Nonprofit and University Strategic Partnerships to Strengthen the Sector

Regan Harwell Schaffer

Pepperdine University

There is a mutually beneficial partnership inherent in the structured collaboration between universities and nonprofit organizations. This article outlines a pilot program designed to address management challenges of nonprofits and provide meaningful and relevant learning experiences for students through the use of community-based research, a joint research study among students, faculty, and nonprofits designed to produce recommendations that will positively affect the community. Assessment data are significant, indicating that students increased their understanding of the sector while nonprofit partners received valuable resources. The article concludes with strategies for nonprofit practitioners and faculty who wish to develop a similar model.

Keywords: *service learning, community-based research, university–community partnerships*

PEOPLE WHO WORK IN the nonprofit sector are often characterized as highly motivated, hard working, and deeply committed. This depth of dedication can lead to high levels of stress and burnout, which are exacerbated when organizations do not provide enough training to help their staff sustain and develop as needed (Light, 2002). Many nonprofits hire from outside the

Correspondence to: Regan Harwell Schaffer, Pepperdine University, Business Administration Division, 24255 Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu, CA 90263. E-mail: regan.schaffer@pepperdine.edu

sector, and staff may have to learn as they go, with little relevant experience or sector-specific training (Peters and Wolfred, 2001). The result is that even though nonprofit staff may feel their work is meaningful, the lack of personal and professional development leaves many questioning why they should pursue long-term careers in the sector.

Recent college graduates, especially those with degrees or certification in nonprofit management, make up another employment pipeline for nonprofits. Numerous undergraduate and graduate programs exist, but new graduates often find it difficult to find employment in nonprofit organizations. In many cases this is because recent graduates have not established the contacts or gained the necessary experience to make them viable candidates. In addition, many nonprofits lack the time and search capabilities to tactically recruit from universities and colleges (Tierney, 2006).

Strategic partnerships between nonprofit organizations and universities are one way to address the staff recruitment and development challenges of nonprofit organizations and provide meaningful and relevant learning experiences for students. While there are numerous ways to approach such partnerships, one model was the creation of a course to meet specific needs of both the nonprofit sector and the university. The course, "Introduction to Community-Based Research in the Nonprofit Sector," was offered to upper-division undergraduate students who were pursuing a minor in nonprofit management. The content included an overview of research methods with an emphasis on knowledge creation that can be used in practical ways to improve an organization or address a social need. The students implemented a research study in partnership with local nonprofit organizations, analyzed the results, and presented their findings at a professional development conference. Through the process, students and nonprofit practitioners became co-learners and co-teachers as they collaborated on the study and sought to create useful and relevant strategies for using the data. This article discusses the formation of the course learning objectives, implementation, and outcomes, followed by suggestions for practitioners and faculty.

Curricular and Programmatic Expectations

To begin the design of the course, practitioners, researchers, and teachers in the field were identified who could provide both content and pedagogical approaches that are necessary to prepare students for work in the nonprofit arena. We also examined the curricular guidelines for undergraduate nonprofit management programs. The Nonprofit Leadership Alliance (NLA; formerly American Humanics) has outlined professional development and foundational competencies students must meet for certification (2008).

Key competencies relevant to this course are nonprofit management, program planning, implementation and evaluation, communication skills, employability skills, and personal skills. In addition, the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC) Guidelines (2007) focus on four pedagogical considerations that should shape the design of undergraduate curriculum: (1) community engagement is essential to understanding the sector; (2) pedagogical tools should be specific to the undergraduate population, who may have limited or no professional work experience; (3) service-learning methods should be used to build knowledge of the sector and develop an "engaged citizenry"; and (4) internships are important to create enhanced opportunities for future employment. NACC also provides specific curriculum that is similar to that of NLA and includes program assessment and evaluation.

