



September, 2016

NACC News publishes information about the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council and its members. We invite you to contribute your news and encourage you to share this newsletter with colleagues, the nonprofit community, and all others you think might find it of interest.

Message from the President

Dear NACC Members,

I have always thought that one of the great things about NACC is that even though we only get together a few times a year, when we do people often say “we ought to do that again soon.” It is a nice sentiment. No, I am not arguing for having monthly member meetings (there are limits, right?). No just a reminder that when NACC events happen they are really informative and perhaps as importantly lots of fun.

Luckily we have a number of NACC events in the future that are in various planning stages. The next event is the NACC member meeting which will take place **Wednesday November 16th in Washington DC**. Full details on the member meeting are available at <http://www.nonprofit-academic-centers-council.org/2016-nacc-member-meeting>. The full agenda is still a work in progress, but the highlights will be the annual center/program updates and a great discussion on accreditation developments. Stayed tuned for additional details in the next couple of weeks.

One small but important update before the member meeting. It was originally our plan to provide a final copy of the NACC Accreditation Summit Reader at the November meeting. However, thanks to the effort of our partner journal (The Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership) we are excited to announce that JNEL will be publishing a special edition in January 2017 with the papers from the NACC Accreditation Summit. This is great news for both NACC and JNEL and a special thanks to JNEL editor Norm Dolch for making it happen.

We are also currently reviewing proposals for our next really big event the 2017 NACC Conference. The NACC conference is clearly starting to gain traction as the odd-year nonprofit/philanthropy summer conference of choice. In 2015, we had over 100 people attend and present and are looking forward to an even bigger 2017 turnout.

Believe it or not we are even in preliminary discussions about having the 2019 NACC conference in London. Obviously this is a long way off and a lot can change but the NACC conference committee has been in some great discussions with partners from “over-the-pond” and are excited at this potential opportunity.

In the meantime, I hope you notice some of the new additions to the NACC news. Our fantastic staff, Erin Vokes and Linda Serra seem to find new and exciting ideas for the NACC news every month, but they can use your help. Our goal is to make the NACC news an entertaining, informative and fun read every month. Erin and Linda would love to have your ideas and your content for the NACC News, so don't be shy about sharing.

I think that covers it for this month. Have a great October and looking forward to seeing everyone in November.

Matt Hale
Seton Hall University
NACC President

Thought Pieces on Accreditation



The September issue of NACC News begins a series of thought pieces on the Accreditation Summit contributed by our community of nonprofit scholars. Mark Hoffman, Associate Dean of the College of Community and Public Service at Grand Valley State University, allowed us to offer our readers a reaction piece he wrote immediately following the Summit.

Observations and Comments on the NACC Accreditation Summit

Below are my observations, opinions, speculation, and a few random thoughts about the NACC Accreditation Summit at Texas A&M. I wrote them down while the experience was still fresh in my mind. I share them for whatever they may be worth to both those that attended and those who did not. For those that don't know me, I was Grand Valley State University's representative to NACC from 2013-14. As the current alternate representative, I returned to NACC for this meeting because my colleague, Sal Alaimo, had a conflicting obligation. I hope this gives me enough insight into NACC to make informed observations without being overly biased by a long-term psychological investment.

Of course, I must have some biases, so I should admit that I am a public administrationist by training. My interest in nonprofit management developed because that was the interest of most of my students. Working for several years with the Johnson Center for Philanthropy¹ and teaching nonprofit management classes in South Korea and Poland moved me further from the dark side. For seven years, I was director of a department that included courses and programs in nonprofit, public, and health management.² Now I am an Associate Dean, and thus understand fully the evils of accreditation. I also worry that my thoughts may also have been scrambled by the repeated frying and freezing of my brain cells as I moved between the inside and outside temperatures of College Station, Texas, in July. I have divided my comments according to seven pairs of dichotomous choices that, I think, must be made prior to formulation of an accreditations plan. Some of these were directly addressed by presenters. Some were only implicit or were undercurrents in conversations.

