NASPAA

Nonprofit Management Education in Schools with Public Affairs Curricula: An Analysis of the Trend Toward Curriculum Integration
Author(s): Judith R. Saidel and Steven Rathgeb Smith
Source: *Journal of Public Affairs Education,* Vol. 21, No. 3 (SUMMER 2015), pp. 337-348
Published by: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/24615512
Accessed: 15-11-2017 02:51 UTC

JSTOR

Nonprofit Management Education in Schools with Public Affairs Curricula: An Analysis of the Trend Toward Curriculum Integration

Judith R. Saidel
University at Albany, State University of New York

Steven Rathgeb Smith
American Political Science Association

ABSTRACT

For almost 20 years, scholars interested in public affairs education have called for innovation in master's-level curricula to respond to shifts, begun in the 1960s, in how public services are delivered. The integral role of nonprofit organizations as implementers of publicly funded programs and as participants in the larger policy process is a key feature of the new public governance. This article examines recent trends in nonprofit management education in universities that offer master's-level graduate programs in public affairs. Based on data from 43 schools collected in two waves, first in 2011 and again in 2014, we elaborate a four-level curriculum integration model and document trends in curriculum development. We find that just over half of the sample schools remain in a pre-integration stage of curriculum development. Simultaneously, analysis across the 43 schools reveals that significant movement has occurred among schools in the later stages of curriculum change.

INTRODUCTION

For almost 20 years, scholars interested in public affairs education have called for innovation in master's-level curricula to respond to the momentous shifts, begun in the 1960s, in how public services are delivered. The integral and expanded role of nonprofit organizations as implementers of publicly funded programs and as participants in the larger policy process is a key feature of what is now generally understood as the new public governance.

At a 1996 conference on nonprofit management education, Salamon argued that public administration teaching programs should undertake a "basic reconceptualization of what the nature of public administration has come to mean" (1996, p. 12). He expanded and reiterated the proposed innovation in a 2004 Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) keynote address (Salamon, 2005). Smith has also built a case for "a fundamental rethinking of the

current curriculum" (2008, p. 126). Along with other researchers (e.g., Cohen & Abbott, 2000), Salamon (1996, 2005) and Smith (2008) identified the integration of nonprofit-related issues into the core curriculum of master's-level public affairs programs as a central element of curricular innovation.

This article is an empirical examination of recent trends in nonprofit management education in universities that offer master's-level graduate programs in public affairs. Based on data from 43 schools collected in two waves, first in 2011 and again in 2014, we elaborate a four-level curriculum integration model and document trends in curriculum development. The four levels—Curriculum Expansion, Pre-Integration, Core Integration, and Institutional Integration —differentiate between stages of curricular and cocurricular developments related to nonprofit management in schools with public affairs curricula. The characteristics by which schools are compared are these: courses and course content, roles of and status of and promotion policy for faculty, certificate availability, and scope of campus outreach. The study's focus on recent shifts in graduate education highlights evolutionary patterns under way since the 1980s. Further explanation of the model is provided in a later section of this article.

The timing of this study is especially fortuitous because of the current intersection in the developmental histories of both nonprofit management education and public affairs education. Nonprofit graduate programs that offer at least three courses related to nonprofit organizations and the nonprofit sector have expanded rapidly over the last 30 years, moving from fewer than 20 in the early to mid-1980s to over 150 today (Mirabella, 2007; Mirabella & Wish, 2000). At the same time, as this *Journal of Public Affairs Education (JPAE)* symposium demonstrates, the field of public affairs education is still in a transition phase toward fully acknowledging that students must be prepared to succeed in a cross-sector management context. The curriculum integration model elaborated here is intended to facilitate change responsive to this context by serving as a conceptual road map for curricular planning and innovation.

The confluence of at least four factors provides a rationale for the importance of new courses and experiential learning opportunities that position students to succeed in cross-boundary management. First, the institutional shift in the forms of collective action toward interdependence between the public, nonprofit, and for-profit sectors (Saidel, 1991, 1994) is, by now, a virtual starting point for any analysis of contemporary public governance. As Smith (2008) contends, although the increasingly complex relationships between sectors in all dimensions of policy development and implementation make decisions about how to revise the curriculum difficult, updating courses, including core courses, to reflect the new institutional reality should be a curriculum development priority.