One common theme is the need for students to understand program assessment; an area of increasing importance in the sector, it is typically given little priority in curriculum (Bailey, 2005; LeRoux and Wright, 2010; Schorr, 2009, Snively, 2010; Vaughan, 2010). This coincides with comments in the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* by Diana Aviv, president of Independent Sector, who urges nonprofit programs to focus intensely on the range of skills that nonprofit managers specifically need (Joslyn, 2004). Other respected voices of management education call for "more experiential, divergent, and realistic learning approaches" (Flannery and Pragman, 2010) that give students hands-on relevant experience (Kenworthy-U'Ren, 2000). As a result, educators increasingly use service learning as a tool to encourage moral and civic engagement and to effectively teach management and leadership skills (Cohen and Abbott, 2000; McCarthy and Tucker, 2002). Crutchfield and Grant (2008) found that although management skills are valuable, focusing on creative ways to create social change is at the heart of effective nonprofit leadership. The *Chronicle of Philanthropy* encapsulates the unique challenges of our programs: "Young people considering nonprofit careers today are caught in the confusing bind of values that puts the power of social movements, coalition building, and advocacy on one end and the necessity of business approaches, social entrepreneurship and the power of the individual leaders on the other. If colleges and graduate programs are successful, they should produce students who have a deep understanding of the traditions of the nonprofit world as well as of current trends and the influence of business and innovation in philanthropy" (Behnke and Oberwetter, 2008, p. 1).

One other factor shaped the course design: nonprofit professionals and students need to spend more time learning and sharing *together*. Students spend numerous hours engaged in volunteer and service-learning activities but often do not receive much mentoring or participate in cross-generational learning. These types of relationships

Although management skills are valuable, focusing on creative ways to create social change is at the heart of effective nonprofit leadership.

are more difficult to create and yet are necessary for both the students and the sector to be able to work together and meet one another's expectations. Behnke and Oberwetter (2008) challenge nonprofit leaders to capitalize on the values, skills, and passion of our current generation and not suffer from a myopic vision of the sector. Conversely, in her research on preparing for a career in a nonprofit, Cryer (2008) found that students who obtained jobs knew someone in the sector who served as an advisor or coach. Successful students also participated in workshops, seminars, and conferences at which they would learn up-to-date information and meet and engage with peers and working professionals in the field.

Community-Based Research

Given the needs identified, we determined that community-based research (CBR) would be the most effective pedagogical tool to meet our course objectives. Community-based research can best be defined as "collaborative, change-oriented research that engages faculty members, students and community members in projects that address a community-identified need" (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, and Donahue, 2003, p. 5). While CBR is a form of service learning, the research element differentiates it from the traditional model of service learning and often allows faculty who might otherwise not choose to engage to do so because they can tie CBR directly to their research (Chapdelaine and Chapman, 1999; Stocking and Cutforth, 2006). CBR also differs from traditional research in that the intended outcome is to benefit the community rather than contribute to a body of knowledge—but it can achieve both goals (Wade and Demb, 2009). For instance, one class conducted a communications audit for several nonprofit partners, including an assessment of their social media, print media, brochures, presentation content, and other formal marketing means. The deliverable to the nonprofit was a thorough, written analysis with recommendations and tools for improvement. The faculty member was able to use the data to inform her research on the effective use of social media for philanthropic purposes, allowing the CBR project to fulfill dual purposes. Nonetheless, CBR as a form of service learning in higher education, particularly with undergraduate students, is relatively new, and few guidelines have been established for designing and implementing CBR at this level (Strand, 2000).

One body of research by Strand and colleagues (2003) offers important considerations when designing CBR. First, the researchers state that the ideal CBR project is one in which all parties are engaged at every step of the process, from identifying the problem, outlining the research questions, developing research tools, collecting and analyzing the data, interpreting the results, and producing final outcomes

