial Generation (12-30 years old).**

9. **How do those characteristics position our generation to help our society address its most important problems?**

10. **What specific ideas, programs, or processes do you think should be implemented to help our society better involve citizens, specifically young people, to help address our most important problems?**
The findings of the Democracy 2.0 Survey were representative of the diversity of viewpoints held by members of the Millennial Generation in that few questions received a majority ranking from the survey respondents.

The first question of the survey asked, “How successful do you think our society is at addressing its most important problems?” While 43% of the respondents felt that society was “Somewhat Successful” and 44% felt that society was “Not Very Successful,” very few survey respondents selected the extreme measures of “Very Successful” (2%) or “Not At All Successful” (7.7%).

**Government and Millennial Perceptions**

Respondents identified a variety of areas where the government was properly serving and failing to serve the public interest. There was no clear consensus on these areas in either category.

Respondents felt that the Government is Properly Serving the Public Interest in the following areas:

- Public Education
- National Security
- Democracy

On this question, 6.6% of the respondents put answers to the affect of “None,” indicating they did not feel the government was properly serving the public interest in any way.

Respondents felt that the Government is Failing to Serve the Public Interest in the following areas:

- Iraq War and Withdrawal Of Troops
- Healthcare
- Public Schools

The respondents seemed divided over the issue of public education and public schools. While 12.8% of the respondents felt education was a strength of the government, 7.8% felt that it was a failing of the government.
KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

Millennial Solutions

Respondents were also asked for specific ideas they had about programs or processes that could be implemented to address our society’s most important problems. The top responses included:

- Youth commissions that are involved in decision-making
- Civic clubs and organizations to mobilize and motivate, focusing on action
- Better educational programs

Characteristics of the Millennial Generation

While some of the survey questions were designed to elicit the views of Millennials about government and society, others were crafted to encourage respondents to self-reflect about their role in civic and political life.

When the question about the characteristic traits of the Millennial Generation was placed on the survey, it read, “Please provide at least three characteristics, traits, or defining values of the Millennial Generation (12-30 years old).” It did not prompt respondents for negative or positive characteristics.

The following emerged as the top positive characteristics. They included:

- Technology Savvy
- Open-minded and Tolerant
- Educated

Although the survey was self-identifying, respondents recognized the negative characteristics of their own generation. Millennials also identified two negative traits that they believed reflected their generation:

- Selfish
- Lazy

The next question on the survey, “How do those characteristics position our generation to help our society address its most important problems?,” got a mixed response. A few respondents felt that the “Characteristics don’t help” while others noted that these characteristics will enable the Millennial Generation to “bring attention to issues,” “bring diverse solutions,” and allow the generation to “network, make connections faster, and break down barriers.”
DEMOCRACY 2.0 SUMMIT

Although the foundation for the Democracy 2.0 Summit was created by youth at the 2006 conference in Missouri, the conversations and ensuing process was entirely participant-driven and utilized an open source model.

Facilitation

The summit was facilitated by Chris Bui, the owner of 5th Medium. Bui, an expert in the field of facilitation, had led over 950 meetings using the Total Participation method. This method and its supporting software, Option Finder, allowed all the participants to:

- Connect with everyone in the room using electronic keypad voting technology;
- Provided real-time responses to pre-created questions; and
- Enabled participants to vote on new ideas that came up during the course of the summit.

The system further allowed for the transparency Mobilize.org sought in that the results of all the votes were seen immediately by the entire room.

Simultaneously, Deirdre Crowley of Crowley and Co. – a graphic facilitator – created a series of large scale wall hangings that visually depicted the process and results of the summit in pictures, words and color. Participants could see what they had produced and discuss them between sessions. The graphic illustrations both recorded and facilitated the process, especially when drafting the declaration began.

In addition to the primary facilitator, Mobilize.org assembled a table facilitation team that led the individual table discussions throughout the summit. Through a process of large group discussion, divergence to small group discussions, and convergence to group conversation and voting, the larger conversation had the unique ability to include the viewpoints of all the participants.

Participants

The summit participants were a collection of 47 politically and socially active members of the Millennial Generation, ranging from ages 16 to 30 and representing 21 different states.