Second, the career argument is persuasive. An increasing number of students in master's programs of public administration and public policy seek and find employment in nonprofit-sector jobs, work in both sectors over time, or have responsibilities as public managers that necessitate an understanding of the dynamics of the nonprofit managerial environment. These employment patterns are, of course, closely related to a third factor—the public service motivation argument that students aspiring to careers in government and/or nonprofits share common values grounded in the ideals of public service (Young, 1999). This underlying motivation reinforces the likelihood that students in schools with public affairs curricula may well work in both sectors over time. Finally, the steady growth and professionalization of the nonprofit sector (Cohen & Abbott, 2000; O'Neill, 2005) during years when the workforces of government and certain sectors of the business economy were shrinking have created an expanded market for credentialed job seekers.

This article is divided into five sections. In the next section, we present background on debates in higher education related to nonprofit management education and a brief review of selected research studies. Then we describe the study's methodology, describe more fully the

curriculum integration model, and report our findings. In the discussion section, we identify potential barriers to and enabling conditions for the full realization of the model. In the conclusion, we suggest ways in which the model may be useful for curriculum planning, as well as potential co-occurring curricular innovations to consider.

BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

From the beginning of scholarly attention to the field of nonprofit management education, scholars have wrestled with whether and, if so, how the education of future managers in programs targeted primarily for careers in one sector should include education about the other sectors and the relationships between them. These questions were especially salient in the broader policy context of devolution and shifts in the ways in which public services were delivered. O'Neill and Young (1988) coedited the first book-length volume devoted specifically to nonprofit management education, titled *Educating Managers of Nonprofit Organizations*. Their introductory chapter highlights themes derived from papers presented at a 1986 conference at the University of San Francisco. The authors elaborate the unique characteristics of nonprofit organizations and argue that programs that seek to prepare students for nonprofit management must be built around these characteristics. They raise the question whether nonprofit organizations, despite their extraordinary diversity, "have enough in common to justify and encourage a distinct, unitary management education tradition of their own" (1988, p. 11). In the mid-1980s, the answer, at least from the authors' perspective, seemed to be yes. At the same time, however, O'Neill and Young made a prescient observation about the implications of cross-sector relationships and linkages. They argued that managers of nonprofit organizations must learn not only about the nonprofit sector but also about the for-profit and public sectors as well.

A second conference on nonprofit management education, held at the University of California, Berkeley in 1996, featured Johns Hopkins University scholar Lester M. Salamon as the key note speaker. In a provocative presentation titled "Nonprofit Management Education: A Field Whose Time Has Passed?" Salamon challenged the question O'Neill and Young (1988) had raised earlier related to the ways in which nonprofit managers should be educated. Instead, he contended that the key questions are these: "What, then, *is* the central management challenge facing public problem-solving at the present time? And what implications does this have for the design of nonprofit management education?" (Salamon, 1996, p. 4–5).

In contrast to a focus on the distinctive characteristics of nonprofit organizations, Salamon's response was "the challenge of learning how to manage the complex collaborative relationships among the sectors" (p. 5). He critiqued current curricula in schools of public affairs, schools of public policy, and free-standing nonprofit management education. Instead, he proposed training nonprofit and public managers together as "professional citizens" in a program organized around the notion of a career in public service. Salamon was clear about the need for public and nonprofit managers to understand the "logics" of both sectors. In addition, he recognized the possibility that the new approach could be absorbed into ongoing curricula, thereby previewing the kind of integrated curriculum captured by the model explored in this article.

As nonprofit management education expanded rapidly in higher education both in the United States and internationally, the topic continued to draw the attention of researchers. Mirabella and Wish (2000) compared graduate nonprofit management education programs and found, among schools highly ranked by U.S. News and World Report, little evidence of curricula that go beyond an emphasis on internal management processes or the "inside function" of long-established management course content (p. 226).

Young (1999) also scanned the field in an analysis of the various ways in which nonprofit management education might develop. He

found that predicting with certainty the future direction of the field was premature, given the diversity of programs under way. During the same period, Cohen and Abbott (2000) wrote an essay for the Columbia University School of International Affairs in which they argued strongly that schools affiliated with NASPAA should avoid, in nonprofit management education programs, course content that highlights the advocacy role of nonprofits and should instead "focus on teaching traditional and innovative management tools, tailored towards the private nonprofit sector" (p. 4). They cited O'Neill and Young (1988) and described a curricular approach congruent with the then-current strategies of most universities as reported by Mirabella and Wish (2000). Cohen and Abbot stressed, however, that "MPA curricula must address issues in both a concentration that prepares people to work in the nonprofit sector, and also in the core curriculum" (2000, p. 12).

