

**Paper Number:** CO034003

**Paper Title:** Crossing Safe Boundaries: Colorado's Defeat of Amendment #31: English for the Children, A Case Study of Nonprofit Lobbying

**Author(s):**

Mr. Jorge Garcia, Boulder Valley Public Schools, Boulder Valley Public Schools, Greeley, CO, USA

Dr. Sheila Shannon, University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Ms. Silvana Carlos, University of Colorado at Denver, University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, CO, USA

Dr. Kathy Escamilla, University of Colorado at Boulder, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, CO, USA

Dr. Ramon Del Castillo, Regis University, Denver, CO, USA

**Summary of Research**

“English for the Children,” a public policy to teach children English as rapidly as possible in public schools; but in reality, a thin veil of disguise to obliterate Bilingual Education programs, was defeated in the November 5th 2002 elections in Colorado. This is a case study analyzing the role that the nonprofit sector played in defeating this legislation. Presenters will discuss the creation of the nonprofit organizational structures, the community organizing strategies utilized, and the building of a nonprofit coalition that coalesced to defeat this legislation.

**Description**

Crossing Safe Boundaries:  
Colorado's Defeat of Amendment #31:  
English for the Children, A Case Study of Nonprofit Lobbying

Introduction

“English for the Children,” a language based policy, disguised as teaching children English as rapidly as possible in public schools; but in actuality, a thin veil of disguise to obliterate Bilingual Education programs in the state, backfired in the November 5th 2002 elections held in the State of Colorado. Similar legislation, financed by Silicon Valley millionaire Ron Unz, had passed in California and Arizona. As a language imperialist, he moved his financial machine to Colorado and Massachusetts and was supporting similar legislation. Unwilling to be boondoggled by a convincing title, the public will voted 56% to 44% to defeat this legislation (Denver Post, Nov. 6, 2002).

This research paper will address the question of the role that nonprofits played in defeating Amendment #31? Although nonprofits by fiat can participate in lobbying against public policies that threaten their funding or can have detrimental effects on those that they are supposed to serve, many nonprofit leaders seem to lean on the conservative side when deciding to get involved in fighting legislation. Overly cautious and often times misinformed about the rules of lobbying, nonprofit leaders have to make ethical decisions whether to go to bat for their constituents. The consequences for overstepping boundaries can be devastating for nonprofits found in violation of the law.

Many nonprofit leaders are not aware of how much of their budgets can be spent on legal lobbying activities. Advocacy and lobbying efforts were expanded by 1976 legislation as stated:

□□The landmark legislation enacted into law in 1976 clarified and greatly expanded the extent to which nonprofits could lobby without jeopardizing their tax-exempt status. Section 1307 of Public Law 94-455, recognized lobbying as an entirely proper function of nonprofits and ended the longstanding uncertainty about the legality of lobbying by groups that are tax-exempt under Section 501 ©(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (Herman, 1994, p. 212).

Was the defeat of Amendment #31 an anomaly? The nonprofits involved in the defeat of Amendment #31 had to create a balancing act that allowed them to advocate and lobby against this legislation without crossing the boundaries permitted by law. The defeat of amendment #31 demonstrates that nonprofits can, in fact, find safe ground to influence public policy.

What became apparent during this legislative battle is that language-based policies have a common thread. It is almost impossible to discuss English Only legislation without discussing Bilingual Education as these programs provide the linguistic strategies to teach children. The battle in Colorado certainly emerged in that particular form.

Although, the genesis of the controversy over language rights is based in English Only legislation, it is almost impossible to discuss one without the other. "Opposition to bilingual education was well organized and a key component of the English Only Movement" in Los Angeles, California and other major cities across America (Acuna, 1996, p.293). In order to develop a complete analysis of language based struggles, it is of paramount importance to draw the relationships between public policies that have detrimental linkages. Often times, political analysts fail to provide linkage between and among sets of public policies that are intertwined and that eventually culminate in maintaining the current institutional arrangements.

The linkages have become apparent in the State of Colorado. In 1988, the voters of the State of Colorado overwhelmingly voted for "English as the official language of the State of Colorado," 73%-27% (Torres, 1997, p. 223). Some very interesting information was uncovered during this campaign. Spearheaded by Representative Barbara Phillips from Colorado Springs and supported by right-wing ideologue Linda Chavez, it was discovered that the main supporters, both politically and financially, had hidden agendas. "What is of concern is what such positions as population control, opposition to immigration, and promotion of a publication which appears to 'argue for genocide,' suggest for the true purposes of English Only" (Ibid, 1997, p. 224).

What lessons were learned in this political melee? Although, opposition to such amendments is usually spearheaded by "grassroots movements run at the state and local levels" (Torres, 1997, p. 222). Language policy battles in the past have utilized this approach but to no avail. Perhaps the biggest lesson learned is that no victory can be claimed without the participation of grassroots nonprofit organizations. Amendment #31 seemed to follow that historical pattern which began as media warfare but strategically changed into a good old grassroots campaign, spearheaded and led by nonprofit organizations. "The two elements worked hand in hand to sway uninformed voters to a real understanding of what #31 stood for" (Del Castillo, 2002).

#### Bibliography

Acuna, Rodolpho. *Anything But Mexican: Chicanos in Contemporary Los Angeles*. New York: Verso.

Britz, John, Political Analyst, member of English Plus Organization. Panel Discussion in "Social Justice, Community Organizing and Activism" class, tape recordings. Regis University: Denver, CO, 14 February 14, 2003.

Bixler-Marquez, Dennis J.; Ortega, Carlos E.; Solorazano-Torres, Rosalia; LaFarelle, Lorenzo. *Chicano Studies: Survey and Analysis*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1997.

Brice Heath. "Language Policies: Patterns of Retention and Maintenance." In Connor, Walker. *Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective*. Washington D. C., The Urban Institute Press, 1985.

Camarillo, Albert. "Chicanos in a Changing Society" *From Mexican Pueblos to American Barrios in Santa Barbara and Southern California, 1848-1930*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Carlos, Sylvana. Community Organizer, member of Colorado Association of Bilingual Education. Panel Discussion in "Social Justice, Community Organizing and Activism" class, tape recording. Regis

University: Denver, CO, 14 February 14, 2003.

Connor, Walker. Mexican-Americans in Comparative Perspective. Washington D. C.: The Urban Institute Press, 1985.

Crawford, James. Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Erosion of language rights continues." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: June 15, 2000.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Sink or swim is not the issue." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: July 6, 2000.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Linguistic Imperialism vs. cultural reaffirmation." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: July 12, 2001.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "The cultural wars continue." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: April 11, 2002.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "One flag, one language." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: June 20, 2002.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Erosion of language rights continues." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: June 15, 2000.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Chavez si, Unz/Montero no!" In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: August 22, 2002.

Del Castillo, Ramon. "Sweet victory leaves a bitter taste." In *El Semanario: The Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: November 14, 2002.

Del Castillo, Richard G. *The Los Angeles Barrio, 1859-1890: A Social History*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.

De Leon, Arnold. *The Tejano Community, 1936-1900*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982.

Denver Post (November 2, 2002).

Evan, William M. *Organizational Theory & Design*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1993.

Gallegos, Herman E. and O'Neill, Michael. *Hispanics and the Nonprofit Sector*. New York: The Foundation Center, 1991.

Gonzales-Estay, Manolo. "No on 31 celebration dinner." In *El Semanario: Weekly Issue*. Denver, Colorado: November 21, 2002.

Herman, Robert D. *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.

Martinez, Ricardo. Community Organizer, member of Padres Unidos Organization. Panel Discussion in "Social Justice, Community Organizing and Activism" class, tape recordings. Regis University: Denver, CO, 14 February 14, 2003.

Martinez, Vilma S. "Hispanic Advocacy Organizations." In Bixler-Marquez, Dennis J.; Ortega, Carlos E.; Solorazano-Torres, Rosalia; LaFarelle, Lorenzo. *Chicano Studies: Survey and Analysis*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1997.

Montejano, David. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.

Roosevelt, Theodore. "One Flag, One Language." In Crawford, James. *Language Loyalties: A Source Book on the Official English Controversy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992, pp. 84-5.

Sheridan, Thomas E. *Los Tucsonenses: The Mexican Community in Tucson, 1854-1941*. Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1986.