Staff members retained limited roles in the discussion process. The facilitation team included James Duffy (NY), Mandy Mallot (OH), Joel Elliott (IN), and Kyle Karker (NY). Also featured are Mobilize.org staff member Katelyn Archer and Founder David Smith.
Questions for the Summit were selected to reflect the content of the survey as well as to integrate the entire room of participants into this process. Initially, a list of characteristics or traits was placed on a PowerPoint projected to the participants to gauge the interests of the group and obtain feedback. Participants then had free range to add or subtract to the list.

The initial question posed to the group was, “Why are we here and what is OUR purpose?”

The Summit participants, known at the time as Democracy 2.0 Ambassadors, engaged in a discussion to define the purpose of the Democracy 2.0 Summit and the Democracy 2.0 Declaration. At the end of this initial conversation, the participants decided that a successful Summit would address the following:

- **Calling attention to the main problems (and successes) of our current political system;**
- **Highlighting the distinct characteristics of the Millennial Generation; and**
- **Providing guidelines for positive change to help cultivate a renewed political process in America.**

**Process**

Summit participants began the process by setting guidelines, collectively creating a tone for the day that included the following characteristics:

- **Commitment**
- **Focus**
- **Listen**
- **Transparency**
- **“More than Majority Wins” Approach**
- **Mutual Trust & Respect**
Among the top choices were visceral components of government—the issues and institutions with which people interface on a daily basis and have the greatest impact in local communities. The conversations focused on local government provision of services, with the distinguishing characteristic, public and national parks, melding both federal and state control.

**Government and Our Perceptions**

The participants embraced the realities of American democracy. Discussions were deep, in recognition of the multi-faceted nature of American government. This contemplative approach produced a list of ways in which American government is serving, and failing to serve, the American public.

**Government is Properly Serving the Public Interest**

- Postal Service
- Public Libraries
- Infrastructure
- Public and national parks

**Government is Failing to Serve the Public Interest**

- Katrina Response
- War in Iraq
- Poverty Rate—Economic Inequality
- No Child Left Behind

According to participants, government had failed in these areas, especially at the federal level. The failings of the government, and the conversations regarding these failings, focused primarily on failings at the federal level that have or had nationwide impacts, indicating that Millennials are conscious of the events that have shaped the direction of policy in their lifetime.
Principles Unique to the Millennial Generation

After an evaluation of the federal government, the participants turned to an introspective approach on their own generation. This reflected the processes’ unique tailoring to Millennial-generated content and solutions. This step served to aid the public in understanding the unique nature of the Millennial Generation and appreciate the values they embrace.

A big gap in the literature on Millennials is information regarding their self-perception. This discussion revealed that Millennials seek to foster community, are inclusive, value freedom, and are invested in civic and political engagement.

Defining Our Generation

The most volatile and inspiring conversation of the day was deciding which characteristics defined the Millennial Generation. This conversation, which was repeated during the Democracy 2.0 session at the Party for the Presidency in December 2007, created some division among members in the room, primarily when it came to the negative characteristics.

Positive Characteristics

Four characteristics emerged as the top characteristics, by an overwhelming consensus of the room. They included:

- Technological
- Communication Savvy
- Multi-Taskers
- Social Networkers/Interconnected

Negative Characteristics

After an extended conversation debating what should constitute the top-ranked negative characteristics, the following three emerged:

- Technology Dependent
- Image Conscious
- Like Instant Gratification
SUMMIT FINDINGS

How These Characteristics Position Our Generation

Using the positive and negative characteristics agreed on by the group as reflective of the Millennial Generation, participants discussed how these characteristics could help position their generation as prepared to assume a leadership role in crafting the Democracy 2.0 Declaration, as well as in implementing its recommendations.

The frenzy and excitement created by this conversation drove the group as they began the initial drafts of the Declaration, exchanging thoughts and phrases amongst the group. These conversations focused around “Taking Action and Telling Our Story.”

Democracy 2.0 Innovations, Solutions, & Action

The group worked towards creating a list of innovative solutions and actions the generation could take to further Democracy 2.0.