and recommendations (p. 6). Second, CBR should seek to "democratize knowledge by validating multiple sources of knowledge and promoting the use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination" (p. 6). This includes utilizing varied and unique methods of knowledge discovery. Strand and others (2003) state that "methods of data collection are developed or chosen not only based on their scientific rigor and appropriateness to research questions, but also because they have the potential for drawing out knowledge that is most relevant and useful and they invite the involvement of all the research stakeholders in identifying, defining and struggling to solve the problem that has been identified" (p. 6). CBR researchers need to be creative in identifying how they will disseminate their research findings using traditional and nontraditional approaches—including websites, community meetings, and workshops (Stocking and Cutforth, 2006). This means writing and/or presenting a report that can be understood by those at all levels of an organization, not just academics. Third, and perhaps most important, is that CBR has as its goal social action for the purpose of achieving social change (Elgren and Hensel, 2006). This could be for numerous purposes: improving programs, promoting interests, identifying or attracting new resources, understanding or assessing needs of target populations, explicating issues and challenges, creating awareness of the need for action, or designing strategies for change (Strand and others, 2003).

> *Perhaps most important is that CBR has as its goal social action for the purpose of achieving social change.*

In terms of learning outcomes, much like service learning, CBR benefits students in their understanding of the course concepts, increased sense of empowerment, greater perception of social problems, and integration of academics and service (Kazura and Tuttle, 2010; Willis, Peresie, Waldref, and Stockmann, 2003). Other benefits are increased skills in problem solving, critical thinking, writing, speaking, reading, and collaborative teamwork (Elgren and Hensel, 2006; Landrum and Nelson, 2002). Students also gain discipline-specific knowledge and increase their understanding of the literature in their fields, methodological frameworks, and rights of human subjects (Perlman and McCann, 2005). Furthermore, students who complete CBR projects frequently deepen their connections to community work and broader social justice issues and show an increased understanding of the underlying causes of problems within the community (Stocking and Cutforth, 2006). The nonprofit professionals who work directly with the students state that they benefit from the service received, access to university resources (and potential graduates), and the collaboration with faculty and other stakeholders (Chupp and Joseph, 2010).

The Course Model

The CBR course was designed to address our learning objectives specific to preparation for work in the nonprofit sector and the

needs of our nonprofit community partners while trying to maintain the integrity of good CBR practice. Two nonprofit partners who each engage extensively with our local nonprofit community (one as a consultant and the other as part of a community foundation) were asked to provide insight in partnership with the faculty member who would teach the CBR course.

Given that this was to be an introductory research course for undergraduate students and our first foray into CBR, we adopted a topic and model from a recent study that coincided with the needs of our nonprofit partners. We looked for leading voices within the sector who were addressing relevant issues that would be useful for our students and community partners. The research of Leslie R. Crutchfield and Heather McLeod Grant on "high-impact" organizations for social change immediately came to mind because of its national recognition, relevance, and applicability. Their book, *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits,* was used as the model. Crutchfield and Grant conducted a national peer study to select those nonprofit organizations that have had the most impact. Once these organizations were identified, the researchers interviewed senior-level staff and board and identified patterns or practices that cut across the organizations and that they believed contributed to their "phenomenal impact" (2008, p. 29). From these patterns they identified six practices of high-impact organizations: (1) advocate and serve, (2) make markets work, (3) inspire evangelists, (4) nurture nonprofit networks, (5) master the art of adaptation, and (6) share leadership.

With the *Forces for Good* study as our model, we attempted to replicate aspects of that study while keeping in mind the limitations of our students, most of whom had never completed any formal research, and the time constraints of the class (a fifteen-week course). We wanted students to do a qualitative study because it would lend itself more toward process and how people make meaning of data (Creswell, 1994). It would also allow students to engage with their research participants through the use of informational interviews followed by content analysis similar to that in Crutchfield and Grant's study. In designing the interview questions, we used an appreciative inquiry approach that focuses on what's working rather than what is wrong (Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros, 2007). To bring the CBR model full circle, we utilized a professional development conference, the Nonprofit Leadership Institute, which we host on our campus each year, as a venue through which the students could present their research findings to the nonprofit community. The institute is designed to bring local nonprofit leaders and students together to engage in an interactive two-day workshop about a given topic featuring a recognized speaker in the field. We invited Heather McLeod Grant as our speaker and asked her to design her workshop around the study and serve as a respondent to the students' presentations. Upon

her agreement, the model was established and the purpose of our study identified: to conduct an analysis of high-impact practices of local nonprofit organizations.