Torres, Luis. "The National English Only Movement, Past, and Future." In Bixler-Marquez, Dennis J.; Ortega, Carlos E.; Solorazano-Torres, Rosalia; LaFarelle, Lorenzo. *Chicano Studies: Survey and Analysis*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1997.

Trujillo, Lorenzo, Attorney & member of English Plus. Panel Discussion in "Social Justice, Community Organizing and Activism" class, tape recording. Regis University: Denver, CO, 14 February 14, 2003.

Trujillo, Lorenzo, Interview by author, no tape recordings, Denver, CO, 14 November 2002.

Vigil, Denys. Community Organizer, member of Colorado Statewide Parent Coalition. Panel Discussion in "Social Justice, Community Organizing and Activism" class, tape recording. Regis University: Denver, CO, 14 February 14, 2003.

**Paper Number:** CO034008

**Paper Title:** Prayer in the Market Place or Money Changers in the Temple: A Spiritual Approach to Finance and Nonprofit Organizations

**Author(s):**

Ms. Carol Mason, Trillium, Nahant, MA, USA

Ms. Candace Cuniberti, Trillium, Salisbury, CT, USA

Dr. Terry Anne Vigil, Trillium, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

**Summary of Research**

The Colloquy will consist of three participants addressing a number of current issues confronting nonprofit organizations and their financial viability. Through discussion and debate, the deeper implications of such commonly used terms as "stewardship," "value," "appreciation," "balance," and "investment" will be examined by each participant from the following standpoints respectively: the staff/board; volunteers/donors; and clients/customers. Handouts will be provided to the audience to assist in involving them, as appropriate, in the discussion.

**Description**

Many nonprofit organizations seem to exist on a thin thread, employees continually being asked to make sacrifices, deficit budgets the norm, and little thought given to funding beyond the near term. Others are highly successful in seeking and obtaining substantial grants from major foundations and corporations, yet somehow don't manage to truly serve their stated mission, leaving many of their employees feeling hollow and disillusioned. In some instances, the mission is met and financial stability obtained. What are the various factors affecting these and other scenarios?

The Colloquy will address a number of current issues and forces confronting nonprofit organizations and their financial viability. Through discussion and debate, such commonly used terms as "stewardship," "value," "equity," "appreciation," "balance" and "investment" will be examined. All these terms are associated with finances, but there are deeper meanings attributed to each one which begin to get at the heart of good management practices, resting on fair and honest dealings within and without the organization. If employees and clients are appreciated and an atmosphere of caring and giving lives within an organization, this true value-added can indeed be successfully conveyed to donors and funders with good results.

Through dialogue and discussion, the three participants will examine these major ideas underlying the financial viability of nonprofit organizations today. Each participant will engage in the discussion from a different perspective.

One participant will view nonprofit finances through the lens of board and staff members. This individual will address how staff and board members can better work together in support of the fundamental values underlying their organization and how this impacts the financial health of nonprofit institutions.

The second participant will assess the role of donors and volunteers in nonprofit financial matters. This individual will address the volunteers/donors' needs and values affecting the organization's financial well-being.

The third participant will be concerned with finances and their impact on the clients and customers of nonprofit organizations. This individual will address how clients/customers are treated and how this impacts the bottom line.

The participants will ask each other a number of questions, such as:

How do we establish a sense of equity and fairness?

How do we overcome "poverty thinking?"

Can we afford to be generous to our employees and our clients? How can we not afford to do this?

Does the way we treat one another affect income?

While money is a yardstick for measuring financial success, what is genuinely substantial?

Why must so many nonprofit boards and staffs believe that operating at a loss is endemic to their organizations?

What role do gratitude and appreciation play with volunteers, donors and staff?

How do we move beyond mere platitudes to really “walking the walk?”

How do we see beyond fear-based answers to solutions that enable capital investment and staff development to become regular components of annual budgets?

How is honest pricing balanced with charity? Can it be?

Why do many assume that “nonprofit” means operating at a loss?

The Colloquy participants have worked for and with a myriad of nonprofit organizations. Some of these organizations have grown and served clients well, while others have struggled. Sometimes the achievement of financial success without client success represents a moral and spiritual poverty that can be as devastating to the organization’s mission in the long term as the type of “penny-wise and pound-foolish” thinking that would balance the nonprofit’s budget on the backs of the employees. How can these pitfalls be avoided and what steps can be taken to build on a more solid, value-driven foundation?

It is hoped that this colloquy will be the beginning of more spiritually-grounded solutions.

**Paper Number:** CO034009

**Paper Title:** Towards a Comprehensive Theory of Nonprofit Finance

**Author(s):**

Dr. H. Woods Bowman, De Paul University, Chicago, IL, USA  
Professor Kevin Kearns, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
Dr. Joseph Cordes, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC, USA  
Dr. Patrick Rooney, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA  
Professor Arthur Brooks, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY, USA  
Professor Maxim Sinitsyn, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA  
Professor Burton A Weisbrod, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, USA  
Dr. Dennis R Young, Case Western Reserve University, Shaker Heights, OH, USA

**Summary of Research**

Nonprofits do not generally depend on a single type of revenue, and they vary widely in their mixes of revenue sources. Thus, nonprofit finance theory must address two basic goals: (a) clarifying the rationales for engaging various types of income – fees, donations, investment income, government funding, etc.; and (b) providing a basis for choosing appropriate mixes of revenues. This colloquy will explore the theoretical underpinnings of alternative nonprofit revenue sources and revenue mixes, and will consider how an overall theory could synthesize existing concepts into one framework that can guide nonprofit financial decisions.

**Description**

Nonprofit organizations are unusual in the manner in which they finance themselves. Unlike private, for-profit firms, they do not rely entirely on sales of goods and services, and unlike government they do not have powers of taxation through which they can command public support. And while nonprofits receive significantly more support from voluntary gifts and grants than other types of organizations, they are not, on average, primarily dependent on this source of funding either. Nonprofits are unique in the sense that they generally do not rely on a single type of revenue, and moreover, that they vary widely in the mix of revenue sources that they engage. As a result, a comprehensive theory of nonprofit finance would require two basic parts: First, a theory should explain the rationale and circumstances under which each type of income is appropriate. Second, a theory should explain what mixes of revenue sources are appropriate under different circumstances. That is, a full theory of nonprofit finance must address the question of nonprofit revenue portfolios.

Nonprofit organizations draw on a wide spectrum of revenue sources, including fees, profits from commercial ventures, gifts and grants from individuals, foundations and corporations, government grants and contracts, investment income from financial assets including endowments, and so on. Existing fragments of theory from the economics, accounting and nonprofit management literatures provide a basis for understanding the role of some of these revenue streams in financing nonprofit operations, while in other cases existing theory is scant. . One contributor to this colloquy will provide an overview of the requirements for an overall theory of nonprofit finance. Five additional contributors will discuss the rationale and theoretical underpinnings of particular sources of nonprofit finance. A seventh contributor will address the conceptual underpinnings of a portfolio theory of nonprofit finance. Each presentation will be five to 10 minutes in length and each will be accompanied by a two page summary paper. The remaining portion of the session will be devoted to dialogue with the audience.

□The first presentation will focus on the need for a comprehensive theory of nonprofit finance. It will cite the variety of sources of nonprofit revenue and the widely varying mixes of revenue that nonprofits' employ. It will also note the varying degrees to which theory is available to understand the role of particular revenue sources, and the incompleteness of existing frameworks for understanding nonprofit

revenue portfolios. It will call for a long term effort to synthesize an integrated theory of nonprofit finance.

□The second presentation will examine the place of commercial revenues in nonprofit finance. It will cite the James/Weisbrod/Schiff model of the nonprofit organization as a multi-product firm to explain when and how profitable activities contribute to the financial viability and mission-related success of a nonprofit organization. This presentation will give special emphasis to the incentives and accounting strategies associated with the Unrelated Business Income Tax and the profit-maximizing behavior of nonprofits for services unrelated to their missions. Results of analyses with IRS Statistics of Income data will be offered.

□The third presentation will discuss government financing of nonprofit organizations. In particular, it will focus on the large amount of public sector money that comes from indirect aid, in the form of tax revenues forgone on tax-deductible contributions by individuals. In some sectors (such as the arts and higher education), this amount dramatically outweighs direct funding. This presentation will draw on analysis of the 1996 General Social Survey which shows that private givers and supporters of direct government aid fit different demographic profiles, implying that direct and indirect government funding owes to distinct constituencies. These findings lead to a number of implications for nonprofit finance.