The following were included among the top suggestions:

- Build a coalition to influence the increase of engagement information presented on TV
- Establish a youth commission in each state capitol
- Get youth involved with local government decisions
- Network of funders/foundations to support youth-led projects and provide professional advice and support

Participant Evaluation and Assessment

Summit participants were asked a variety of questions regarding their experience at the Democracy 2.0 Summit (on a scale of 1 to 10):

I felt heard. (9.2)

We are on the right path. (9.1)

We had a successful Democracy 2.0 Summit. (9.1)

I am excited about bringing this work/these ideas back to my ongoing work. (9.1)

The voting technology was used effectively. (9.1)

I liked the format. (8.7)
Democracy 2.0 Declaration: Setting the Tone

A writing team, comprised of 11 members of the Democracy 2.0 summit participants, stayed up until the late hours of the night, refining the Declaration. After the last keystroke was made on the Declaration, members of the writing team went to the Jefferson Memorial and read the Democracy 2.0 Declaration for the first time to the statue of Thomas Jefferson.

The Declaration was presented publicly for the first time on October 4, 2007, at the annual National Conference on Citizenship in Washington, D.C., a conference that includes civic leaders dedicated to strengthening civic engagement and civil dialogue. Later that day, Mobilize.org hosted a press conference at the House of Representatives with members of Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s 30 Something Working Group, including Debbie Wasserman-Schultz (D-FL), Tim Ryan (D-OH), and Kendrick Meek (D-FL).

Insight on the Declaration

Feedback was both supportive and critical. Mike Connery, on his blog *Future Majority*, wrote that Mobilize.org had met the first hurdle he identified with the creation of a generational statement. The Declaration was inclusive of different groups as the 47 Summit participants had synthesized the survey responses of 1,581 individuals in a collaborative manner and were themselves diverse on a variety of measures including age, educational level, ethnicity, gender, geography, and race. Connery did leave one point of insight that reflected the breadth of critical feedback received about the document: “Yet, without more specificity, it’s hard to see how the document could be an effective roadmap in leading a generation toward a concrete resolution of the problems it identifies.”

Participant Buy-In

Despite not identifying specific action measures, Mobilize.org had accomplished the second critical step in its path to Democracy 2.0: it had gained the buy-in of key stakeholders, Millennials themselves, who embraced the Declaration and shared it with their peers through MySpace, Facebook, via email, and the blogosphere. Since the authors of the Declaration shared a commitment to every word in the Declaration due to the collaborative process by which it was formed, their endorsement, as members of the Millennial Generation themselves, legitimized the Democracy 2.0 Project, laying the foundation for the next phase of the Project: Millennial-led action.
DEMOCRACY 2.0 DECLARATION

Democracy is an unfinished project. It’s time we upgrade.

We, the Millennial Generation, are uniquely positioned to call attention to today’s issues and shape the future based on the great legacy we have inherited. Our founding fathers intended for every generation to build, indeed to innovate, on the American experience. We realize that as young people we are expected to be the leaders of tomorrow, but we understand that as citizens we are called to be the leaders of today.

We are compelled by the critical state of our present democracy to establish a new vision.

In a world often damaged by conflict and intolerance, we must commit to develop common ground through equality and open mindedness.

In a world often damaged by social isolation and materialism, we must commit to community at the family, local, national and global levels.

In a world often damaged by instant gratification, we must commit to creating sustainable solutions.

In a world often damaged by apathy and disillusionment, we must commit to civic participation and inclusion of all voices.

The present state of our democracy impedes opportunity for real change. We must connect the specific issues failing our population with their underlying systemic causes.

Our government seems unable or unwilling to adequately address our broadest problems, including economic inequality, America’s role in the world, and the effect of money on the democratic process. But we must remember, our government is only as effective as the sum of its citizens. Low civic participation means the most disadvantaged people in society are neglected and we overlook many potential solutions to our problems.

Our generation is telling a different story. We are uniquely positioned to foster community engagement through social networks of all kinds. It is our responsibility to use information and technology to upgrade democracy, transform communication and advance political engagement and civic participation.

We are social networkers, we are multi-taskers, we are communicators and we are opinionated. The informality of our generation breaks down traditional barriers and opens doors for inclusiveness and equality. Most importantly, we are leaders in a society that yearns for leadership.

It’s our democracy, it’s time to act.
A MILLENNIAL THEORY OF CHANGE

“It’s our democracy. It’s time to act.”

-- Democracy 2.0 Declaration
“We are Social Networkers:” Using Online Space to Build a Movement

After the initial draft of the Declaration was publicly released in the real world, it was also released in the virtual world to continue to gain feedback through both commentary and editing. A wiki was created for the Declaration and space was used in the Democracy 2.0 Group on Facebook to facilitate conversations. The unique nature of this social networking tool allowed both those who had participated in the Summit and other Millennials to engage in conversations about the Declaration.