1. Accreditation vs. not

The Summit's highest profile players in NACC leadership, Matthew Hale (Seton Hall), Stuart Mendel (Cleveland State), Patrick Rooney (Indiana), William Brown (Texas A&M), and Robert Ashcroft (Arizona State) were enthusiastically in favor.

Some skeptical comments that most impressed me came from:

Norman Dolch (Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership), because it has such low value to our stakeholders that it is not worth the cost;

Steven Rathgeb Smith (current president of the American Political Science Association), because there is no problem that it really solves;

Jo Ann Ewalt (current chairperson of COPRA, NASPAA's accreditation arm), because it produces consistency at the expense of variety and innovation;

Roseanne Mirabella (Seton Hall), because there are better things NACC could be doing (specifically championing curricular transformations that would "encourage students to create the change we and they hope to see in the world"³);

David Renz (University of Missouri, KC), because it is biting off more than NACC can chew.⁴

At the business meeting after the summit, there was no vote. So I have no direct way to gauge support. My sense is that a solid majority of participants were in favor of moving forward, but the devil is in the details. It is not clear that there is yet sufficient consensus to create an operational plan.

¹ The Johnson Center for Philanthropy is organizationally independent of the department, but within the same College.

² We have a NASPAA-accredited MPA program.

³ While I believe there is some sympathy for critical theory within the NACC membership, I don't think there is much support for this as an alternative. Graduate students often enter our programs with well-developed values. What they want from us is the knowledge, skills and strategies for best combining their values with their careers. They are not seeking our values.

⁴ My interpretation / summation of his various comments over the two days.

2. Accreditation vs. Accreditation-lite

Because the accreditations process can be resource intensive, both for the accreditor and applicant, there was some sentiment for a low-calorie accreditations process. This was articulated by Jennifer Alexander, who labeled it “curricular certification.” Another word proposed was “recognition.” Throughout the summit, “accreditation” was the most common word used, although it was sometimes followed by “or whatever.”

My own opinion is that “accreditation” is a recognized word and would be useful in communicating with potential students and university administrators. Assuming a seven-year accreditation cycle, for one of the seven years a rigorous accreditation process will not be worth the cost, but for the other six it will be more valuable than “curricular certification” or “recognition.” No pain; No gain. However, to accommodate alternatives to accreditation, I will henceforth refer to LARC: “Legitimation through accreditation, recognition, or certification.”

3. “Program” or “School/Center/Unit/Department”

This was the only dichotomous question for which I believe there was near unanimity. If there will be a LARC, it should be by program, not for a whole School/Center/Unit/Department (SCUDs) that deliver the program. Furthermore, “programs” should include not just degrees, but concentrations and certificates. This would make NACC’s LARC unusual. I did hear some express the sentiment that NACC should avoid undergraduate programs because this might harm the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance, which operates on this turf.

4. “Nonprofit First” vs. “Philanthropy and Nonprofit First --- in that order”

A “Nonprofit first” perspective holds that the legitimacy and authenticity of nonprofit sector studies and research rests on the nonprofit sector being the primary frame of reference, rather than viewing it as only relative to another sector.⁵ Stuart Mendel’s argument was that LARC should be conditional on a program’s adoption of a nonprofit-first perspective. To the NACC audience, Stuart’s position did not seem controversial. It would reject programs without genuine nonprofit content created as “money grabs” to lure students. It would cast suspicion on programs that are appendages of MPA, MSW or MBA programs. While almost convinced, I would like to see a presentation defending Paul Light’s “Public Service” perspective (“nonprofit equal”?) that now permeates NASPAA’s rhetoric. Nonprofit First may not be the only acceptable perceptible within a LARC regime.⁶

⁵ Ironically, the most common names for the sector, “nonprofit” and “nongovernmental,” define it with references to other sectors.

⁶ Steve Rathgeb Smith did argue for an “integrated approach,” but this led him to conclude that NACC accreditation was altogether unneeded. So it wasn’t explored as an alternative framework.