Research Design

The study fell into four phases; the first two were completed before the class began and the final two were completed by the students.

Phase 1 consisted of identifying nonprofits that would fit the criteria to participate in the study and benefit from their involvement. We asked our local community foundation to solicit its members and invited nonprofit organizations that had existing relationships with our university. Based upon the number of qualified participants, we invited another nonprofit class to participate in the data collection and analysis, for a total of thirty student participants.

Phase 2 was to gain consents from the participants and have them complete an online survey that would assess their organization's' strengths in each of the six practices from the *Forces for Good* model. Sixty people from different organizations volunteered to be part of the study and completed the online survey to serve as our target population. Each participant was coded based upon the two practices of the six that he or she ranked highest as his or her organization's strengths. Once the results were compiled, we had anywhere from five to seventeen organizations listed for each of the six practices (many respondents did not utilize all of the six practices).

Phase 3 consisted of each student interviewing two respondents from the Phase 2 survey following an interview protocol for each of the six practices (see the appendix for questions). The coordination was challenging, but sixty people were interviewed about the two practices they had ranked the highest for their organizations. The interviews were semi-structured, allowing the students to probe as necessary when conducting their interviews. In addition, the students researched historical and demographic data about each of the organizations represented by the participants and provided written reports on each interview following specific guidelines.

In phase 4 the students formed six teams, one for each practice, and conducted content analysis of the written interviews, seeking to identify themes, examples, and outliers from the data. Based upon their findings, they wrote reports incorporating anonymous quotes from participants that illustrated each theme.

The class culminated with the students presenting their research findings at the Nonprofit Leadership Institute. The audience was

> *The model was established and the purpose of our study identified: to conduct an analysis of high-impact practices of local nonprofit organizations.*

made up of the research participants who attended at a discount rate, local nonprofit leaders, and students. Each of the six student research teams had five minutes to present the findings on their practice using a structured format. At the conclusion, Heather McLeod Grant served as a respondent and made observations regarding the students' findings. The audience asked questions, and then the entire group transitioned into round table discussions of each of the six practices. Audience members could self-select which table to sit at, and during that time they were encouraged to ask deeper questions of the student researchers or provide further insight. The rest of the time at the institute was devoted to providing practical strategies for the nonprofit professionals to incorporate into their organizations. By the conclusion of the conference, the nonprofits had received organizational assessments, attendance at a professional development conference, plans for how to use the assessment data for their organizations, and an opportunity to engage with students on a deeper level. The students had gained a meaningful and valuable learning experience and the opportunity to learn alongside professionals in the field.

Learning Outcomes

A survey of the twelve students enrolled in the CBR class was conducted at the beginning and conclusion of the course to assess their confidence in their knowledge in several key variables, as outlined in Table 1. A composite scale was used because there was a strong degree of reliability (0.72 for the pretest, and 0.71 for the posttest). On the pretest, the sample had a mean of 20.25 (SD = 4.33) and posttest mean was 31.92 (SD = 4.14). The difference in scores was highly significant ($t = 9.66$, $df = 11$, $p < 0.001$) and had a very strong effect size ($d = 2.75$). The variables that noted the greatest change were nonprofit careers, nonprofit marketing, nonprofit assessment, and board and staff relationships. The survey findings are encouraging because the students appear to have a greater understanding of the dynamics of working in the sector and with that clarity have greater confidence about their ability to build careers. The following quote from a student illustrates the impact: "I was skeptical of how these adult nonprofit leaders would respond to a group of undergraduate students assessing their organizations and offering suggestions. Not once during the study or the institute did I feel patronized nor was anyone condescending. Perhaps I should have had more faith in the integrity and confidence of the leaders but that was very significant for me. I am more excited to be part of this group of people when I graduate."