A conversation between summit participant William Mohring from the University of San Francisco and Brian Crowley from Catholic University who questioned the “action” piece of the Declaration, prompted others, including user Jonathan Tate from San Francisco, to jump into the conversation thread. Youth from California to New York were able to engage in documented conversations about the Declaration, conversations that could benefit both Mobilize.org and the broader community of Millennials.

Mobilize.org also posted a reading of the Declaration by Founder David Smith on platforms such as YouTube to expose the document to other online audiences.

Above: The Democracy 2.0 group on Facebook.com quickly grew in membership in the first few weeks after the Declaration was released to the general public.
At the end of the Democracy 2.0 Summit, it became clear to Mobilize.org that another event it had planned, The Party for the Presidency, must take the Democracy 2.0 Declaration formed at the summit and find a way to use those principles to create plans for Millennial action in 2008.

**Now, It is YOUR Turn: Party for the Presidency**

**General Framework**

The Party for the Presidency began with a return to the Democracy 2.0 Declaration after nearly three months of online discussion and input, revisiting this document with a broader group of Millennials. The Party for the Presidency brought together Millennial thought leaders in an environment where they could identify the issues most important to the generation, share best organizing practices, learn new tools and techniques in deliberative dialogue and organizing, and then apply these lessons in real time. These thought leaders were not only challenged to identify and engage in deep discussions of the issues, but to create plans to implement those solutions by developing projects.

This again required the use of electronic voting technology to facilitate decision-making, open space for work and discussion, and a less structured environment for visceral networking. This type of environment complimented the social networking that the majority of the Party for the Presidency participants had engaged in on the online space Mobilize.org had created for them.

**Goals in Group Dynamic: Diversity, All-Partisanship, and Millennial Attitudes**

It was a critical element of the Party for the Presidency for Mobilize.org to assemble a group of delegates that was truly representative of the Millennial Generation. Mobilize.org had three goals it wished to achieve in its membership at the event:

- **Diversity**
- **All-partisanship**
- **Representation of Millennial Attitudes**

Through the use of electronic keypad voting technology, Mobilize.org was able to conduct a series of polls to gauge the composition of the room, measuring ethnicity, gender, age, and education level as well as the political affiliations, social views, and interests of the participants.
PARTY FOR THE PRESIDENCY

Mobilize.org decided at its founding to embrace the concept of “all-partisanship,” since its founder felt that it was not sufficient for Millennial politics to be treated as “bi-partisan.” Americans, particularly America’s youth, do not divide between just two political party affiliations. The organization’s focus is on educating, empowering, and energizing America’s youth, regardless of party, ideology, or policy positions.

According to a recent report by CIRCLE, “Millennials Talk Politics,” 48% of young people do not identify with either party and have chosen to identify as independent or decline to state. Through the use of electronic keypad voting technology, Mobilize.org was able to conduct a series of polls to gauge the composition of the room, measuring ethnicity, gender, age, and education level as well as the political affiliations, social views, and interests of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Affiliation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertarian</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-22</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-30</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In High School</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Degree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“And that’s what’s good about the Party for the Presidency. It brought together all of us from all of the fifty different states.”

DeAudre Ridley, 24 (OK)

Top: Tracey Zeng (CA) presents for the team Community Social Networking.

Bottom: DeAudre Ridley (OK) works on the design of the Operation Engage America logo.
Self-Identification of the Millennial Generation

Party for the Presidency participants engaged in the same identification of the positive and negative characteristics of the Millennial Generation that the Summit participants undertook. Although there were some similarities in the findings of both groups, differences were largely present in the identification of the negative characteristics.

Positive Characteristics and Traits

- **Technological**
- **Social Networkers/Interconnected**
- **Communication Savvy**
- **Diverse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Democracy 2.0 Summit</th>
<th>Party for the Presidency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multi-Taskers</td>
<td>Technological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technological</td>
<td>Social Networkers/Interconnected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication Savvy</td>
<td>Communication Savvy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social Networkers/Interconnected</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative Characteristics and Traits

- **Apathetic**
- **Materialism**
- **Instant Gratification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Democracy 2.0 Summit</th>
<th>Party for the Presidency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Technology Dependent</td>
<td>Apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Image Conscious</td>
<td>Materialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instant Gratification</td>
<td>Instant Gratification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth negative characteristic that emerged in the discussion on characteristics was “social and cultural amnesia.” In a demonstration of the transparency and participant-directed nature of the process, participant Asher Underwood (TX) announced and defined his meaning of the characteristic to the rest of the general assembly of participants. The buy-in to this issue was so high that it was ranked as the fourth measure in this category.