□The fourth presentation will consider the place of individual giving in nonprofit finance. It will note that in some sub-sectors private philanthropy plays the key role in the finances of nonprofits, while in others, such as hospitals and universities, private philanthropy plays a key supplementary role, enabling greater access to services and/or means of achieving greater excellence. The presentation will cite economic theory that suggests that private philanthropy can play an important role in providing public goods and goods with large externalities where it is not politically feasible to reach a large enough consensus to address market failures through government subsidies, taxes or regulation. This presentation will address the who, what, where, when, and why of individual giving in the context of these market failures.

□The fifth presentation will consider the role of foundation funding in nonprofit organization finance. While foundation giving constitutes a small fraction of overall giving, and a still smaller part of nonprofit finance, this presentation will cite the strategic significance of foundation support in starting new initiatives and innovations, in leveraging other sources of support, and in building collaborative efforts among foundation grantees. The presentation will conceptualize the wide variety of foundation approaches to funding and the need for nonprofits to reconcile their needs for programmatic and organizational support to the preferences of foundation decision makers.

□The sixth presentation will focus on the role of endowments and investment income in nonprofit finance, examining parallels and differences between investment income and commercial income in striking the balance between mission and financial objectives. It will also consider the incentive effects of investment income with respect to organizational efficiency and the assumption of financial risk.

□The seventh presentation will focus on revenue portfolios and existing frameworks for nonprofits to choose appropriate mixes of revenue from different sources. Several different considerations which affect the viability and desirability of a revenue portfolio, including financial balance, strategic positioning and risk will be discussed. Alternative frameworks from the literature will be cited and assessed for their adequacy and completeness, and suggestions will be made for future development of a nonprofit revenue portfolio assessment framework.



**Paper Number:** CO034011

**Paper Title:** Issues of Trust: Quiet Dismissal or Public Scandal?

**Author(s):**

Professor Paul Kennedy, Institution/University/College, George Fox University, Newberg, OR, USA  
Professor Michele E. Johnson, Institution/University/College, George Fox University, Newberg, OR, USA  
Professor Janis Balda, Newberg, OR, USA

**Summary of Research**

There is a generally accepted view that a key component of social capital is trustworthiness (Putnam, 2000). The theoretical and practical implications of how non-profits prioritize social capital, and particularly trust, over financial capital when financial capital is misappropriated will be explored. The implications for trust and social capital of stakeholders and constituencies at a variety of levels will be described and the personal, organizational and social consequences of quiet dismissal versus public scandal, in particular, will be examined.

**Description**

There is a generally accepted view that a key component of social capital - social networks and norms that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit - is trustworthiness (Putnam, 2000). This norm has been discussed with regard to business (Fukuyama), society (Putnam) and its institutions (Etzioni). Henry Hansmann, in his seminal article, "The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise" included among the defining characteristics of nonprofit firms-- both legally and economically- what is called a non-distribution constraint. Nonprofit firms can make profits, but they cannot distribute those profits to their "owners" or other insiders. One concomitant of the constraint is that nonprofit firms are a "better" fit and most often found in markets where customers do not really know what they're purchasing with their contribution. It is difficult to tell whether a homeless person received the blanket or meal that the contribution was intended to purchase. These are "trust" markets.

While one may argue with the specific impact of the value of trust and confidence in the third sector, it is apparent that increasing scandals, both within the third sector and in business affect the norms of society. What are the ways in which some of the third sector chooses to address these issues? How does their choice impact social capital?

One participant will discuss the sociological dimensions of social capital--interpersonal relationship, trust, shared norms, and values--as they are evidenced in the non-profit sector. The theoretical and practical implications of how non-profits prioritize social capital over financial capital when financial capital is misappropriated will be explored. The theories of Emile Durkheim and Jurgen Habermas will be drawn upon as first steps toward theoretically analyzing the activity of non-profits in these situations of misappropriation. Comparisons to the for-profit sector regarding the interplay of social capital and financial capital will be drawn to highlight distinctive characteristics of non-profits.

The nonprofit form, in the shape of corporate governance, shares other key values and norms that are integral to social capital and affect trustworthiness. These are responsibility, accountability, fairness and transparency (see Hansmann, 2000; Jennings, 2002).

Nonprofit organizational leaders have a fiduciary responsibility to protect and safeguard the trust placed in them by donors. In this part, another participant will look at a case of misplaced trust in the Pacific Northwest and her investigation of how one individual broke that trust. This individual used his affinity with the board members of a charitable organization to sell insurance and investments to a wide group of denominational churches and colleges and retirees. He managed to do this with neither an insurance nor securities license. In the process, individuals and organizations lost over forty-five million dollars.

How did the nonprofit organization deal with the potential scandal?

The third participant will discuss embezzlement by an officer and employee of a nonprofit, the implications of the behavior upon the organization and the steps taken to address the matter. This analysis will involve a case study of a nonprofit, the decision-making process they followed once embezzlement was discovered, and the impact of the legal arena upon that decision. It will analyze the response of different "players" and upon the rationales for choices made.

Together the participants will examine the personal, organizational and social consequences of quiet dismissal versus public scandal. The implications for trust and social capital of stakeholders and constituencies will be described. The participants will discuss the extremes to which institutions will go to ensure the "trust" of their donors, members or other persons of influence, even if that means forgoing economic recovery, and raise questions about the long term impact of this choice upon the larger social order. In addition, the participants will suggest some practices for good fiscal and legal management that have been found to enable an organization to better protect the resources of the organization while still building social capital.

The colloquy will engage an interdisciplinary approach to a significant problem facing the sector - a problem which, if unchecked, can diminish the effectiveness of the sector. The result is that 1.) the field is challenged to review and assess another aspect of the impact of trust issues on performance and 2.) by discussing practical situations and analyzing their particular facts, practitioners can begin to think critically about their own response to these types of situations, and devise a proposed course of conduct for their organization.

**Paper Number:** CO034012

**Paper Title:** The Study & Teaching of Nonprofit Organizations, Voluntarism & Philanthropy: Curricular Guidelines & Standards of Quality

**Author(s):**

Dr. Norman Dolch, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Shreveport, LA, USA

Dr. Pamela Leland, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA

Dr. Naomi Wish, Seton Hall University, South Orange, NJ, USA

Dr. Russell A. Cargo, Nonprofit Enterprise Institute, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

**Summary of Research**

Nearly two years ago, the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC), an organization of university centers that are engaged in research and graduate education, was awarded a grant to develop curricular guidelines and standards of quality, as well as identify gaps in the literature for graduate degrees that focus on nonprofit organizations, voluntarism and philanthropy.

□The Nonprofit Academic Center Council will summarize the work done thus far in developing each of the following:

- curricular guidelines
- standards of quality
- a body of literature that supports the curricular guidelines

**Description**

□Nearly two years ago, the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (NACC), an organization of university centers that are engaged in research and graduate education, was awarded a grant to develop curricular guidelines and standards of quality, as well as identify gaps in the literature for graduate degrees that focus on nonprofit organizations, voluntarism and philanthropy.

□The Nonprofit Academic Center Council is proposing a colloquy for the ARNOVA annual meeting in Denver in which the NACC participants will summarize the work done thus far in developing each of the following:

- curricular guidelines
- standards of quality
- a body of literature that supports the curricular guidelines.

1.□Curricular Guidelines

This presentation will focus on NACC's efforts to identify a graduate-level core curriculum for the field of nonprofit sector philanthropic studies. This effort will be compared to guidelines developed by NASPAA/NACC and AACSB. The presentation will also include specific outcomes, future steps and future needs as the area of study expands into other graduate programs, undergraduate programs and the continuing education area.

2.□Standards of Quality

It is usually agreed that standards of quality should relate to curricular guidelines. However, other aspects of graduate education are very often considered, such as faculty research, student-faculty ratios, outside funding, alumni employment, etc.

This presentation will review NACC's thinking on standards of quality for nonprofit studies.

3.□Body of Literature

In most disciplines, graduate studies rely on a body of scholarly literature that has been developed over centuries. Because intensive study and research on nonprofit organizations, voluntarism and philanthropy are recent phenomena, graduate programs suffer from the effects of major gaps in this literature. This part of the colloquy will define these gaps and attempt to identify scholarly research priorities that could support the development of nonprofit studies as a discipline.