We also asked the nonprofit professionals who attended the institute to rate the students on a 4-point scale (1 = poor, 2 = average, 3 = very good, 4 = excellent). Fifty-seven professionals responded as outlined in Table 2; their comments reinforced the

Table 1. *t*-Test of Pre- and Post-Student Survey Content: Paired Sample Statistics

	Mean Pre/Post	*N*	*Standard Deviation Pre/Post*	*Standard Error Mean Pre/Post*
Volunteer management	2.17/2.92	12	0.835/0.793	0.241/0.229
Fund-raising	2.67/3.00	12	0.888/0.739	0.256/0.213
Board recruitment and development	1.75/2.50	12	0.866/0.905	0.250/0.261
Staff training	2.00/2.58	12	0.853/0.669	0.246/0.193
Board and staff relations	1.67/3.00	12	0.778/0.853	0.225/0.246
Nonprofit careers	2.00/3.33	12	0.603/0.651	0.174/0.188
Strategic planning	1.67/2.75	12	0.778/0.754	0.225/0.218
Nonprofit marketing	1.67/3.08	12	0.778/0.515	0.225/0.149
Nonprofit assessment	1.33/3.33	12	0.651/0.651	0.188/0.188
Corporate philanthropy	1.67/2.67	12	0.492/0.888	0.142/0.256
Lobbying/Advocacy	1.67/2.75	12	0.778/0.622	0.225/0.179

Table 2. Nonprofit Professional Ratings (*N* = 57)

Please evaluate the student's research and presentation on the following scale: 1 = poor, 2 = average, 3 = very good, 4 = excellent	
Quality of presentation	3.48
Format for sharing and discussing research	3.67
General applicability of research findings to your organization	3.58
Small group discussion	3.67

dynamic that was shared between the students and nonprofit leaders:

- "[It was a] wonderful experience listening to the lessons learned by the students."
- "Great to hear about hard work and to see research outcomes."
- "The students seemed well prepared and professional. I wish I had this opportunity in college."

Lessons Learned and Implications

The CBR course has the potential to be a win/win/win for faculty, community members, and students as they use their collective resources to address important issues, improve programs, or create initiatives. This pilot course went well, but even with thoughtful planning there were unexpected challenges that could have compromised the quality of the course. Obvious issues for faculty is to plan the course early to give time for institution review board applications, identifying community needs and a research agenda, and securing all necessary consents. Another consideration is designing a research study that is thorough enough that the students can experience different data collection techniques and complete

the study within the time frame of the course. It's necessary to have room in the course schedule for problems or delays. Additionally, a venue at which the students can present their research and make their reports available to those who can benefit from it is imperative. This may provide the greatest meaning and impact for all involved. Finally, faculty should highlight their CBR as an example of engaged scholarship prominently in their tenure and promotion documents. CBR is an excellent example of Boyer's (1990) scholarship of teaching and application, which is part of our criteria for rank, tenure, and promotion decisions. That coupled with the emphasis on undergraduate research has allowed our faculty to articulate successfully a justification for their research and teaching practices. When faculty esteem the value of CBR, they encourage future faculty to adopt this worthy pedagogical and research tool.

When faculty esteem the value of CBR, they encourage future faculty to adopt this worthy pedagogical and research tool.

Nonprofits interested in creating a strategic collaboration should first look to their current relationships with local colleges or universities. This may be the means for the first point of contact. If no relationship exists, they can identify institutions with academic programs or courses that are relevant to the organization's needs. This could be a nonprofit management program or initiatives that promote undergraduate research, social justice, public policy, or content areas pertinent to the organization's field. Once a potential partnering college or university is identified, the nonprofit should clearly articulate what type of data would be most useful and how it would use the information once it has been received. Because the nonprofit's voice guides the focus of the study, representatives should be intentional and committed to making the study a success. This includes providing data, consent forms, and interviews in a timely manner and recognizing the constraints of the course calendar. It is also important that the nonprofit partner understand the limitations of the study when working with undergraduate students. While undergraduates are very capable, they may lack the ability to deliver extensive analysis because of their own limited life experiences, knowledge, and expertise. Therefore it is imperative that the nonprofit professional partner with the faculty to design the study and focus on topics and formats that will glean the needed depth of information to truly be beneficial. Finally, once the data is collected and a report has been provided, it is crucial that the nonprofit see that the information is shared appropriately and acted upon by the right people. This is where the social change happens and the ultimate goal of CBR can be fulfilled.