Selection of Issues for Participants to Tackle

From both the results of the Democracy 2.0 Survey and the issues identified by the participants at the Democracy 2.0 Summit, Mobilize.org developed a list of thirteen umbrella topic areas to spark discussion amongst the Party for the Presidency participants. The participants engaged in a discussion of these issues and rank ordered which were most important. It was from this discussion that participants broke off into smaller groups to engage in “deep dive” discussions of these issues and their potential solutions.

The issues included:

- Higher Education
- Healthcare
- $50 Trillion Debt
- Money in Politics
- Social Justice
- Environment
- Student Debt
- War in Iraq
- Electoral Reform
- Workforce Investment
- Energy
- K-12 Education
- America’s Role in the World

It’s great to be on the right side of an issue, but if you are just taking your information from a sound bite you heard and don’t know why you are in that particular camp, that’s not exactly a strong point to argue.

Jenna Wilson, 23
(MA)

Top: Jenna Wilson shares her thoughts on the issues most pertinent to the Millennial Generation.

Bottom: Participants share best practices in the field of civic engagement online.
Mobilize Entrepreneur

Process Design: Thought Leaders

From both the use of the Summit discussions and survey feedback, Mobilize.org discovered that members of the Millennial Generation wanted opportunities to flex their skills.

During the Democracy 2.0 Summit, participants listed “a network of funders/foundations to support youth-led projects and provide professional advice and support” as an innovative solution and action that would further the vision of Democracy 2.0. This concept, often described as entrepreneurship, began to gain traction amongst the Millennials that Mobilize.org was working with.

The number of members of the Millennial Generation embracing entrepreneurship is astounding, from companies like Echo Ditto and Facebook, organizations like The Roosevelt Institution, and the worldwide development projects being undertaken in countries like Uganda. Mobilize.org wanted to create an environment where all members of the Millennial Generation could be supported in another endeavor: social entrepreneurship.

By borrowing best practices from IBM’s Global Innovation Outlook and the Clinton Global Initiative, Mobilize.org worked to develop Millennial-led conversations on critical issues and get these participants to commit to work on these issues by developing projects to effect change on the local and national level. This exercise was initially called the Mobilize Entrepreneur Contest and later became known as a Democracy 2.0 Entrepreneur Grant Summit.

Mobilize Entrepreneur Contest

Participants began forming teams on the second day of the conference, aligning on the issues they felt were most critical. Teams were comprised of participants from across the country, making part of the challenge to develop a proposal that could be implemented through either a local or nationwide network.

Participants were required to submit a Letter of Inquiry to a panel of judges at the conference who deliberated on which proposals would advance to the round of presentations. Although 25 teams submitted proposals, 15 teams were selected to present on the last day of the conference.

The presenting teams had three minutes to “pitch” their peers on the merits of their projects and answer questions from judges, which included Kari Dunn of The Case Foundation, Thaddeus Ferber of the Forum for Youth Investment, and Joseph Green, the Founder of Project Agape, the group responsible for the Causes application on Facebook and MySpace.
MOBILIZE ENTREPRENEUR

Teams received critical feedback and suggestions from their peers and the experts instantaneously through the use of electronic keypad voting technology on their projects. The winning teams were selected by both their peers and the panel of judges, utilizing electronic keypad voting technology. Teams were assessed on creativity, innovation, and the relationship of their project to the idea of Democracy 2.0.

The winning teams were comprised of team members ranging from ages 15 to 27. Although participants varied in their levels of education, it did not serve as a deterrent for the teams developing a role for each member to assume for the project design and implementation.

Participant Evaluation and Assessment

The wide range of intellectual activities and the Mobilize Entrepreneur Grant Summit were well received by the participants. Team members left excited and energized to continue work on their projects, even if they did not receive grant funding from the organization. Party for the Presidency participants were asked a variety of questions regarding their experience at the event (on a scale of 1 to 10):

**It was a Successful Event.** (8.4)

**I liked the format.** (7.1)

**I felt heard.** (7.8)

**I am excited about bring this work/these ideas back to my ongoing work.** (8.2)

**We are on the right path.** (8.2)

**The voting technology was used effectively.** (8.6)

High school participants expressed appreciation for the professional nature of the event. They enjoyed the challenge of having deadlines and measures they were expected to meet. The Millennial participants were also surprised at how well they worked together. University of Hawaii student Francis Choe commented on his thoughts going into the process: “I thought, ‘We are all gonna butt heads, we are never gonna get anything done since we will argue over who is in charge,’ but look how it turned out.”