**Paper Number:** CO034013

**Paper Title:** The Research Capacity of Regional Associations of Grantmakers: the Regional Giving Study

**Author(s):**

Ms. Deborah Bussel, c/o Donors Forum of South Florida, Miami, FL, USA

Ms. Jackie Reis, c/o Forum of Regional Association of Grantmakers, Washington, DC, USA

Ms. Suzannah Cowell, Donors Forum of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

**Summary of Research**

Detailed regional analyses of funding patterns and statistics are vital to creating a community of individuals and organizations committed to the future of effective philanthropy. Regional Associations of Grantmakers play a growing role in gathering and distributing data on the philanthropic sector. Many produce valuable Regional Giving Studies to inform the public, media, policy makers, and their constituencies, of current philanthropic trends. Due to their strong regional presence, they are able to cultivate unique relationships, which enable them to access and synthesize regionally pertinent data in a format intended to organize, inform, and motivate responsible philanthropic responses in their localities.

**Description**

Detailed regional analyses of funding patterns and statistics are vital to creating a community of individuals and organizations committed to the future of effective philanthropy. Regional Associations of Grantmakers play a growing role in gathering and distributing data on the philanthropic sector. Many produce valuable Regional Giving Studies to inform the public, media, policy makers, and their constituencies, of current philanthropic trends. Due to regional presence, they are able to cultivate unique relationships, which enable them to access and synthesize regionally pertinent data in a format intended to organize, inform, and motivate responsible philanthropic responses in their localities.

The purpose of the proposed colloquy at the Fall 2003 ARNOVA conference, is to present the unique value of research products, particularly the regional giving study, that are offered by regional associations of grantmakers; to explore possibilities for new collaborations with others in the philanthropic research community; to engage in discussion with other ARNOVA conference participants regarding best practices in methodology; to explore further dissemination options for regional giving studies; and to explore the unique value of regional associations as capable information clearinghouses on philanthropy, amassing data from diverse resources to better inform the decision-making processes of those involved in planning philanthropic activities across all regions.

The Forum of Regional Associations of Grantmakers has recently undertaken a collaborative project gathering information on regional giving study methodologies from its members across the United States. Relying on input from member research staff, this study strives to document the efforts made to date on research processes to collect, analyze and disseminate regional philanthropic data. The individual presenter from the Forum Regional Associations will share findings and recommendations for future collaborations among regional associations to maximize the comparative use of this detailed regional data with the goal to inform a more detailed set of national data. Other desired outcomes include: to create templates for regional associations and others doing or contemplating giving studies; to develop a set of shared questions so that data across regions lends itself to facile comparison; to create a "community of practice" for those engaged in regional philanthropic research; and a demonstration of how regional giving studies add value to, rather than duplicate, related national research.

Three of the Forum's member associations, the Donors Forum of Chicago, the Donors Forum of South Florida, and the Washington Regional Association of Grantmakers, will also participate in the proposed colloquy. Each of these three will present the findings of the regional giving study in their respective region, highlighting funding trends by subject area, top foundations by total giving and total assets,

individual giving, donor advised fund giving, as well as other relevant demographic data in the regions, which illuminate the above findings. Data sources, such as the IRS Business Master File, state Attorney General's Office data, survey instruments, and regional association databases, as well as methodologies, trends and comparisons across regions, will be explored in this discussion.

Additionally, each presenter will discuss opportunities for further utilization of the regional data beyond the regional giving study. In all cases, examples will be provided that demonstrate how such data, unavailable in such detail anywhere else, can be tailored and utilized by a variety of constituencies, such as funders, nonprofits, and state alliances, for a growing number of purposes, including strategic planning, community organizing, and further detailed trend analysis to inform funding practices, as well as to assess and anticipate funding needs.

**Paper Number:** CO034014

**Paper Title:** The Impact of International Funders on Local NGO's

**Author(s):**

Ephrem Tadessee, Institute of Development Research and Development Policy, Ruhr University Bochum, Bochum, Germany

Dr. Ann Marie Thomson, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

Dr. Angela Bies, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

Dr. Carol Barbeito, CLB and Associates, Highlands Ranch, CO, USA

Ms. Laurie Paarlberg, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

**Summary of Research**

This colloquy brings together academic researchers and practitioner to discuss the impact of international funders on local NGO's. NGO's in developing nations are heavily dependent upon international funders; however, development assistance is facing growing criticism in both receiving societies and within the international donor community itself. Concern exists that international assistance has been unable to energize receiving organizations, and ultimately their home societies, to address their own development challenges in a meaningful and sustainable way. The participants draw upon their research and professional experience to explore the challenges and implications of the complex relationships between foreign donors and local NGO's.

**Description**

This colloquy brings together academic researchers and practitioners to further discussion on the impact of international funders on local NGO's. Many NGO's in developing nations are heavily dependent upon the resources of international funders; however, international development assistance is facing growing criticism in both receiving societies and within the international donor community itself. A common theme that has emerged from each of the colloquy participants is that concern exists that international assistance has been unable to energize receiving organizations, and ultimately their home societies, to address their own development challenges in a meaningful and sustainable way. Drawing upon professional experience and academic research in a variety of locales and regimes, we address a variety of questions, including: the impact of NGO's on local responsibility; the impact of funder policies and practices on local NGO management capacity; and the impact of relationships between donor and local NGO on local practice and capacity.

□

Participant one draws upon professional experience with local NGO's in Africa, particularly the Horn of Africa, to address the impact that international assistance has had on local senses of responsibility. In the 90s, international development assistance focused on supporting civil society and development assistance was mainly provided to non-governmental organizations (NGOs). As a result Africa witnessed the emergence and proliferation of many local NGOs that are outwardly designed in the shape of Northern NGOs.

Encouraging responsibility for ones own development should be at the center of the relation between international donors and local NGOs—energizing local efforts; building local bases of support; encouraging accountability of NGO's to their own societies. However, based upon his work in Africa, the participant observed that the formation and proliferation of local NGOs in response to international assistance raised questions of accountability to local membership and constituency, and long term suitability and the relevance of their programs and projects in responding to local needs. Their missions by far reflect that of their donors and not necessarily the interests of societies they claim to represent and change with the change of donor focus areas and priorities. As they do not have meaningful membership and constituency base, it is quite difficult to identify local groups who back or support their objectives and goals. Their accountability is mainly for their funding agencies and, in some cases, government authorities. Lack of accountability to local membership and constituency blocks opportunities of formulating priorities based on local voices. As those organizations are dependent to

external donors and they are, in many ways, unknown to societies, it is difficult to influence their direction in the interest of membership or constituency. This contributed significantly to the creation of artificial organizations whose existence ceases when donors stop or reduce their support.

Participant two discusses the results of her research on international funding and NGO practices in Poland. Similar to the case of Africa, the financial investment by international donor agencies in Polish NGOs has resulted in the growth of both numbers and assets of individual NGOs. At the same time, there is increased reliance on NGOs to deliver vital services and contribute to the development of civil society and social policy. With this increased scope of economic activity and sphere of influence, the activity of NGOs has come under heightened attention, with concern for managerial, governance and operational practices of NGOs emerging as a paramount concern for funders, policymakers, and NGO leaders themselves. This study focused on two central questions: What role do the policies and practices of international funders play in differentiating NGOs that implement certain management, governance, and operational practices from those that do not? Among NGOs that implement certain practices, what differentiates successful attempts from less successful ones?

The second participant reports on her findings from a national survey of 918 NGOs in Poland that are registered with the national database, and from in-depth interviews and site visits with twenty-two international funders, NGOs, and nongovernmental support organizations. Resource dependence showed positive predictiveness on the implementation of certain managerial, governance, and operational practices. Contextual factors influencing adaptive and maladaptive resource dependence responses are examined with particular emphasis on alignment between international funder priorities and NGO needs, fidelity of interaction between international funders and local NGOs, and the effects of varying, and sometimes competing, conceptualizations of appropriate management, governance, and operational practices.