Patrick Rooney's "Philanthropy and Nonprofit First – in that order" ("Philanthropy First" for short) perspective is offered as a refinement rather than an alternative to Stuart's "Nonprofit First." I am less comfortable with this refinement than with the original. I don't have a quarrel with what Patrick specifically says, as he always defines philanthropy broadly and inclusively. But my own experience makes me suspicious. Philanthropy firsters tend to dichotomize the field into grant-makers and grant-seekers. Very few people, including most of our students, enter nonprofit work with a grant-seeker self-identity. To me, it seems vaguely demeaning, and counterproductive if our major market are aspiring nonprofit managers.⁷ This debate is intellectually very interesting, but can be likely smoothed over in the LARC process as long as the Philanthropy firsters don't ask for too much.

5. Education-centric vs. Centers-centric

My observation is that NACC's membership can be divided into:

The Grossvaters, stand-alone nonprofit "Centers" with an eclectic assortment of characteristics and functions.⁸

The Kinder, nonprofit programs in academic departments, most of which are also identified with public administration, political science, business, social work, or urban studies.

NACC was founded by the Grossvaters. But after a high mortality rate created a membership crisis, the fast multiplying Kinder were invited to join. On day one of the conference, I believe many participants inferred that in LARC, the Grossvaters and Kinder were equal. The focus was going to be on education. Heather Carpenter presented on curriculum mapping and Susan Schmidt on competency-based designs. But on day two, the "NACC Indicators of Quality in Nonprofit Academic Centers" was resurrected as a LARC tool. Stuart attempted to be accommodating, suggested the word "program" can be substituted for "center, but the values of the Centers-centric model are intrinsically embedded in the indicators. Then a suggestion was made that LARC should incorporate a Carnegie-like classification system. This produced a palpable uneasiness among the attendees, as the Centers-centric model was unexpectedly eclipsing the education-centric model as the LARC's gold standard.

In my opinion, other strong candidates for a LARC gold standard should be considered equal to the quality indicators. One candidate would be based on "engagement" activities, as described in the

⁷ Furthermore, Philanthropy First may be more stifling or frustrating to critical perspectives within the field (as represented in presentations by Roseanne Mirabella, Maureen Emerson, et al.). Critiques of society and culture are likely to be harder on philanthropy, as a practice, than on nonprofit activity. No matter how inclusive the definition, quantity of philanthropic activity ("cha-ching") is weighted toward social elites, and is intertwined with their political activity, as both are attempts to shape the world toward their understanding of the good. Nonprofit activity, while admittedly often sponsored by philanthropy, at least seems more diverse and democratic, and more amenable to the potential for systemic changes. Have not the Argentines, with their worker-controlled *empresas recuperadas* (taken factories), taught us that nonprofit management is compatible with systemic change? Has not the lopsided support from young people for Bernie Sanders negated the hypothesis that the pervasive service learning / volunteerism paradigm undermines support for systemic change?

⁸ I use a masculine term not to be unintentionally sexist, but to be intentionally descriptive.

Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. That is, LARC should value a program that integrated quality community engagement into projects that simultaneously involved teaching, research and service. For many Kinders, an “engaged program” is closer to their ideal than is emulating the Grossvater nonprofit centers.

6. Mission-based vs. content based

Resting on the well-received NACC guidelines, some NACC participants, particularly from the Groosvaters, assumed that the LARC would be content-based. Others, influenced by current trends in the CHEA academic accreditation regime, assumed it would be mission-based and outcome driven. I was among the latter. Perhaps, because I was surprised by the support for a content-based LARC, I felt this topic was not explored nearly enough.

I think a compromise is possible. My argument would be that NACC guidelines are so exhaustive that no program could do them all justice. Thus the only reasonable approach is to define a program’s mission and then identify the appropriate priority for the various guideline items.

7. Domestic vs. International

This was a question where the presentations did change my opinion. Before the Summit I would have thought that a LARC should be designed for international participation. An international perspective is intrinsically valuable. However, I now understand that the logistics just don’t make this very practical. The contexts and content of curricula vary too widely. The demand will be minimal. The costs of verification will be very high. So the best option is that the LARC would be left open for international participation, but that would not be an expectation.