One of the judges at the event summed up what the purpose of Mobilize Entrepreneur and the Party for the Presidency represented: “I think the real thing to reflect on is what it means to be a mobilizer, what it means to mobilize.”

---

*It’s interesting since there was such a short amount of time. So, I think that based on the time they had, it’s a good representation of some really creative ideas.*

Kari Dunn, The Case Foundation

Top: Joshua Contreras (NM) from the team Transportation Aid for Student Interns.

Bottom: The logo developed for Operation Engage America.
Several proposals were advanced discussing ways to work on the issue of the environment. One team had three simple goals: a “green” White House, a “green” America, and a “green” world. The Green White House Project believes that making a well-known public symbol of our country, the White House, as environmentally-friendly as possible will set an example to the rest of the nation and inspire citizens to pursue similar sustainable lifestyles. The Green White House Project aims to fulfill its commitment to political and civic participation through the creation of eco-friendly homes and communities. The effort will include the formation of a coalition to green the White House with a grassroots campaign centered around increasing public knowledge through traditional and new media outreach, a Green March, workshops, speaking engagements, and a pledge signed by the 2008 presidential candidates.

Through leadership and mentorship, politically-active and formerly-adjudicated youth envision bringing civic engagement to their peers and their communities. LEAd, Leadership and Empowerment for Adjudicated Youth, seeks to increase the civic engagement of young people who have been processed through the justice system. By targeting a subset of the population that are often ignored and historically absent from political involvement, LEAd will work to eradicate the feelings of oppression and work to overcome injustice by training adjudicated youth in the fields of social justice and community organizing. The effort will include a series of peer-led summits and education seminars. Leading by example, the facilitators of the LEAd program will show youth the ways to become and remain productive, contributing members of their communities.
By combining real life experience with professional trainings, On the Trail seeks to teach college students the skills necessary for working on a political campaign. On the Trail will primarily operate through in-person training camps where participants gain expertise in message development, campaign technology tools, fundraising, campaign operations, and grassroots mobilization. For those not able to attend the in-person trainings, an online version will also be available through a key component of On the Trail, the TrailMix 2.0 Placement Software. TrailMix will allow On the Trail graduates to create personal profiles of their campaign experience and view available opportunities to become involved in political campaigns. Participants who successfully complete On the Trail training camps will become an On the Trail certified graduate. These graduates will be paired with new scholars to strengthen their leadership, increase both productivity and retention, and become eligible to teach at future training camps.

With the mission to empower young Americans to actively participate in the political process and instill the value of citizenship, Operation Engage America (OEA) seeks to ease the process by which young people form, manage, and sustain mock legislation programs in their schools. The OEA team believes that mock legislation programs foster an understanding of the political process, international affairs, and the defense of positions on the issues. By creating a national umbrella organization and information clearinghouse, OEA plans to provide the support, knowledge, and guidance necessary for the initiation of widespread mock legislation programs. OEA will create and distribute both on and offline versions of resource packets, how-to guides, and action plans.
Transportation Aid for Student Interns (TASI) is a project that seeks to provide transportation assistance to unpaid interns through weekly unlimited METRO cards in Washington, D.C. This program will allay one of the major deterrents to youth seeking unpaid internships in Washington, D.C. by make a simple, cost-effective investment in their transportation costs for a semester. TASI feels that this measure will help to increase youth interest in public service.
“I think it is important to use introspection. We need to be able to turn the tables on ourselves and say, ‘What we can do to effect change for our future?,’ and not wait for others to do it for us. We are the leaders we have been waiting for, and we are the generation we have been waiting for.”

--Kristen Cambell (DC)
Mobilize.org will continue its commitment to Millennial-generated conversations, ideas, and projects by hosting grant summits across the nation in 2008, as well fostering and promoting Millennial-generated policy research. Mobilize.org feels that this strategy will not only let Millennials put their plans to action, but also move the generation forward in tackling our nation’s most critical issues.