The third participant draws upon 15 years of experience in working internationally with and for funding organizations, NGO's, governments and the for profit private sector to describe basic issues that seem to underlie these relationships. One is the need for two-way understanding of the cultures in the countries involved, both the perceptions and the realities must be taken into account. Interpersonal relationships as well as organizational relationships are influenced by these perceptions and realities. A second issue is the influence of language and the inability or difficulty of translation of some terms due to their cultural imbedding. The legal system also exerts a strong influence on expectations and behaviors of funders and NGO's. Government's view of NGO's and the laws and policies concerning their conduct and the conduct of donors is an important factor. \*Misunderstanding of donor motivations and donor accountability can lead fund seekers to view international donors as a "pot of gold" that they are entitled to. NGO's may have little understanding of the process of application process and may think the funder representative can personally get them money with little effort on their part. Nontraditional organizational structures and processes by Western normative standards can create a barrier to providing funding due to accountability concerns.

Participants four and five propose a theoretical model to examine the influence of foreign funding relationships on indigenous NGOs. They draw upon their work in Azerbaijan to understand the impact different types of foreign funding-indigenous NGO relationships have on key organizational dimensions, both internal and external to the recipient NGO. Mirroring, , Karen Casper's Partnership Arch (Casper, 1996) ISAR has found that Azeri NGO's are closely involved with international organizations through a variety of relationships from mentoring/partnering relationships to relationships based on the receipt of direct aid or development/training resources (ISAR-Azerbaijan,1999). They are especially interested in determining whether patterns of variation emerge along these key dimensions depending on what form the international funder-indigenous NGO relationship takes. How, for example, does a partnering relationship impact these key dimensions versus a direct grant-making relationship? Furthermore, do these funding relationships vary across different types of NGOs (e.g. advocacy, health, culture, development, and direct service NGOs)?

Their discussion will include a review of the theoretical and empirical literature on funding relationships (in general, then, more specifically, international) and their impacts on recipient organizational structure, management practices, organizational capacity, and external relationships. From this literature review,

they develop a preliminary framework to be “tested” (for exploratory purposes) in Azerbaijan. They propose a model to explore how the differing relationships might influence key characteristics and capacities of local NGO’s—a model that they hope might potentially further the development of local NGO’s in Azerbaijan, but also may \_\_\_ the experiences of the other colloquy participants.



**Paper Number:** CO034015

**Paper Title:** Nonprofit Capacity Building through Knowledge Management and the Use of the World Wide Web

**Author(s):**

Dr. Joel Orosz, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Donna Van Iwaarden, Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy & Nonprofit Leadership, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

Angela Vander Hulst, Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy & Nonprofit Leadership, Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI, USA

**Summary of Research**

Philanthropic Nonprofit Knowledge Management results in the selective and efficient use of information, capturing of key lessons, and avoiding the "re-invention of the wheel." Ultimately, PNKM results in a nonprofit organization using "preferred practices" to operate as effectively as it can, and serve its clients in the best available way.

The Nonprofit Good Practice Guide, [www.nonprofitbasics.org](http://www.nonprofitbasics.org), answers virtually any question about managing nonprofits through Preferred Practices and Pitfalls, Glossaries, Resources, Taxonomy, and Web Site Profiles within ten topic areas. This resource directory and capacity building tool provides an abundance of information, which can be applied directly to their organizations.

**Description**

Participant A will discuss how one university and academic center has created a Knowledge Management program to aid nonprofits in increasing capacity, both locally and nationally. Funded by a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Philanthropic and Nonprofit Knowledge Management (PNKM) Initiative is a project of the Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy & Nonprofit Leadership. The Johnson Center, a component of Grand Valley State University, began in 1992 as a multidisciplinary university-wide center, developed with the support of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The PNKM Initiative seeks to capture, organize, disseminate, and promote the use of good practices in the nonprofit sector. The Initiative promotes raising awareness of the need for funder effectiveness, but also seeks to offer nonprofits the opportunity to improve the management efficiency, promote community service learning, and encourage collaboration between grantors and grantees for the success of the nonprofit sector.

**Philanthropic and Nonprofit Knowledge Management**

Participant B will provide the audience with research and trends regarding Philanthropic and Nonprofit Knowledge Management and its relationship to capacity building in the nonprofit sector. An increasing number of nonprofit organizations are seeking capacity building grants, and at the same time, an increasing number of foundations are investing in technologies to help manage their knowledge. Knowledge has historically been viewed as a private asset, but more recently, emphasis has shifted to focusing upon sharing knowledge throughout the organization and even throughout the nonprofit sector. In a recent national study by the Tides Center, 68% of those surveyed use the Internet. With an overwhelming amount of information provided online and people increasingly using the Internet as their primary information source, it is essential for nonprofits to be offered a comprehensive and organized clearinghouse of nonprofit good practices from reputable sources.

Knowledge, of course, has always been available to nonprofit organization leaders and workers, but it has been scattered, diffused, and difficult to find. Even when nonprofits have been able to track down the information they need, they have often been uncertain as to whether it is of value to them or sound information in itself. Nor have they had a plan for using the information once it has been acquired, leading to the paradox of the organization that "knows better than it does."

The goals of Philanthropic and Nonprofit Knowledge Management, therefore, are to: find sound and useful information of benefit to nonprofits from myriad sources; select the most sound and useful information found for use by nonprofits; aggregate that sound and useful knowledge in an easily

accessible place; translate that sound and useful knowledge so as to be user-friendly and easily amiable; and encourage use of these knowledge resources within organizations in order to foster more effective practice.

### The Nonprofit Good Practice Guide

Participant C will discuss the Nonprofit Good Practice Guide, a project of the PNKM Initiative, provides Preferred Practices and Pitfalls, Taxonomies, Glossaries, Resources, and Web Site Profiles within ten topic areas. These ten topic areas include Fundraising and Financial Sustainability; Governance, Staff Development and Organizational Capacity; Accountability and Evaluation; Volunteer Management; Communications and Marketing; Operations Management and Leadership; Advocacy; Technology; and Foundations and Grantmaking.

The Nonprofit Good Practice Guide is a resource directory and capacity building tool that offers answers to virtually any question about managing nonprofits; however, it is not the accumulation or collection of information that determines its value, but rather how it is used. The Nonprofit Good Practice Guide is structured in such a way as to encourage both rapid learning and deeper reflection among its users. For example, Glossary definitions provide a rapid understanding of key concepts, and the Preferred Practices and Pitfalls offer concise roadmaps to both enhance positive practice and avoid counterproductive practice. Other resources of the Guide, however, encourage deeper reflection and thoughtful adaptation of lessons. For example, links to substantive articles, relevant books and on-line courses encourage a culture of learning and use of the lessons offered by the Guide.

Audience volunteers will provide Participant C with daily nonprofit informational needs and situations. Participant C will then show the audience how to gather different types of information relating to these situations and how this information can be applied directly to organizations. The audience will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback regarding the Nonprofit Good Practice Guide and Philanthropic and Nonprofit Knowledge Management in general. Participants and discussants will answer these questions and elaborate on various proposed issues. An evaluation of the site will be distributed and the audience encouraged to provide comments on the Guide's design, content and functionality.

**Paper Number:** CO034016

**Paper Title:** New Directions in Giving and Volunteering Surveys

**Author(s):**

Dr. Arthur Kirsch, Independent Sector, Washington, DC, USA

Dr. Mark Wilhelm, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Dr. Carol Silverman, University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Dr. Michael Hall, Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, Toronto, CANADA

Dr. Chris Toppe, Independent Sector, Washington, DC, USA

**Summary of Research**

Since the 1980s when Independent Sector launched its survey series on the patterns of giving and volunteering, the formal study of giving, volunteering, and civic engagement has matured. There are now many organizations studying these topics, with divergent approaches to both defining the basic concepts and data collection methods. This session will present various approaches to defining, collecting, and understanding giving and volunteering data from multiple perspectives.

**Description**

The formal study of giving, volunteering, and civic engagement has matured and grown since the late 1980s when Independent Sector launched its survey series on the patterns of giving and volunteering. There are now many organizations studying these topics, with divergent approaches to both defining the basic concepts and managing data collection. This session includes presentations from leaders in this field who will describe their approaches to studying charitable behavior.

XXX and YYY of Independent Sector will discuss the new approach IS is taking on studying giving and volunteering and how the new methodologies differ from prior IS efforts. Among the differences are changes in sampling and data collection methods that were adopted to ensure both more accurate and more timely data; changes in the focus of the survey from individual volunteering to family volunteering in an attempt to capture a more realistic picture of volunteering; a new focus on seasonality; and a new effort to match IS data collection efforts with those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

XXX of The Canadian Centre of Philanthropy will discuss their behavioral approach to studying giving and volunteering. Their approach is based on asking people about specific behaviors that they may or not have done, using the responses to these questions to define volunteering a priori. Michael will discuss the advantages to this approach over the methods used by others in which the definition of volunteering is left to the respondent.