Of course, there are other questions worth thinking about. Among them is what LARC means for NACC’s soul. (Or, can a drinking club really morph into an accrediting body?) Is accreditation a temporary distraction? Or will it be an all-consuming project for the next five years? Or will it permanently become NACC’s *raison d’être*. These questions were raised in personal conversations, but not addressed in the summit’s program.

In summation, the Summit was a wonderful experience providing good information. Based on the spirit of the summit, I believe that NACC leadership now has its mandate to create and propose a LARC plan to its members. I think its biggest challenge will be to expediently and efficiently create a consensus around an operational plan. With members only meeting twice a year, and factoring in a moderate absentee rate, the goal of a 2018 adoption seems very optimistic.

On My Mind

NACC Institution Representatives

NACC News continues a series of brief articles contributed by representatives of member institutions. This column offers an opportunity to faculty of member institutions to present their



thinking and begin an exchange of ideas about issues that affect the nonprofit sector. This month we are pleased to present an article by Professor Heather L. Carpenter, Ph.D., Professor of Business and Nonprofit Management and Program Coordinator of the MA in Nonprofit Management at Notre Dame Maryland University.

Current Challenges and Opportunities for the Future of Nonprofit Management Education

To be published as part of the entry: Teaching and Training in Nonprofit Organizations in the Encyclopedia of Public Administration. Please do not copy, cite or distribute without the author's permission

There has been much growth in the number of nonprofit management education (NME) programs and in the number of full-time faculty teaching in such programs, as well as alumni satisfaction over the last twenty years. However, there are still many challenges and opportunities that lie ahead for NME programs.

NME programs have been slow to integrate multiple disciplinary perspectives in its courses. Curriculum is primarily focused on the discipline in which the course, certificate or degree program is housed (i.e. degree programs housed in schools of public administration are still very focused on public administration and courses rarely have a multi-sector or multi-disciplinary approach).

In addition, scholars have discussed the tensions between teaching theory and practice (Donmoyer, 2009; Ebriham, 2012) and NME curricular content (Burlingame, 2009). Burlingame argued that programs need to emphasize management and the liberal arts. He said, "It is important to have a curriculum that provides the knowledge of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector, and the tools that lead students to appreciate the role society played by the organizations they work; how the organization mission is carried out effectively; and how resources –human and financial – are gained and applied to actualize the mission of the nonprofit" (2009, p. 60-61).

Many NME programs do not achieve the curricular content that Burlingame speaks of and there still remains a strong tension between programs housed within arts and sciences, public administration, and business. The tension stems from the balance of teaching the necessary skills needed to run nonprofit organizations and the theory behind why nonprofits operate the way that they do. Burlingame also said, "The curriculum feels like a hodgepodge of skills courses with a lot of things to do with little theoretical integration" (Burlingame, 2009, p. 64). However, the counter argument that some business scholars believe, is that the liberal arts has minimized teaching the daily operations of running an organization.

Another tension has to do between the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty members. As NME programs are becoming accredited, these programs are increasing the number of full-time faculty. The ratio of full-time and part-time faculty members that teach in NME is also largely dependent upon if the program is accountable to a larger accrediting body. For example, a Master of Public Administration degree program that offers a nonprofit concentration must maintain the percentage of part-time faculty members less than 50%, due to requirements from NASPAA, the public administration education accrediting body. Whereas, stand-alone programs may have a much higher percentage of part-time faculty members who teach in the program.

The increased publication requirements for tenure, impact factor ratings, and required publishing in specific journals is causing full-time faculty to decrease their teaching focus and spend less time on collaborating with community, which is ultimately pushing NME programs away from how they were created.