Within 5 to 6 years, the dominant "inside function" approach of most nonprofit management education programs was under substantial challenge. Salamon (2005) had delivered a scathing critique of existing programs to the NASPAA community. As noted in the introduction, Smith (2008) contended that the complicated nature of inter-sectoral relationships in public policy development and implementation necessitated a reexamination of conventional curricula. In particular, Smith argued for a restructuring of the core MPA curriculum. "One important goal, then, should be to integrate material on the increasingly complex relationship between the public sector and nonprofit and for-profit entities into the core curriculum" (Smith, 2008, p. 123).

Horne and Paris (2010) focused specifically on how to prepare graduate students in public administration programs to achieve success in cross-sector collaboration careers. They interviewed seasoned managers in both public and nonprofit sectors and, based on the implicit knowledge conveyed in the interviews, developed learning objectives around student understanding of both the formal structures

and the informal processes and relationships that contribute to the realization of successful collaboration outcomes. Their recommendations reflect a fully integrated curriculum ideal.

The research reported here adds to prior studies and debates by examining the following question: To what extent has curriculum integration occurred? This is the central descriptive research question of this study. In addition, we examine two explanatory research questions that have not been explored in previous studies: How can we understand in a systematic way the developmental stages through which graduate nonprofit management education programs move? What are the conditions that enable and the barriers that impede the integration of nonprofit management education into the core offerings of schools with public affairs curricula?

METHODOLOGY
This study proceeded through a two-stage research process. Stage 1 involved development and refinement of the four-level model. In Stage 2, we tested the model through a survey and interviews.

Stage 1
Our interest in the notion of curriculum integration as it applies to nonprofit management education in schools with public affairs curricula originated in panel presentations we made and discussion at the Benchmark 3.0 Conference, sponsored by the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC) and held at Arizona State University in 2006. Subsequently, we pooled our experience at various universities and developed a conceptual model of curricular developmental phases through which most nonprofit management programs seemed to proceed. We presented the framework and received positive feedback at the 2010 NASPAA and Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA) conferences.

Stage 2
In 2011, we conducted an empirical investigation of the state of nonprofit management education in schools with public affairs curricula.

The purpose of the research was to determine whether the curriculum integration model is, in fact, consistent with the developmental phases of a wide variety of graduate nonprofit management education programs in U.S. universities.

Data sources for this research include U.S. News & World Report's Top 25 MPA Programs; U.S. News & World Report's Top 10 Nonprofit Management Programs (three schools on this list were not ranked in the Top 25 MPA Programs); and a diverse purposive sample of 15 universities drawn from the NASPAA Nonprofit Management Education Section list. The choice of a reputational sample from the first two sources is based on the likelihood that highly ranked schools offer evidence of innovations in curriculum development (Light, 1999; Mirabella & Wish, 2000). The total number of campuses in the study is 43. In order to maintain consistency in the sample across time, we utilized the 2011 rankings and NASPAA sample for data collection in both 2011 and 2014.

In both 2011 and 2014, the primary method for data collection was intensive website analysis with follow-up e-mails or phone calls, when necessary, for clarification of the data. Still, it is possible that primary reliance on website analysis can result in some inaccuracy in data interpretation. We also interviewed, in 2011, a purposive sample of seven experienced faculty members from different universities with responsibility for nonprofit management education programs. Faculty were identified from campuses that, taken together, would reflect diversity along the lines of urban/rural, region, nonprofit concentration or not, and public/private. Time constraints limited the number of interviews we were able to conduct.

Research interviews, conducted via telephone, included seven questions and lasted from 30 to 60 minutes. After checking the accuracy of Web-derived information, we asked faculty interviewees to describe the origin and evolution of the nonprofit management program. We followed up with open-ended questions about conditions that facilitated or presented

barriers to the growth of the curriculum. The interview concluded with informational questions that enabled verification of placement of the university at the appropriate level in the curriculum integration model (see Table 1, described below).