XXX of the Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University will discuss their panel study of giving and volunteering that they participate in with the University of Michigan. Their approach allows for both the tracking of individuals over time and for matching their giving and volunteering behaviors with many types of social, health, economic, and family status data.

XXX of the University of San Francisco will discuss their approach that includes a broader definition of giving and volunteering encompassing informal ways people help each other beyond involvement with formal organizations. He will discuss how this approach expands our understanding of charitable behavior and provides insight into new ways of measuring this behavior.

**References**

Hall, Michael, et. al., *Caring Canadians, Involved Canadians: Highlights from the 2000 National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating*, Toronto, Canada: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, 2002

Toppe, Christopher M., Arthur Kirsch, and Jocabel Michel. Giving and Volunteering in the United States, 2001, Washington, DC: Independent Sector, 2002

US Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Volunteering in the United States," US Department of Labor News, USDL 02-686, Washington, DC: US Department of Labor, December 18, 2002

Wilhelm, Mark, The Distribution of Giving in Six Surveys, Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2002

**Paper Number:** CO034017

**Paper Title:** Enhancing Civic Engagement at the Community-Level: Synthesizing Research on Civic Innovations and Strategies in the United States

**Author(s):**

Professor William A. Galston, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Professor Jessica Gordon Nembhard, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

Professor Lewis Friedland, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

Ms. Kathryn Nelson, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

Dr. James Riker, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA

**Summary of Research**

What are the key factors that enhance and sustain citizens' civic engagement and build community capacities for reinvigorating democracy? This colloquy will provide an assessment of the fundamental factors that increase, deepen, and sustain civic engagement at the community level. It will highlight the role that nonprofit and religious organizations, government and other actors play in strengthening civic engagement and democratic citizenship. The panelists will present the results of a synthesis report that provides a comparative framework to understand the main variables that enhance civic engagement and democratic citizenship at the community-level.

**Description**

Civic engagement and the health of democracy in America has been the subject of much research during the last decade. While the very definition and scope of "civic engagement" is still contested, numerous analysts have posited a decline of citizen engagement and questioned democracy's capacity to solve public problems at the community level. In the aftermath of the September 11th tragedy, initial reports have signaled a resurgence in civic engagement and a renewed faith in democracy. Whether Americans are withdrawing from public life or participating in different ways is still a matter of much scholarly contention. Although no consensus has been reached regarding the level of civic engagement, the debate has broadened to include questions about the quality, equality and sustainability of participation.

What are the key factors that enhance and sustain citizens' civic engagement and build community capacities for reinvigorating democracy? Engaged, effective citizens are not born; they are created through social, economic, and political processes. This roundtable panel will provide an assessment of the fundamental factors that increase, deepen, and sustain civic engagement at the community level. It will highlight the role that nonprofit organizations, religious organizations, government and other actors play in strengthening civic engagement and democratic citizenship in communities across the United States.

This roundtable panel will highlight effective strategies and innovations that enhance civic engagement and foster democratic citizenship. The panelists will also explore the broader implications and lessons for communities. Specifically, the panelists will examine the key factors that:

Enhance (or limit) opportunities for civic engagement;

Build effective civic skills and capacities of individuals, organizations, and communities;

Create and foster civic values, norms and conditions that strengthen (or reduce) the possibilities for civic engagement; and

Shape community, economic, and political structures that affect and enhance the possibilities for civic participation.

The panelists will present the results of a synthesis report that provides a comparative framework to understand the main variables that enhance civic engagement and democratic citizenship at the community-level. Specifically, the panel will highlight an emerging inventory and knowledge base of

effective civic innovations and strategies based on comparative research of various communities around the United States. Drawing on this knowledge base, the panel will address the following questions:

How do we understand the context when developing the civic capacities of particular communities?

What role do community and religious organizations play in strengthening civic structures and participation?

How can economic forms of participation enhance civic engagement?

What are the institutional prerequisites and political structures that enhance civic engagement?

There is an urgent need to develop tools that can be used for top-down and bottom-up evaluation of various ways to foster civic engagement. Such tools – focusing on what works, what has been shown to work, and what might work – should prove particularly helpful for community leaders, nonprofit organizations, policy-makers and foundations seeking to enhance the quantity and quality of civic participation and sustain its impact for enhancing democracy in their communities. This roundtable panel will highlight the findings of a report that provides a systematic assessment of civic engagement and democratic citizenship to understand what works and does not work to strengthen citizen involvement at the community level.

#### Relation to the State of Knowledge

This report and roundtable panel will build on the past decade's breadth of research in tracking civil society, social capital and civic engagement in the United States. Notably, this study draws on Putnam's (1995, 2000) assessments of civic engagement and social capital, Skocpol and Fiorina's (1999) analysis of the parameters of civic engagement, and Verba, Scholzman and Brady's (1995) examination of civic life. This project seeks to deepen the understanding of the factors that strengthen or weaken civic engagement at the community level and highlight the implications for enhancing democracy in the United States.

#### The Approach for Analysis (including data sources)

This study will draw on the existing scholarly literature and highlight examples of enhanced civic engagement in the field drawing comparatively on the empirical experience of 26 communities across the country presently working with the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. In addition to the scholarly literature, the study will analyze the survey approaches and various indicators of civic health and participation in communities around the United States: the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, the Citizen Participation Study, the Democratic Audit Survey of Citizenship, Involvement and Democracy, the CIVICUS Index on Civil Society, the World Values Survey, HUD's State of the Cities Report, the National Commission on Civic Renewal's Index of Civic Health, the Boston Foundation's Civic Health Assessment and the Illinois Civic Engagement Benchmark Survey, just to name a few. By comparing and contrasting these sources, this study will deepen the understanding of the key factors that enhance and sustain citizens' civic engagement and build community capacities for reinvigorating democracy.

#### Contribution to the Field

This comprehensive assessment of civic engagement practices will synthesize current research and empirical experiences that enhance democracy at the community level. Providing specific recommendations to nonprofit practitioners, policy makers, grant makers and local stakeholders, this report seeks to bridge the gap between research and practice and to distinguish civic strategies and activities that produce demonstrable results in renewing and strengthening democratic participation at the community level. This report should help to highlight effective practices and processes, raise new

research issues, and encourage new levels of support and funding for such civic innovations, which in turn should raise the quantity, quality, equality and sustainability of citizen engagement at the community level, a core building block for a healthy, democratic society.

Key Words: Civic Engagement, Citizenship, Civic Innovations, Community-building, Democracy

**Paper Number:** CO034018

**Paper Title:** Executive Transition Management: Establishing a New Brand of Capacity Building through Theory, Research and Practice

**Author(s):**

Tommy Timm, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Rocky Mountain District, Denver, CO, USA  
Joe Gonzales, Gonzalez and Associates, Denver, CO, USA  
Dr. Denice Rothman Hinden, Management Performance Concepts, Silver Spring, MD, USA

**Summary of Research**

This Colloquy will explore executive transition management which is about the change in executive director level leadership in nonprofits. Discussants will explore 20 years of research on the topic, multiple theories informing the practical work, the approach to the practical work, and the effort being made to establish executive transition management as a core element in capacity building. This effort includes building the field through new information and tools, expanding the number of providers of the service, and raising awareness among executive directors boards of directors and other nonprofit sector stakeholders about the challenges and opportunities in transitions.

**Description**

**Introduction:**

Leadership transition is gaining the attention of many concerned about the capacity and effectiveness of nonprofits because quality of leadership is widely recognized as a significant variable. And, by all indications, an “era” of transition is looming. Today, roughly 10-12 percent of U.S. nonprofit organizations are managing an executive leadership transition at any given time. In the next five to seven years the rate of transitions is expected to climb by 15 percent or more as the baby-boomer generation – many of whom founded organizations 20 and 30 years ago- reaches retirement age. Further, according to recent surveys, 15-35 percent of nonprofit executives plan to leave their current positions within two years and 61-78 percent are planning to leave within five years. From 1994-1997 the David and Lucile Packard Foundation experienced executive turnover in 45 percent of its grantees. While mounting empirical evidence suggests that a change in nonprofit leadership is one of the most important, challenging and powerful opportunities a nonprofit organization will face – particularly in smaller organizations, and in organizations with founders or long-term executive directors who leave – this is an important time to review what we know and what we suspect about transition services. Properly managed, a leadership transition provides a pivotal moment, enabling an organization to change direction, maintain momentum, and strengthen its capacity. This topic - unlike other issues in capacity building –has been the focus of significant research over the last 20 years, though only now is it enjoying wide spread attention and discussion.