Another issue has to do with the fact that many programs provide little internationalization integration into the curriculum. International concepts and globalization inclusion varies by program focus and program location. Although there are many international NME students, many degree programs lack integration of global concepts. In Burlingame's 2009 article, he said: "In 1999 John Palmer Smith predicted by 2016 we would still have a vital nonprofit sector in the USA but that there would also be global expansion of the sector" (p. 66). Palmer Smith's assertions are correct but little has been done to seize globalization opportunities within the classroom setting. The majority of courses and programs discuss running a nonprofit within the United States. Although the two main associations that nonprofit researchers and academics participate in, the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), and the International Society for Third Sector Research (ISTR) have a strong international focus, more can be done to integrate international nonprofit management concepts into NME curriculum.

In a recent article in the *Nonprofit Quarterly*, Millesen explains opportunities for the future of NME programs. She says:

“Today’s programs lack attention to the broader context in which ... skills might be deployed to improve conditions in communities and accomplish real change. Programs need to teach students:

1. How to establish an organization’s community value,
2. How change happens,
3. How to work in a group/collaboratively, and;
4. How to select organizational structure and business model that fits the situation.” (2014).

She also explains there is a large disconnect between the kind of learning NME students expect to emerge with and what is being taught. These “soft skills” of change are not taught in the majority of Ph.D. programs. The NME programs that excel at teaching soft skills tend to bring in full-time and part-time instructors from other disciplines.

In summary, NME programs must be cognizant about how the discipline where the program is housed influences the curriculum and course offerings. Adding multi-disciplinary and international perspectives, and balancing the number of part-time and full-time faculty may help mitigate the theory and practice tensions in the future.

References

- Burlingame, D. F. (2009). Nonprofit and Philanthropic Studies Education: The Need to Emphasize Leadership and Liberal Arts. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15(1), 59–67.
- Donmoyer, R. (2009). Theories About the Role of Theory in Nonprofit and Philanthropic Studies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 38(4), 701–713. doi:10.1177/0899764009333687
- Ebrahim, A. (2012). Enacting our field. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(1), 13–28. doi:10.1002/nml.21053
- Millesen, J. L. Thoughts on the Relevance of Nonprofit Management Curricula. *Nonprofit Quarterly*, July 22, 2014 <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2014/07/22/thoughts-on-the-relevance-of-nonprofit-management-curricula/>
-

A NACC Discussion and Opinion Paper Series

NACC is considering developing a Discussion and Opinion Paper Series with contributions by the faculty and students of NACC member institutions. Our intent is to disseminate nonprofit research and generate discussion within the nonprofit community.

- The series is designed with three major sections:
 - Faculty research
 - Student research
 - Faculty and Student opinion papers
- Papers are downloadable and free of charge
- Publication here does not preclude publication elsewhere
- Papers can be revised and resubmitted in progressive versions
- Content is the responsibility of the author
- Work submitted can be articles, chapters, or reviews
- Comments or questions by the reader are sent directly to the author
- Papers can be cited without permission
- Copyright policy protects the intellectual property of authors
- The English language will be used
- A simple template guides all submissions:
 - Abstract of 200 words
 - Biography of author(s) 150 words each
 - Length of faculty papers 4,000 to 9,000 words double-spaced
 - Length of student papers 2,000 – 9,000 double-spaced
 - Opinion Papers: author biography of 150 words; paper 2,000 – 5,000 words

We would like to learn your response to the possibility of a NACC paper series. Please send your comments to Linda Serra at lindserra@gmail.com. We'd like to hear from you.

Nu Lambda Mu

Students: Apply Today

Applications for the fall semester are being accepted from September 15 through November 4, 2016. Now is the time for graduate nonprofit students and their advisors to apply for the Nu Lambda Mu (NLM) award. The Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC) established the NLM honor society to recognize outstanding students pursuing graduate study in nonprofit management, philanthropy, and social entrepreneurship enterprise. The mission of NLM is to advance the study of nonprofit

organizations and their function in society as well as promote scholarly achievement among students engaging in these academic pursuits. The award signals scholars, employers, and colleagues that the winner of the award was a superior student. The Nu Lambda Mu award is the perfect way for you to let others know you are a leader with a clear path to success.