To examine recent trends over time in the developmental histories of nonprofit management education programs, in 2014, we developed a brief survey to be completed electronically by the schools classified in 2011 as Level III. Whereas evidence of Level I, II, and III programs can be deduced from website analysis, evidence of Level IV activities is not as accessible by examining websites only. The Web-based survey included five "yes/no" items related to the criteria for placement at Level IV. Criteria for the different levels in the model are explained in the following section. All Level III schools completed the survey, for a 100% response rate.

CURRICULUM INTEGRATION MODEL

As Table 1 indicates, the developmental curriculum integration model features four levels (horizontal axis) and compares the characteristics of schools on the basis of courses and course content, roles of and status of and promotion policy for faculty, certificate availability, and scope of campus outreach (vertical axis). Schools at Level I—Curriculum Expansion—have added nonprofit elective courses; hired adjunct, non-tenure-track faculty as instructors; and developed noncredit certificate programs for community members, often offered through university extension departments or schools of continuing education or continuing studies. Students in Level I schools may self-identify as nonprofit students and begin to advocate for more formal, expanded curricular opportunities. Level II—Pre-Integration—schools have created a nonprofit concentration, instituted formal advising and mentoring of students interested in nonprofit management or related education, invited nonprofit guest speakers, hired tenure-track faculty, regularized adjunct appointments, and offered nonprofit internships.

TABLE 1.
Curriculum Integration Model

	Level I Curriculum Expansion	Level II Pre-Integration	Level III Core Integration	Level IV Institutional Integration
Courses and course content	Nonprofit elective courses added	Nonprofit concentration developed within master's degree Formalized advising made available Nonprofit guest speakers invited to present	Core courses within master's degree include nonprofit-related material	Nonprofit courses marketed across the university
Roles of and status of promotion policy for faculty	Adjunct instructors hired as faculty	Tenure-track faculty hired Adjunct appointments regularized	Nonprofit journals counted in faculty review and promotion Qualified nonprofit faculty awarded tenure Attendance at nonprofit conferences supported	Nonprofit faculty serve on dissertation committees in disciplinary departments and vice versa Faculty from disciplinary departments participate in nonprofit programs
Certificate availability	Noncredit certificate developed for community members		Credit-bearing certificate introduced for degree students	Nonprofit certificate marketed to all students on campus
Scope of campus outreach		Nonprofit internships offered		Nonprofit events widely publicized on campus

The key feature of universities at Level III—Core Integration—is, as the name implies, integration of nonprofit content into the core curriculum. For example, public management courses include nonprofit cases that illustrate concepts such as mission and leadership in the nonprofit context. Course content on government-nonprofit relationships and public-private partnerships is reflected in courses on the foundations of public administration, the policy process, and public management. Nonprofit material is part of the syllabi for microeconomics, budgeting, and public and nonprofit finance courses. In addition, in Level III schools, nonprofit journals and discipline-based journals in which nonprofit-related research is published are positively recognized in the faculty review and promotion process; qualified nonprofit faculty members are awarded tenure; attendance at nonprofit academic meetings is encouraged

and supported; and a credit-bearing certificate for degree and/or nonmatriculated students has been introduced.

Level IV—Institutional Integration—is characterized by the assimilation of the nonprofit program into the broader university academic and cocurricular environments. Nonprofit courses are marketed across the university. Nonprofit faculty members serve on dissertation committees in the disciplinary departments or in professional schools and vice versa. Faculty from disciplinary departments such as political science and sociology, as well as professional schools such as business and social welfare, participate in the planning and implementation of nonprofit programs within the university and/or programs such as seminars and colloquia that span the university and wider community. The nonprofit certificate for graduate and professional students is marketed to all students and nonprofit events are widely publicized on campus.

FINDINGS

As reported in Table 2, in 2011, 14% of the schools sampled were in the Level I, Curriculum Expansion, stage of development. Students could elect nonprofit courses that were taught primarily by adjunct instructors. A noncredit certificate was sometimes available. The largest

percentage by far—over half (55.8%) of the universities in the sample—were at Level II, Pre-Integration. The MPA curriculum of these schools included a nonprofit concentration, tenure-track faculty members taught at least some of the courses, and procedures for advising and offering appropriate internships were under way, but little connection was apparent between nonprofit courses and the core MPA curriculum.