References

Bailey, M. B. "Think 'Results,' Not 'Evaluation.'" *Public Manager,* 2005, *34*(1), 8–10.

Behnke, S., and Oberwetter, P. "Create Jobs with Meaning for Generation Y." *Chronicle of Philanthropy,* March 6, 2008. Retrieved on May 5, 2010, from https://philanthropy.com/article/Create-Jobs-With-Meaning-fo/60896/.

Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate.* Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Chapdelaine, A., and Chapman, B. L. "Using Community-Based Research Projects to Teach Research Methods." *Teaching of Psychology,* 1999, *26*(2), 101–108.

Chupp, M. G., and Joseph, M. L. "Getting the Most Out of Service Learning: Maximizing Student, University, and Community Impact." *Journal of Community Practice*, 2010, *18*(2/3), 190–212.

Cohen, S., and Abbott, T. "Integrating Nonprofit Management Education into Graduate Programs in Public Policy and Administration." Columbia University, January 2000. Retrieved June 3, 2010, from http://www.columbia.edu/~sc32/documents/Integrating%20Nonprofit%20Management.pdf.

Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D., and Stavros, J. *The Appreciate Inquiry Handbook: For Leaders of Change* (2nd ed.). New York: Crown Custom, 2007.

Creswell, J. W. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1994.

Crutchfield, L. R., and Grant, H. M. *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits.* San Francisco: Wiley, 2008.

Cryer, S. *The Nonprofit Career Guide: How to Land a Job That Makes a Difference.* Nashville, Tenn.: Fieldstone Alliance, 2008.

Elgren, T., and Hensel, N. "Undergraduate Research Experiences: Synergies Between Scholarship and Teaching." *Peer Review,* 2006, *8*(1), 4–7.

Flannery, B. L., and Pragman, C. H. "Service-Learning and Integrated Course Redesign: Principles of Management and the Campus Kitchen Metaproject." *Journal of Management Education,* 2010, *34*(1), 11–38.

Joslyn, H. "Gaining Success by Degree." *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 8, 2004. Retrieved May 15, 2010, from http://philanthropy.com/article/Gaining-Success-by-Degrees/62103/.

Kazura, K., and Tuttle, H. "Research-Based Learning Approach: Students' Perspectives of Skills Obtained." *Journal of Instructional Psychology,* 2010, *37*(3), 210–215.

Kenworthy-U'Ren, A. L. "Management Students as Consultants: A Strategy for Service-Learning in Management Education." In P. C. Godfrey and E. T. Grasso (eds.), *Working for the Common Good: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Management.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education, 2000.

Landrum, R. E., and Nelson, L. R. "The Undergraduate Research Assistantship: An Analysis of the Benefits." *Teaching of Psychology,* 2002, *29,* 15–19.

LeRoux, K. M., and Wright, N. S. "Does Performance Measurement Improve Strategic Decision Making?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 2010, *39*(4), 571–587.

Light, P. "Grasping for the Ring: Defining Strong Nonprofit Leadership." *California Association of Nonprofits Alert,* July/August 2002. Retrieved June 10, 2004, from http://canonprofits.org/CANAlert/july.aug.02/index.html.

McCarthy, A. M., and Tucker, M. L. "Encouraging Community Service Through Service Learning." *Journal of Management Education,* 2002, *42,* 629–647.

Nonprofit Academic Centers Council. *Curricular Guidelines for Undergraduate Study in Nonprofit Leadership, the Nonprofit Sector and Philanthropy.* Cleveland, Ohio: Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, 2007. Retrieved May 30, 2010, from http://www.naccouncil.org/pdf/UnderGradCG07.pdf.