**Purpose of the Colloquy:**

The purpose of this colloquy is to explore the theory and practice of Executive Transition Management to further inform our development of this new “brand” of capacity building. Specifically we are interested in ideas and perspectives on establishing Executive Transition Management as a brand, and building the field of interest in this work from theory and research to standards of practices for practitioners available to deliver the service.

**Colloquy Discussants:**

**#1 A View from the Field:** This discussant will set the context for the importance of this topic to the nonprofit sector with an overview of the pioneering research conducted by Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation in the early 1990’s. With funding from the Kellogg Foundation, Neighborhood Reinvestment monitored 100 executive transitions and developed 10 in-depth case studies over a five year period to study needs, collect relevant data and develop a working hypothesis on the dynamics of leadership transition in their network. The framework outlining three distinct phases of executive transition services and the tools developed through this research are still being used today and are



fundamental to current thinking about the Executive Transition Management “brand” of capacity building. The presentation will include a brief review of the findings from Neighborhood Reinvestment’s early research and a more in-depth look at the practical experience today of Neighborhood Reinvestment staff in implementing the transition management framework with nonprofit organizations in their network.

**#2 How We Do It:** This discussant will explore the Executive Transition Management framework (i.e. process and stages), its intersection with nonprofit organization capacity building, and how theory is informing the development of this work as an opportunity for capacity building. The first part of the presentation will summarize the three phases in the executive transition management process which are 1) Getting Ready, 2) Recruitment and Selection, and 3) Post-hiring Support. Consideration will be given to the specific roles of nonprofit organization executive directors, boards of directors and other stakeholders in each phase. The second part of the presentation will explore the link between transition management and capacity building, and some of the theories informing the work including chaos theory, family systems theory, life cycle theory, and management theory around interim leadership.

**#3 Building Demand and Supply for this Work:** This discussant will explore the effort underway to make executive transition management a widely recognized tool – like strategic planning or program evaluation - for nonprofit organization capacity building. This presentation will trace the roots of this work and the approach to moving it from being an interest of a few people to a growing focus among nonprofit sector stakeholders. Two recent waves of research from CompassPoint Nonprofit Management Services in 1998, and the Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations and Annie E. Casey Foundation in 2000 to the present will be summarized. (The current research builds on the earlier research conducted by Neighborhood Reinvestment in the early 1990’s.) The available data helps us understand the potential scope of executive leadership transitions in the next decade, the issues that are critical for executive directors and boards of directors to consider in preparing their organizations for leadership change, and the preliminary success of executive transition management services. The presentation will conclude with a discussion about the increasing number of nonprofit organization executive directors, boards of directors and philanthropy leaders that are paying attention to executive transition management and the new resources and ideas that are being developed to further build this field of work.

**Paper Number:** CO034021

**Paper Title:** How Do Politicians View Nonprofit Lobbyists? Do's and Don'ts from the Receiving End of Lobbying

**Author(s):**

Elizabeth Baumgarten, Charity Lobbying in the Public Interest, Washington, DC, USA

Dr. H. Woods Bowman, De Paul University, Chicago, IL, USA

Mordecai Lee, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI, USA

**Summary of Research**

The literature on nonprofit lobbying is written almost totally by people associated with the nonprofit sector. But how does it feel to a politician to be lobbied? What works and what doesn't? This colloquy consists of two faculty members who had been elected to the State Legislature of their respective states. The third member of the colloquy panel is a practitioner-trainer who specializes in lobbying issues. She will review the final results of a three-year research project on effective nonprofit lobbying from the perspective of nonprofit executives as well as present tips and strategies on successful lobbying.

**Description**

This colloquy is intended to present to ARNOVA members a perspective that has usually been missing from discussions of nonprofit lobbying: that of politicians. What are the do's and don'ts of lobbying from the point of view of elected officials? This will be an informal training session on effective nonprofit lobbying from the perspective of those on the receiving end such lobbying. Two former politicians will share some war-stories about being lobbied, describing what it's like constantly being lobbied, whether by people from the public, private and nonprofit sectors, and what styles and approaches they found more persuasive than others. As a colloquy, rather than a panel of papers, the session is also intended to be a bit light-hearted, as well as include active participation by the audience sharing some of their poignant experiences – whether good or bad!

Since a colloquy is by its nature more informal than a panel of paper presentations, the members of the panel do not necessarily expect to submit formal papers regarding their presentations at the colloquy.

One of the former elected officials will describe the standards he and his colleagues in the state legislature applied for dealing with lobbyists and lobbying efforts.

1. Most elected officials care only about the views of two population categories: constituents (and future constituents if planning to run for higher office) and potential contributors. Therefore, contacts from other rank-and-file citizens carry very little weight.

2. Many elected officials 'weigh their mail', i.e. they count up the number of contacts they've had from constituents on the two sides of any issue and then assume that the side with the most contacts is a roughly accurate reflection of the views of their constituents. Therefore, a relatively small number of contacts from constituents can carry great weight.

3. When politicians weigh their mail, not all contacts have equal weight. A contact that requires a greater investment of effort is assigned greater influence than a contact that required little time and effort. So, a handwritten and mailed letter has more political 'heft' than a signature on a petition. A personal visit is more powerful than an email.

4. Some elected officials like to listen/talk, others like to read. It is important to provide one's case in the format each prefers. How does one know? Ask their staffers.

5. Most elected officials tend to think of politics as similar to Adam Smith's economic market place: let everyone be as self-interested and selfish as possible and the final outcome would be the best possible

result. Therefore, many politicians see themselves as neutral and passive judges responding to these conflicting inputs. However, this particular elected official tried always to independently define the public interest in each legislative situation and then pursue it. Given the different roles that politicians can assign themselves, nonprofit lobbyists need to pursue lobbying strategies (especially regarding the contents of their pitches) that are effective at the receiving end of this chaotic environment.

6. This particular elected official made a differentiation between self-interested and self-serving lobbying versus those that were disinterested. So, in the context of the nonprofit sector, lobbying by a nonprofit association of liquor retailers would be no different than the self-serving lobbying of liquor businesses themselves. Simply doing the lobbying on the rubric of the nonprofit sector would not add any new legitimacy. On the other hand, lobbying by an interfaith religious group to expand education and training opportunities for welfare recipients would be given great weight since the lobbyists don't obtain any personal or tangible benefit if they'd be successful. So, not all nonprofit lobbyists can operate on this moral high ground. It is a mistake to assume that all nonprofit lobbyists would be given a deference simply because they're from the nonprofit sector. Which part of the nonprofit sector they're from is a crucial distinction that impacts on how they will be received and treated.

The researcher-practitioner on the panel will summarize final results from a 3-year research project on effective nonprofit lobbying. She will also present tips and strategies on effective lobbying. The research findings will address the lobbying activity level of charities as well as the barriers to participation. The Strengthening Nonprofit Advocacy Project (SNAP), was the first national research effort designed to investigate the public policy role of 501(c)(3) organizations. It was undertaken by Tufts University, OMB Watch and Charity Lobbying in the Public Interest. (Some of the early draft findings of the project were shared at the 2002 ARNOVA conference.)

**Paper Number:** CO034022

**Paper Title:** An Interdisciplinary Conversation on Research Methods Best Practices for Non-profits Studies

**Author(s):**

Dr. Carl Milofsky, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA, USA

Ms. Patricia Hughes, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, MN, USA

Dr. Wolfgang Bielefeld, IUPUI, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Dr. Susan Chambre, Baruch College, New York, NY, USA

Dr. Jo Anne Schneider, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, USA

**Summary of Research**

As an inter-disciplinary organization drawing both scholars and practitioners, ARNOVA offers the rare opportunity to foster understandings of issue of concern to the third sector from multiple perspectives. Bringing together scholars and practitioners allows occasions to deepen understanding of the impact of various issues on non-profits and develop practical solutions, dialogues rarely held in forums exclusively for academics or practitioners.