In 30% of the sampled graduate programs, those in Levels III and IV, course titles offered evidence that nonprofit-related content had been incorporated into core courses.[1] On the other hand, very few graduate nonprofit programs (14%) were fully integrated into the broader academic and co-curricular campus environments.

By 2014, the picture in Levels I and II was mostly unchanged. Six schools remained in Level I, Curriculum Expansion; over half (51.2%) of universities were still in Level II, Pre-integration. On the other hand, at the more advanced levels of integration, the programs in all schools that had been in Level III, Core Integration, ($n = 7$) in 2011 had moved toward a campus-wide scope of activity (Level IV, Institutional Integration) in 2014. The percentage change column in Table 2 documents the dramatic difference over a 3-year period between curricular stability in Levels I and II and significant curricular change in Levels III and IV.

TABLE 2.

Change in Number of U.S. Universities at Each Level of the Curriculum Integration Model, 2011–2014 ($N = 43$)

	2011		2014		Percentage Change
	N	**%**	**N**	**%**	
Level I	6	14.0	6	14.0	0.0
Level II	24	55.8	22	51.2	−8.7
Level III	7	16.3	0	0.0	−100.0
Level IV	6	14.0	15	34.9	+150.0

Notes. Level I = Curriculum Expansion; Level II = Pre-Integration; Level II = Core Integration; Level IV = Institutional Integration.

DISCUSSION

This section draws on the findings described above. In addition, it relies on the interviews we conducted, our own direct experience at various schools, and our observation of developments on other campuses. Many formal and informal conversations at professional meetings such as NACC, ARNOVA, and NASPAA have informed the analysis.

The development of graduate nonprofit management programs follows a largely, but not entirely, predictable pattern. Some elements of more-advanced program levels may occur earlier than other elements. The mix of particular program features in each level may vary across campuses and change back and forth over time within one campus. For instance, one interviewee observed: "We started with integration into core courses and found insufficient rigor and attention to nonprofits; usually nonprofit content got shortchanged, and it was not satisfying for those interested in nonprofits."

After careful deliberation, the faculty decided to establish a separate nonprofit curriculum and maintain some nonprofit material in core courses. This program is somewhat unique in that it includes both a strong separate nonprofit program as well as integrated core courses. On the whole, though, the model presented in this article reflects the current contours of nonprofit management education on 43 campuses in the United States.

Given the concentration of universities at pre-integration stages of curriculum development in both 2011 and 2014, we asked our faculty interviewees to reflect on barriers that impede curricular change. Drawing on their responses and our own experience and observations, we conclude that multiple factors at different levels

TABLE 3.
Factors That Promote or Impede Curriculum Integration

	Factors that promote change	Factors that impede change
Faculty role	Active support by department faculty, especially tenured members Intentional deliberation by faculty supporters and others	Lack of broad-based faculty support "Lone voice" faculty advocate
Administrators' role	Support of department chair, dean, and other higher-level university administrators	Lack of support or relative disinterest among higher-level university administrators
Students' role	Expanding student demand	
Resources	Financial resources available for faculty hires Substantial, multiyear support available from foundations or other external sources Presence of an academic center Resources for curricular innovation and change	Internal resource scarcity Low or no priority among foundations or other external sources
Curriculum in place	Curriculum open to change	Well-entrenched curriculum tracks
Role of intermediary associations	Consistent encouragement by higher education professional associations	

of institutional life may present challenges at a particular time.

As indicated in Table 3, a number of different factors can either promote or impede movement toward curriculum integration. Reflecting on obstacles to change, our respondents frequently mentioned the lack of broad-based support among departmental faculty as a formidable barrier. Also, a "lone voice" faculty advocate for innovation, one who is pursuing a research agenda in this area, may be perceived as self-interested and too narrowly focused. By contrast, a senior faculty member in a Level IV university commented that "faculty members themselves took a much more active posture toward articulating the need for faculty with specializations in nonprofit and NGO [nongovernmental organization] management."

Similar observations about the need for voices of support were made by a number of respondents commenting on the critical importance of higher-level administrative university leadership. In a program with seven full-time tenure-track faculty teaching and/or conducting nonprofit-related research, key administrative leaders such as the center director and vice dean were "particularly strong advocates" for an expansion and institutionalization of the nonprofit curriculum. Of course, even the presence of articulate and committed leaders cannot compensate for a lack of financial resources available for faculty hiring. Another potential structural barrier may be the prior establishment of curricula, by now well-entrenched, with specific tracks such as international development or social policy that seem to discourage course integration. Institutional culture that mitigates against specialization can also be a factor. One respondent indicated that her school's pride in creating "informed generalists" had been an early barrier to curriculum change related to nonprofit management.