Democracy 2.0 Entrepreneur Grant Summits will blend both policy and grassroots organizing, focusing on the concept of “social entrepreneurship.” The summits will focus on a variety of issues and will vary in scope, focusing on local, state, and national concerns. The first summit will take place in September 2008, focusing on the topic, “Money in Politics,” in partnership with CSIS, The Sunlight Foundation and Common Cause. Emphasizing the problem at the national level, Mobilize.org will challenge Millennials from across the nation to compete for grant funding to support projects to work to promote clean elections practices.

Mobilize.org’s second grant summit will take place in San Francisco, CA, in November 2008, encouraging members of the Millennial Generation to propose innovative solutions to continue, and sustain, the “civic currency” that is being built in advance of the 2008 Election.

Democracy 2.0 Grant Summits are aimed at the proliferation of new ideas to address areas in which we are lacking Democracy 2.0 compliant governance. The winner of this competition must advance a new solution or approach to a problem- one that will change the pattern in the field of civic engagement.

Our grant summit winners will each receive a grant, between $3,000 and $5,000 and, more importantly, will receive the support of Mobilize.org and our extensive partner network to champion their proposal. We will work carefully to develop sustainable projects and work with them to increase their reach and impact, and advocate for systemic social change.
The ideas presented at the summit will be evaluated against existing projects and initiatives, as Mobilize.org is focused on the real “change potential” afforded by the projects it selects to fund in 2008. The selection process, as arrived by both a panel of expert judges and the peers of competition participants shall include:

- **Relationship to Democracy 2.0** (50%)
- **Use of Innovative Technology** (20%)
- **Creativity / Entrepreneurial Idea** (15%)
- **Social Impact of the Idea** (10%)
- **Plan for Sustainability** (5%)

**Partnerships**

Mobilize.org will be seeking several different types of partners to support its Democracy 2.0 Entrepreneur Grant Summits. Partners will be an integral part of the outreach to recruit the most qualified participants as well as serve as part of the foundational team to build the summit experience. In Mobilize.org’s attempt to create a holistic approach to Millennial Generation involvement, the organization is seeking partners who can commit to involvement before, during, and after the summits.

**A Theory of Change**

Mobilize.org feels that it is essential to empower young people to take responsibility for their activism and the activism of their peers. These summits allow Mobilize.org to move forward with Democracy 2.0, the theory of change that is the foundation of the work that Mobilize.org engages in with members of the Millennial Generation.

Mobilize.org’s theory of change starts with the individual citizen identifying problems at the local, state, and national levels. Once problems are identified, citizens must engage in conversations searching for innovative solutions to the problems they have identified. Mobilize.org seeks to take the individual past the deliberation stage, enabling members of the Millennial Generation to implement their solutions. Mobilize.org’s end goal is to institutionalize citizen-generated solutions as a staple of American governance at all levels.

Mobilize.org foresees an exciting future ahead with its commitment to social entrepreneurship, and its investment in the change potential of members of the Millennial Generation.


"We want to give you the stats, a story, and a solution."

-- Mobilize Entrepreneur Team “On the Trail”
METHODOLOGY

Scope

The scope of this report is limited to the findings of Mobilize.org from July 4, 2007, to January 1, 2008. All data referred to in this report was collected through the online and offline distribution of the Democracy 2.0 Survey, the 47 member summit conducted on October 3, 2007, and the 250 person Party for the Presidency in Hollywood, California, December 29-31, 2007.

Definition of “Millennial”

Mobilize.org has worked with persons ages 12 to 30 during the Democracy 2.0 Project. Although there are differences in the field over which age brackets constitute a “member” of the Millennial Generation, the Project studied members of the Generation primarily ages 12 to 30.

In its inclusion of voter statistics to this report, Mobilize.org defines “Millennial” as persons falling within the age range of 18-24 and 25-29, reflecting the breakdown provided in voter statistics by the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE).

Survey Implementation

The Democracy 2.0 Survey was distributed throughout the United States, beginning on July 4, 2007, and ending September 27, 2007.

Offline

The Mobilize.org team, comprised of eight members, began the survey distribution process at colleges and universities throughout the United States, including George Mason University (DC), George Washington University (DC), Georgetown University (DC), American University (DC), Marymount College (VA), the University of Maryland (MD), Rowan University (NJ), Stockton College (NJ), Rutgers University (NJ), Ball State University (IA), Florida Atlantic University (FL), University of California at Berkeley (CA), and Wagner College (NY).