**Description**

The inter-disciplinary nature of non-profit scholarship also presents challenges as scholars educated in various disciplines conceptualize the research process differently. The practitioner community includes people with a wide range of experience with research, varying from PhDs with significant research experience to people with strong community experience, but limited academic training. Given this diverse membership, questions sometimes arise about what constitutes quality research and the benefits of various methods to understand issues of concern to the non-profit sector as a whole.

The proposed colloquy would offer a first step in developing an inter-disciplinary conversation on research methods meant to provide guidelines on research best practices and activities to share information on various methods for scholars and practitioners working on non-profit sector issues. Colloquy participants and audience members would be offered opportunities to develop 1) research notes on various methods for Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 2) workshops on methods for the 2004 Arnova meetings, as well as suggest other mechanisms to share information in research methods techniques.

This forum would bring together seasoned researchers to talk about research methods for 1) multi-methods ethnography in anthropology, 2) qualitative research in the social sciences, 3) quantitative research in the social sciences, 4) economic modeling, and 5) scholar/practitioner collaborations. The proposed colloquy would start with a series of short presentations (8-10 minutes) from scholars in various disciplines addressing the following questions:

#□What are the goals of research in your discipline? (For example to understand a problem holistically, to model future behavior, to determine key factors that affect a research question?)

#□How does your discipline and/or this research method conceptualize the relationship between theory and practice?

#□What are the primary data collection and analysis methods for this type of research?

#□How does this type of research address questions of replication, generalizability, and researcher bias?

#□What are the hallmarks of high quality research? What “red flags” would indicate low quality research?

The remainder of the session would open the floor to audience members for discussion of research issues and ways to disseminate information on various methods to third sector researchers. Toward the end of the session, audience members would be invited to sign up for small groups focused on various methods to develop workshops and other dissemination materials.

#### Discussants/Topics:

**Qualitative Research in the Social Sciences: Triangulation and Truth: Developing Histories of Nonprofit Organizations Using Diverse Data Sources.** The growing availability of data on the nonprofit sector and nonprofit organizations provides students and researchers with remarkable opportunities to develop a more nuanced understanding of the nature of the nonprofit sector and individual organizations. A great deal of information is now available with limited effort including data from large surveys, organization's websites, on Guidestar and in news and magazine databases means that a great deal of information is available throughout the world with limited effort. Why, then, might nonprofit researchers need to do ethnographic fieldwork? Similarly, are searches of organizational records less needed today than in the past? Drawing on fifteen years of research on New York City's AIDS community, this paper will describe the benefits of triangulation in nonprofit research. The paper will point out that information obtained from each type source has potential biases. News articles about organizations often reflect the viewpoints of one or two participants in an organization and often provide a highly favorable picture of an organization or set of events and might in fact not reveal the 'dark side' of nonprofits for various political and strategic reasons. Information on the web, including tax returns, is often incomplete and might reflect a sanitized version of a nonprofit's activities. Individuals might overstate or even understate their own importance in interviews but at the same time provide keen insights into issues not discussed in published sources and a clearer cognitive map of the phenomenon than scattered news articles or documents. Information from archives or organizational records, sometimes not even categorized or filed, often reveals fact about organizations that never make it to the news. The paper will describe the author's study of the Association for Drug Abuse Prevention and Treatment (ADAPT), the first organization in New York City that conducted HIV prevention with active drug users. Information from tax returns, interviews, journal articles and an extensive search in the organization's records revealed a number of events in the organization's history that were not covered in the news and were inaccurately portrayed in Sociological publications. Multiple research methods are recommended as a strategy for obtaining a more holistic and accurate profile of organizations.

**Multi-Methods Ethnographic Research:** Ethnography is the research strategy of Anthropology. In contrast to most social science research, anthropology approaches research problems holistically. The goal of an ethnographic research project is to understand a non-profit organization or a particular issue in organizational theory and practice within the context of history and the various micro and macro level factors that influence organizational behavior. Micro level factors could include staffing and management issues, interactions with program participants, budget strategies, collaborations with other organizations, and location factors. Macro level factors include government policy, funding trends, larger non-profit organization systems, race/class dynamics, and labor market issues that shape the environment for any given organization. Anthropology also focuses on process rather than outcomes, looking at why a particular pattern occurs instead of searching for a small number of variables that account for universal outcomes. Individual anthropological studies tend to concentrate on one organization or community, but looking at common patterns across ethnographic studies provides generalizability. Best practices anthropology generally combines several methodological techniques: participant observation (regular observation of an agency over a period of months or years), interviews, statistical studies or examination of relevant government/administrative quantitative data, analysis of secondary source documents, and examination of relevant historical materials. Using the Kenosha Social Capital Study as an example, this presentation will outline the assumptions behind multi-methods ethnography and the methods used in this technique. The Kenosha Social Capital Study was a multi-methods ethnographic study examining the role of social capital through churches and non-profits in the Latino and African American communities in this small city. The study also looked at the social capital dynamic between these two sub-communities and mainstream Kenosha government and business

sectors. I will also briefly describe the hallmarks of high quality reports or articles in an anthropological tradition.

**Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences:** The research process includes a number of distinctions. One distinction involves exploratory and explanatory studies, the former designed to generate concepts and relationships and the latter designed to generalize and test propositions and theory. Exploratory studies are carried out first in new areas of study. Another distinction involves quantitative and qualitative data, the former involving reliance on numerical measures and statistical conclusions and the latter relying more on verbal or written descriptions and the identification of patterns and trends in them.

Quantitative methods are most often associated with explanatory research. The place of this combination in the research process will be clarified. The state of nonprofit research, in general, will be considered and areas (topics) which have benefited from quantitative research in the past will be identified. Examples (and exemplars) will be considered. Areas which now seem ready to move to this level will be identified and suggestions for how this may usefully transpire will be considered.

**Quantitative Research in Economics:** Econometric modeling is used to understand the determinants of change that we observe in a particular variable. Rather than looking at simple correlations or cross-tabulations between variables, regression analysis is used to uncover the underlying behavioral relationship. To begin, a theory or hypothesis is developed which identifies the important factors in a relationship and their expected impact on the variable in question. For example, we may want to know what factors are important in influencing an individual's level of charitable donations. We consider the financial factors and incentives, the need for the service funded by the donations, and individual characteristics that may influence philanthropic behavior. To consider how any one factor affects donations we estimate a multiple variable regression model, which considers all factors simultaneously. The estimation allows the separate influence of each factor to be measured, holding all other factors constant. For this process to provide accurate results, the entire relationship must be specified, and a representative sample of the population must be included. I will discuss issues of specification, interpretation, and inference provided by the regression model.

**Academic/Practitioner Partnerships: What Academics Can Offer to Practitioners** Often the discussion in the nonprofit research community about how scholars can assist practitioners is based on an assumption that researchers possess or have developed advanced knowledge that would be useful to practitioners if it were translated into a form lay practitioners could understand. The relationship is expected to be hierarchical and practitioners are thought to be less schooled, less sophisticated, and less equipped to understand esoteric language and the language of complex data analysis.

This paper presumes that in reality practitioners routinely use complex skills and sophisticated knowledge and that scholars generally have limited knowledge of current issues, new areas of knowledge development, or the practical skills required for successful management in most nonprofits. Scholarly knowledge may be esoteric in language but it usually is irrelevant to the real world problems practitioners confront. The question arises, what do scholars have to offer practitioners that is useful and that would make partnerships worth developing?

This paper argues that scholars are most useful to practitioners when they work as partners addressing problems that practitioners define and find challenging. When scholars jointly define and analyze problems, collect data, and create experimental interventions there are genuine gains for practitioners. Scholars provide three kinds of benefits to practitioners: they are capable of organizing and carrying through to completion the process of research; they are able to make available institutional resources and prestige connected to the university or scholarly community; and they apply disciplinary methods of analysis to practical problems that practitioners find creative, useful, and stimulating. The presentation I propose for the ARNOVA conference would explain these three contributions and give examples.

In this approach, scholars contribute because they are catalysts allowing practitioners to collect and

analyze data in new ways. The hierarchical model of scholar/practitioner relationships has it wrong, however, in presuming that practitioners are less sophisticated than scholars either in theoretical background or data collection and analysis skills. The practical demands and the institutional settings of practitioners' work make it hard for them to do advanced data analysis or to apply it to real world problems. The scholar-catalyst makes sustained data analysis possible for practitioners.