To become a member of Nu Lambda Mu students must:

- Be a current graduate student or possess a graduate or certificate from a NACC-affiliated program.
- Have completed a minimum of 50% of their required degree-program coursework, or all required coursework for a graduate certificate.
- Hold a minimum 3.70 GPA.
- Include a registration fee of \$40 with their application.

Once students meet the requirements for Nu Lambda Mu and are inducted into the society, they become a member for life. For instance, if a member's GPA falls below the 3.70 mark, they will continue to be a member of NLM. Nu Lambda Mu inductees receive honor cords for graduation and a Nu Lambda Mu certificate. Nu Lambda Mu applications must be submitted online. Applications are accepted September 15 through November 4, 2016 by 5:00 pm EST for the Fall term and February 1 - March 31, 2017 for the Spring term.

For information, please refer to the NACC website at, <http://www.nonprofit-academic-centers-council.org/>. On the first page simply click on the Nu Lambda Nu button. If you have questions, please contact Barbara Benevento at b.benevento@csuohio.edu.

NASPAA Annual Conference, October 2016

We're pleased to share that several NACC affiliated panels have been accepted for the 2016 NASPAA Conference. These panels and the following sessions, may be of a particular interest to our NACC Members.

Nonprofit at the Core? Implications for Accreditation

Friday @ 2:00 pm

Member Panelists: William Brown, Robert Ashcraft, & Renee Irvin

Affiliate Panelist: Jo Ann Ewalt

Research Findings on Public and Nonprofit Management: How much do the sectors overlap?

Friday @ 11:15 am

Member Panelists: Stuart Mendel & David Renz

Affiliate Panelist: Jennifer Alexander

Critical Competencies: Featuring Nonprofit Content during Accreditation

Thursday @ 10:45 am

Member Panelists: Kathleen Hale & Mary Ann Feldheim

Affiliate Panelist: Lisa Dicke

The Relationship of the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector to Public Service

Thursday @ 4:15 pm

Member Panelists: Mary Ann Feldheim & Roseanne Mirabella

Affiliate Panelists: Jennifer Alexander & Jo Ann Ewalt

Finding a Place for Critical Perspectives in Nonprofit Management Education

Friday @ 10:00 am

Member Panelists: Angela Eikenberry, Roseanne Mirabella, & Billie Sandberg

Affiliate Panelist: Jennifer Alexander

The Skills and Resources needed to be Effective MPA and PhD Directors

Thursday @ 8:00 am

Member Panelist: Matt Hale

Board Report

Each issue of NACC News provides a summary of the discussions and decisions of the previous month's Board of Director's meeting.

NACC Board of Directors Meeting

August 24,2016

Matt Hale welcomed new board members to their first meeting and facilitated a brief review of ongoing issues and projects including, new software for support of board activities, revision of NACC bylaws, biennial conferences for 2017 and 2019, and the Accreditation Summit.

The concept of a potential working, discussion, or opinion paper series to present NACC membership faculty and students an opportunity to publish their work was considered. Board members expressed some reluctance in terms of the time and effort required to initiate and maintain a paper series as well as a possible resistance to share research in progress. A non-research forum might be useful and permit NACC faculty and students an opportunity to

engage one another in discussions of current nonprofit issues. Membership will be asked for their opinions of a NACC paper series.

As the November Membership Meeting at the ARNOVA conference is a great opportunity for faculty representatives to come together, plans for the logistics and content of the meeting were thoroughly reviewed. Members will be informed via email messages and an announcement in the September and October issues of NACC News.

Building on NACC's current position in the nonprofit academic community by expanding membership and reaching out to potential nonprofit education, research, and community engagement programs was identified as a priority.

With expansion of the Board to eleven members, a review of Board structure and clearly defined areas of responsibility was discussed: A standing committee structure with Board members as chair and representatives of NACC membership institutions was generally agreed upon and referred to the By-law committee for development.

NACC Membership Meeting

November 16, 2016

Washington D.C.

We look forward to seeing you this November at our annual meeting for representatives of NACC membership institutions.