In the research interviews, we also asked respondents to identify conditions that facilitate the growth of nonprofit management education curricula. Expanding student demand and support from the department chair and/or dean were among the most frequent responses. Additional enabling conditions mentioned were external foundation grant support and the presence of an academic center.

The Building Bridges Initiative of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation deserves special mention in this regard. According to the key Kellogg Foundation executive staff member who directed the multimillion-dollar, multiyear grant program, Robert K. Long (personal conversation with Saidel, October, 1999), the Kellogg Foundation's purpose was to change the face of higher education with respect to nonprofit-related curricula. By providing grants over a 4-year period (from 1998–2001) that were generous and long-lasting enough to be transformative, the foundation strongly encouraged university-based academic centers to work toward the institutionalization of nonprofit courses and certificates. One grantee institution began to sponsor community-wide leadership events that annually drew 300 to 400 people to campus, thereby gaining "a lot of cachet in the outside community" and increasing through external visibility the internal legitimacy of the nonprofit program.

Interviewees also mentioned the strong advocacy of tenured faculty colleagues as an important enabling condition. One person observed the following:

> A well-published, tenured political science faculty member focused on international studies came across Japanese NGOs and realized he needed more information in order to continue his work. He approached me, and that relationship sold the concept of nonprofit studies to political science faculty.

Another longtime faculty advocate for curriculum innovation in this area made a similar comment, noting that a colleague whose research focus was housing policy and urban politics embraced the study of nonprofit organizations as a critical element of his teaching and research interests and subsequently added his voice to curriculum expansion efforts.

Finally, in the analysis of factors that might explain stability at the lower levels and change at the more advanced levels of the curriculum integration model, we note that a bimodal pattern of institutional isomorphism appears to be at work in the highly professionalized field of public affairs education. Among the 15 Level IV schools in 2014, 93.3% (*n* = 14) are NASPAA-accredited. For Levels I and II, the NASPAA-accreditation percentages are 33.3% and 77.3% respectively. Institutional theorists have long emphasized the powerful influence of professional norms on the adoption of organizational practices and the diffusion of innovation. Through its accreditation authority, ongoing work of standing committees, and annual meetings, NASPAA clearly exerts strong isomorphic pressures that help explain this study's findings, including the movement of schools at Level III in 2011 to Level IV in 2014. The establishment and expansion of the Nonprofit Management Education Section within NASPAA, as well as the more frequent publication of nonprofit management–related articles—highlighted by this symposium—in the *Journal of Public Affairs Education, Public Administration Review, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, and other public affairs journals attest to the increasing attention of public affairs faculty and researchers to trends in the field.

CONCLUSION

The curriculum integration model elaborated in this analysis is designed not only to provide a systematic way to determine what is currently happening in universities with public affairs curricula but also to function as a road map for future curricular development. We have received feedback from colleagues at various conferences that the model can be utilized to respond to the questions: How are we doing relative to our peers? and What factors might enable us to move the curriculum innovation process forward? The model can assist in building a case for needed changes in the content, scope, resource base, faculty hiring decisions, and internal and external reach of nonprofit management education programs. Perhaps it can add momentum to change processes under way in Level II schools and enable them to overcome what ap-

pear to be substantial barriers impeding progress to Level III, Core Integration. Further, progression to Level IV (Institutional Integration) can be impeded or slowed by structural obstacles common in academic institutions: the difficulty of collaboration across departments, including lack of institutional incentives or adequate financial resources; differences in disciplinary perspectives; and the ongoing investment of particular schools and departments in nonprofit-focused programs that may intensify, even if unintentionally, competitive pressures among campus units. Nonetheless, institutional leadership can overcome these obstacles in the interests of greater curriculum integration.

In addition, the trajectory of movement among the four levels of the model highlights the continuing need to integrate nonprofit material into the core curriculum and develop new courses and experiential learning opportunities in areas such as cross-sector management, collaborative governance, and integrative leadership that will prepare students for the "multi-sector, shared-power"[2] world of public governance. The argument made in this article is different from challenging universities with public affairs curricula to establish strong nonprofit management programs, although that is a worthy goal. The developmental curriculum integration model instead reflects a progression toward a curriculum and cocurricular activities that meaningfully prepare students for cross-boundary management, regardless of the sector in which students may be employed.