Mobilize.org’s team also targeted members of the 16-18 age demographic, distributing surveys to high school students in California, Colorado, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Texas, and Washington, D.C. Surveys were distributed at high schools including El Toro High School (CA), Sandra Day O’Connor High School (TX), Willowbrook High School (IL), Rio Rancho High School (NM), Fairview High School (TN), Lincoln High School (NY), Horace Mann High School (NY), Bridgeton High School (NJ), and Cesar Chavez Public Policy High School (DC).
Online

Mobilize.org partnered with other Millennial Generation organizations to get a diverse pool of online survey respondents. Partner organizations included Youth Service America, the Roosevelt Institution, the Student Association for Voter Empowerment, the Association of Young Americans, and Vision XY. The survey was also distributed through the University of California at Berkeley Political Science Department and numerous other academic listservs.

Democracy 2.0 Summit Process

The next step in the Democracy 2.0 process was to take the results of the 1,581 surveys and use these results to facilitate a conversation among a smaller group of Millennials. Mobilize.org sought a dialogue method that would both create transparency and adhere to Millennial characteristics and principles.

Partnering with Chris Bui of 5th Medium, Mobilize.org was able to synthesize the survey results and share them with the 47 Summit participants through the use of the Option Finder technology. This use of technology in the form of electronic keypad voting was critical in getting a collective and accurate measurement of the summit participants opinions on the content of the survey.

The process began with a large group discussion in the morning, explaining the technology and the framework for the day. The participants ranked what they felt was most important to accomplish and set the tone for the session.

For each question, the group broke first into table discussions of 6 to 8 people to explore the question in a small group format. The group then reconvened in a collective assembly, and each small group was afforded the opportunity to share their discussion. After each table shared its experience with the question, a larger group discussion would ensue, leading to the use of the electronic keypad voting technology to come to a final consensus of the participants on that particular question. In the afternoon of the summit, the participants wanted to break off into a working group format, beginning the initial drafts of the Democracy 2.0 Declaration. As ideas, words, and phrases were developed, they would be discussed with the entire room before their inclusion in the draft Democracy 2.0 Declaration. Due to the comprehensive and collective nature of the process, the Democracy 2.0 Declaration provides a clear guide as to the nature of the conversations that took place the day of the summit.
1. How successful do you think our society is at addressing its most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #1</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Successful</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Successful</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Successful</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Successful</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much of a role do you think people like you have in helping to address our society's most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #2</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large or Significant Role (It's our responsibility)</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable but not required role</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Role (Should be asked, but it's not really our job)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Role (That's the elected officials job and not mine)</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Role (That's the elected officials job and not mine)</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How much of a role do you think people like you should have in helping to address our society’s most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #3</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large or Significant Role (It’s our responsibility)</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable but not required role (Should be involved if we want to)</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Role (Should be asked, but it’s not really our job)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Role (That’s the elected officials job and not mine)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Overall, do you feel that government is serving the public interest?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #4</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Really</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 5-6 and 8-10 were open-ended, qualitative questions. Questions 5 and 6 were created to solicit responses in areas where members of the Millennial Generation felt the government was properly serving the public interest and failing to serve the public interest. Questions 8-10 were provided to have members of the Millennial Generation self-identify both the positive and negative characteristics of their generation, and to identify the types of solutions this generation would advance to solve our democracy’s most important problems.

5. Please provide at least one example of where you feel government is properly serving the public interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #5</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Education</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Security</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“None”</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Please provide at least one example where you feel the government is failing to serve the public interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #6</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq War and Withdrawal of Troops</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Global Warming</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty / Gas and Oil Prices (tie)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Do you think our generation is uniquely positioned to help our society address its most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #7</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Really</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please provide at least three characteristics, traits, or defining values of the Millennial Generation (12-30 years old).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #8</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Savvy</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-Minded and Tolerant</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfish</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved and Active</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How do those characteristics position our generation to help our society address its most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics don’t help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring attention to issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring diverse solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network, make connections faster, and break down barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine to follow through.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What specific ideas, programs, or processes do you think should be implemented to help our society better involve citizens, specifically young people, to help address our most important problems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth commission to be involved in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic clubs and organizations to mobilize and motivate, focusing on action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better educational programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More press and news to youth about politics and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth internships in politics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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