Register today at <http://www.nonprofit-academic-centers-council.org/2016-nacc-member-meeting>

- **Date:** Wednesday, November 16, 2016
- **Time:** Check-in from 11:30-12:00. The meeting will begin promptly at 12:00 and includes complimentary lunch. The meeting will end at 4:30 and will be followed by a closing reception. A more detailed agenda can be found on our website at the link above.
- **Location:** Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, 400 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C., USA, 20001, in the Columbia Foyer Meeting Room on the Ballroom level of the hotel.
- **Lodging:** For guests attending the conference, rooms have been blocked at the Hyatt Regency. Hotel reservations can be made online and must be made by Thursday, October 20, 2016 in order to receive the ARNOVA Conference Rate.
- **Questions?** Please contact Erin at e.vokes@csuohio.edu.

We are also seeking **Sponsorships** to help make our Member Meeting possible. Your contribution, no matter the size, will help make this event a success. If you are interested in Sponsorship Opportunities, please contact Erin at e.vokes@csuohio.edu.

NACC Membership News

❖ Texas A&M University Welcomes New Faculty - Dr. Ellie Heng Qu



The Nonprofit Management Program at The Bush School of Government & Public Service Texas A&M University is excited to welcome a new faculty member, Dr. Ellie Heng Qu. She has her PhD in Philanthropic Studies with an emphasis in nonprofit economics and finance from Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. She received her B.A. and M.A. in Political Science from Sun Yat-sen University in China.

Qu's research interests and current projects include nonprofit revenue management and organizational capacity, nonprofit financial reporting and accountability, social innovation and impact investing, motivations for individual charitable giving and nonprofit resource development, effects of pro-social behavior on people's well-being, and experimental studies. She will begin as an Assistant Professor of Nonprofit Management at The Bush School of Government & Public Service at Texas A&M University this fall!

❖ Center for Nonprofit Policy and Practice:



Dennis Young, Executive in Residence in the Levin School at Cleveland State University and Choony Kim, Korea Federation for Environmental Movement, Seoul, South Korea, received the Outstanding Paper Award for Excellence - 2016 from the *Social Enterprise Journal* for their article, "Can Social Enterprises Remain Sustainable and Mission-focused? Applying resiliency theory." This paper adapts concepts from resiliency theory to understand the conditions under which social

enterprises may remain true to form and purpose or are likely to change their character. This leads us to consider issues of governance, economic incentives associated with different organizational forms of social enterprise and the effects of the financial environment, the role of organizational slack and the influence of organizational leadership on the dynamics of social enterprises. Three case studies of organizations in the USA are analyzed to illustrate the application of resiliency theory to the stability of social enterprises. The fact that all forms of social enterprise must reconcile the tensions of social purpose and market raises important questions about the dynamics of these enterprises. This is the first application of resiliency theory to the analysis of social enterprise stability.

Reference: (2015) "Can social enterprises remain sustainable and mission-focused? Applying resiliency theory", *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 11 Iss: 3, pp.233 – 259

- Dennis Young contributed the following announcement and request for students in nonprofit programs to apply for the D-Prize.

“The [D-Prize](#) is seeking aspiring leaders to start a new organization and increase access to global poverty solutions. Winners of our entrepreneurship competition are given up to \$20,000 in funding to launch a pilot of their venture idea. We are especially interested in supporting students who are just getting started in their social impact careers. The D-Prize wants to fund 15+ new ventures through the 2016 competition.”

Nonprofit Students: The [D-Prize](#) wants to award you up to \$20,000 to solve the world's global health, energy, education, and corruption challenges. You make up the next generation of social impact leaders and we want to hear your ideas! Check out our Summer 2016 competition, select one of the challenges, and then pitch your two-page idea to D-Prize by October 3. Up to 15 winners will be awarded seed capital and given support to launch a pilot. Join the competition at www.d-prize.org.

❖ **University of Central Florida,**

UCF Alumna Leads \$6 Million Fundraising Effort for Pulse Victims: Alumna Ida V. Eskamani, '12, '16, serves as a development officer for Equality Florida in Orlando where she is currently managing what she describes as the most important task of her career.