Our model also recognizes that in many schools with public affairs courses and degree programs, the curriculum pertaining to nonprofits has lagged behind scholarship published in the academic journals in the field. Leading public administration journals, for example, have for many years published articles on nonprofit organizations and cross-sector management. This curriculum integration model provides benchmarks and guidance for schools with public affairs curricula that are interested in both greater curricular integration and building upon existing research on nonprofit and cross-sector management.

Future research studies in this area could expand the number of colleges and universities in the sample, extend the analysis across additional years, and include interviews from all the universities in the sample. It would also be valuable to determine whether the patterns of curriculum development that characterize United States–based schools are similar to or different from patterns that have developed in other parts of the world.

The stubborn persistence of complex policy issues that require multisector strategies suggests that student demand for public affairs curricula responsive to the realities of 21st century social problems is not likely to diminish in the foreseeable future. Given this scenario, we hope that the curriculum integration model will serve as a useful conceptual road map for creative planning and curricular innovation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

1 Course titles may not always reflect course content, so we report this finding with caution.

2 This term was used in the title of the Creating Public Value in a Multi-Sector, Shared-Power World

conference, hosted by the Center for Integrative Leadership, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, September 20–22, 2012.

REFERENCES

Cohen, S., & Abbott, T. (2000). Integrating nonprofit management education into graduate programs in public policy and administration. New York, NY: Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs.

Horne, C. S., & Paris, T. V. (2010). Preparing MPA students to succeed in government-nonprofit collaboration: Lessons from the field. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 16*(1), 13–30.

Light, P. (1999). *The new public service.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Mirabella, R. M. (2007). University-based educational programs in nonprofit management and philanthropic studies: A 10-year review and projections of future trends. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(Suppl. 1), 11S–27S.

Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B. (2000). The "best place" debate: A comparison of graduate education programs for nonprofit managers. *Public Administration Review, 60*(3), 219–229.

O'Neill, M. (2005). Developmental contexts of nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 16*(1), 5–17.

O'Neill, M., & Young, D. R. (1988). Educating managers of nonprofit organizations. In M. O'Neill and D. R. Young (Eds.), *Educating managers of nonprofit organizations* (pp. 1–21). New York, NY: Praeger.

Saidel, J. R. (1991). Resource interdependence: The relationship between state agencies and nonprofit organizations. *Public Administration Review, 51*(6), 543–551.

Saidel, J. R. (1994). The dynamics of interdependence between public agencies and nonprofit organizations. In J. L. Perry (Ed.), *Research in Public Administration* (Vol. 3, pp. 201–29). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Salamon, L. M. (1996, March). *Nonprofit management education: A field whose time is passed?* Paper presented at the Conference on Nonprofit Management Education 1996: A U.S. and World Perspective, Berkeley, CA.

Salamon, L. M. (2005). Training professional citizens: Getting beyond the right answer to the wrong question in public affairs education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 11*(1), 7–20.

Smith, S. R. (2008). The increased complexity of public services: Curricular implications for schools of public affairs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 14*(2), 115–128.

Young, D. R. (1999). Nonprofit management studies in the United States: Current developments and future prospects. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 5*(1), 13–23.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Judith R. Saidel is O'Leary Associate Professor of Public Administration and Policy, Rockefeller College of Public Administration and Policy, University at Albany, State University of New York. She publishes on government-nonprofit relationships, nonprofit governance, and gender and bureaucracy. She won the 2006 Rita Mae Kelly Distinguished Research Award, which was conferred by the American Society for Public Administration's Section for Women in Public Administration.

Steven Rathgeb Smith is the executive director of the American Political Science Association. He was previously the Louis A. Bantle Chair in Public Administration at the Maxwell School at Syracuse University and the Nancy Bell Evans Professor at the Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy and Governance at the University of Washington. He is the author of several books, including *Nonprofits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting* (with Michael Lipsky) and, most recently, *Nonprofits and Advocacy: Engaging Community and Government in an Era of Retrenchment* (with Robert Pekkanen and Yutaka Tsujinaka).