Nonprofit Leadership Alliance (formerly American Humanics) Certification Competencies, 2008. Retrieved May 30, 2010, from http://www.humanics.org.

Perlman, B., and McCann, L. I. "Undergraduate Research Experiences in Psychology: A National Study of Courses and Curricula." *Teaching of Psychology,* 2005, *32*(1), 5–14.

Peters, J., and Wolfred, T. *Daring to Lead: Nonprofit Executive Directors and Their Work Experience.* San Francisco: CompassPoint, 2001.

Schorr, L. B. "To Judge What Will Best Help Society's Neediest, Let's Use a Broad Array of Evaluation Techniques." *Chronicle of Philanthropy,* 2009, *45*(7) 62–72.

Snively, S. "Measuring Up." *Chartered Accountants Journal,* 2010, *89*(5), 34–35.

Strand, K. J. "Community-Based Research Pedagogy." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2000, *7*(1), 85–96.

Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., and Donohue, P. "Principles of Best Practice for Community-Based Research." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2003, *9*(3), 5–15.

Stocking, V. B., and Cutforth, N. "Managing the Challenges of Teaching Community-Based Research Courses: Insights from Two Instructors." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2006, *13*(1), 56–65.

Tierney, T. "The Nonprofit Sector's Leadership Deficit." Bridgespan Group, 2006. Retrieved June 12, 2006, from http://www.bridgestar.org/Library/LeadershipDeficit.aspx.

Vaughan, S. K. "The Importance of Performance Assessment in Local Government Decisions to Fund Health and Human Services Nonprofit Organizations." *Journal of Health and Human Service Administration,* 2010, *32*(4), 485–512.

Wade, A., and Demb, A. "A Conceptual Model to Explore Faculty Community Engagement." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2009, *15*(2), 5–16.

Willis, J., Peresie, J., Waldref, V., and Stockmann, D. "The Under-graduate Perspective on Community-Based Research." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2003, *9*(3), 36–43.

REGAN HARWELL SCHAFFER is an associate professor of management and organizational behavior at Pepperdine University, where she also directs the Nonprofit Leadership Program.

Appendix: Interview Questions

Advocate and Serve

- What have been your greatest successes in advocating for policy reform or increasing government resources on behalf of your constituents?
- Ideally, what are your goals in the area of advocacy?
- How could you build your advocacy program to best accomplish your agency's mission?

Make Markets Work

- What have been your greatest successes in working with businesses to accomplish your mission (through changing business practices, attracting business resources, or running your own business)?
- Ideally, how would you like to work with businesses in the future to accomplish your organization's goals?
- What are the steps to building better partnerships with businesses starting now?

Inspire Evangelists

- Who are your best evangelists or cheerleaders? Give us an example of what your best "evangelist" would say about your organization. What benefit do you think they receive from promoting your organization?
- If money was not an issue, whom would you choose to represent your organization? Why? Generally speaking, how do you hope evangelists will advance your mission and major goals?
- What steps can you take to continue to inspire evangelists for your cause?

Nurture Nonprofit Networks

- Can you share some examples of ways you have worked successfully with other nonprofits to accomplish a shared mission? How does having a high level of collaboration with peer nonprofits have a role in increasing impact?
- Ideally, how much collaboration with peer nonprofits would you like to have? Why? Is there such a thing as too much?
- What are your plans for building stronger collaborative partnership with peer nonprofits?

Master the Art of Adaptation

- Please share an example of a time when your organization successfully changed course or direction in order to attain a specific goal.
- In what way would your organization change its goals and/or mission if lack of money were not a deterrent?
- How do you plan to manage adaptation to a changing environment through measuring results, evaluating impact, and modifying your approach?

Share Leadership

- Can you provide a few examples of how you have successfully shared leadership with senior management, board members, volunteers, and/or staff?
- In the future, how do you plan to engage others in your organization in leadership roles?
- What structures do you plan to implement to encourage shared leadership? (If they are already there, ask them what structures they currently have in place.)