Following the shooting at Pulse Nightclub, Equality Florida launched a Go Fund Me page for the victims' families and survivors. Eskamani launched the site and is managing the fundraising effort as well as Equality Florida's victim outreach; working directly with many victims in need of support and resources.

With the initial goal of \$100,000, Eskamani and her team raised \$6.2 million in just two weeks of the page's launch. This is the fastest Go Fund Me page to reach \$1 million, the first to reach \$2 million, and the largest in the history of the site. With a new goal of \$10 million, the page is rapidly growing toward meeting this objective.

"We are awed by the outpouring of love and support from every corner of the world," explained Eskamani. "Every dollar raised directly supports the victims' families and survivors."

The UCF School of Public Administration has added two new faculty members to the nonprofit management program, Hui Li and Suzette Myser, who will be joining the school as assistant professors.

Li hails from the Sol Price School of Public Policy at the University of Southern California, where she earned her Ph.D. in public policy and management and served as a teaching assistant at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Her research interests include public and nonprofit management, organization theory and civic engagement.



Myser joins SPA from the University of Kansas' School of Public Affairs and Administration, where worked as a teaching assistant and earned her Ph.D. in public administration. Her research interest is budgeting and finance, and prior to earning her doctoral degree, she worked as a budget analyst for the Ohio Office of Budget and Management. She has also served as the deputy director of the Ohio governor's office in Washington D.C.



❖ **The USC Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy Launches Fund Focused on Philanthropic Leadership**



How are philanthropic leaders at the board and executive levels facing the opportunities and challenges of making an impact? In an effort to shed light on this critical question, The USC Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy has launched the Irene Hirano Inouye Philanthropic Leadership Fund, named for the President of the U.S.-Japan Council, in recognition of her success in building effective foundation boards, including as chair of both The Kresge and Ford foundations. The Fund supports efforts to elevate and amplify how philanthropic leaders can help to scale impact

and brings greater attention to issues of shared governance between boards and executives in foundations of all types. Cases and other applied research will be developed and shared with foundation boards to stimulate conversations, with an emphasis on moving leadership beyond reactionary and fragmented problem solving to a more proactive, forward-looking approach. The Center will further develop programs focused on foundation trustees and executives and the choices they confront as philanthropic leaders, including steps to create a culture of constructive and inclusive decision making in the boardroom.

The first Fund-supported effort currently underway is the development of a case study on Detroit's Grand Bargain – the imaginative approach that helped resolve Detroit's bankruptcy in less than eighteen months – and the catalytic role foundation leaders played in the agreement. For the case, The Center interviewed the presidents of twelve of the foundations involved, as well as the court appointed mediator, Judge Rosen, 6th District U.S. Circuit Court for Eastern Michigan, and Gene Gargaro, the long-time chair of the board of the Detroit Institute of the Arts.

As the fund continues to grow, The Center will develop other cases and related convenings focused on philanthropic leadership to engage foundation trustees and executives from across the spectrum of philanthropy in sharing experiences to encourage bold, visionary leadership.

Since its inception in 2000, The Center on Philanthropy and Public Policy has emphasized research and analysis as a means to deepen the understanding of complex issues in philanthropy, with a critical focus on strategies for greater impact in public problem solving. See more at <http://cphp.usc.edu/>

NACC NEWS

Looking for a job in a nonprofit academic institution? Go to the Job Opportunities tab on the NACC website for the latest job postings from NACC institutional members.

Please, members, take note: job postings can be added to NACC News and posted on the NACC website. This is a free service and exclusive to members. Email a link to the job posting along with a brief description of the position to Linda Serra.

Do you have news or event notices to share? Please send to Linda Serra.

If you no longer wish to receive NACC News, please send an email to Linda Serra with your email address and the words "unsubscribe NACC News" in the subject line.

Linda Serra, Editor, lindalserra@gmail.com. Nonprofit Academic Centers Council, 2121 Euclid Avenue, UR120, Cleveland, OH 44155