8-2009

2009 Applied Projects Organizational Impact Report

Heather Carpenter
Caster Family Center for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Research, University of San Diego

Paula Krist
Caster Family Center for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Research, University of San Diego

Applied Projects Organizational Impact Report

August 2009

Heather Carpenter, MMNA
Research Assistant
Caster Family Center for Nonprofit Research

Paula Krist, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment Support
School of Leadership and Education Sciences

Special thanks to Pat Libby, MS, for conceptualizing the study and supporting it from the very beginning to its completion, Linda Siefert, Ph.D., for guiding the design of the study, Robert Donmoyer, Ph.D., for providing qualitative research insights and expertise throughout the process, and Pressley Rankin IV, for designing the report.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Student learning outcomes and student satisfaction of nonprofit management graduate degree programs have received much attention recently from researchers. However, little research examines the community impact of such programs.

This paper reports findings from a community impact study of the Masters of Arts in Nonprofit Leadership and Management at the University of San Diego. An extensive qualitative study was conducted to determine whether student-led applied projects conducted for nonprofit organizations had an impact on those organizations, and if so, to assess the type and duration of that impact. A key finding was that all organizations that were interviewed for the study used the student-created project in some capacity. In addition it was found that although some organizations may not have fully used the project, they benefitted from the project recommendations. Students employed by their own organizations completed the most successful projects. This was because students chose a project precisely when it was needed by the organization.

Report findings contain recommendations for future research and for future students engaging in projects. The future student recommendations range from improving communication between students and organizations to improving the timing and duration of student projects. Nonprofit graduate program directors can utilize these results and recommendations when creating and/or managing the experiential learning components within their programs.

Background

Many universities that offer a graduate degree concentration in nonprofit management (three or more courses) are requiring students to engage in different types of experiential learning throughout the degree program. The Nonprofit Leadership and Management (NLM) masters degree program at the University of San Diego has an experiential learning component that requires students to complete applied projects in most courses offered through the program. Examples of these applied projects include: board manuals, financial management procedures, and performance audits.

Each student completes at least eight applied projects during the degree period. Roughly 30% of these projects are included in students' final portfolios along with a letter from the nonprofit organization for which the project was conducted verifying that the organization used the project. At the beginning of this research study, approximately 276 projects had been completed by students for nonprofit organizations.

Problem Statement

Traditionally, impact studies of universities that offer a graduate concentration in nonprofit management focus on student satisfaction and measures of specific student learning outcomes (Wilson & Larson, 2002; Fletcher, 2005; Herman & Renz, 2007). However, little research has been conducted to measure the community impact of such programs. In other words, little research has focused on studying the impact of nonprofit-focused graduate degree programs on the nonprofit organizations themselves. Because of the importance of this missing piece of outcomes evidence, there was a need and opportunity to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the applied projects portion of USD's NLM program.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the current research was to determine whether student-led projects had an impact on the nonprofit organizations for which they were developed, and if so, to assess the type and duration of that impact. There were six questions that guided the research.

Research Questions

1. What was the organization's motivation to participate in the project?
2. What, if any, was the nature and duration of the impact of the applied project on the organization?
3. Was the relationship between the student and the nonprofit organization a factor in whether or not the project was used as designed, and did that relationship affect the degree to which the project had an impact on the organization?
4. Were the organization members' perceptions of the need for the project a factor in whether or not the project was used as designed and did they affect the level of impact the project had on the organization?
5. Did the use and degree of impact of the project change based on internal support for the project during both development and implementation periods?
6. What role did the organization members' overall satisfaction with the final product play in the impact of the project on the organization?

Selected Review of Literature

The majority of literature that evaluates nonprofit management education programs focuses on student learning outcomes and alumni perspectives (Wilson & Larson, 2002; Fletcher, 2005; Herman & Renz, 2007). The few studies that assess the impact of nonprofit focused graduate programs from the nonprofit perspective, originate from nonprofit management education and service-learning literature.

In the nonprofit management education literature, Mirabella and Wish (1999) conducted focus groups at universities across the country to assess the community impact of nonprofit management graduate degree programs. They called it assessing "stakeholder perspectives" (p. 330). Employers assessed students acquiring management tools and new collaboration opportunities with the university as determinants of impact.

Another study, conducted at the University of Pittsburg, assessed the community impact of graduate students engaging in projects through the Nonprofit Clinic, an outreach center on campus (Bright, Bright, & Haley, 2007). Although not connected to a specific degree program, nonprofits benefitted greatly from students engaging in these projects.

The service-learning literature tends to focus on undergraduate students engaging in projects and student attitudes about such projects (Jorge, 2003; McCarthy & Tucker, 1999; Nichols & Monard, 2001; Petkus, 2000). The few studies of graduate students completing projects in local nonprofits focus on student learning and nonprofit university partner relationships rather than organization impact (Bacon, 2002; Basinger & Bartholomew, 2006; Dorado & Giles, 2004; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Worrall, 2007). One study that focused on nonprofit and university partnerships also assessed the community impact of the projects that students completed while enrolled in a nonprofit graduate degree course at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst (Bushouse, 2005). Overall, the nonprofits reported great utility of the service-learning projects.

These articles are important for understanding the degree to which nonprofit graduate degree programs are assessing community impact. In a study of outreach centers that provide professional development, capacity building, research or other services to the nonprofit community, Mirabella and Renz (2001) state, "[Nonprofits] want help in designing and implementing programs and strategies that will work, and many think (and hope) that there is help to be found within the walls of higher education" (p. 15). The experiential education components in nonprofit graduate programs provide these strategies for nonprofit success.

Methodology

The researchers determined that the best way to obtain this information was to interview program alumni (employed by the organizations) and employees of the nonprofit organizations for which projects were conducted. Interviewing is a qualitative research method and the methods used in this study were inductive and taken from grounded theorists (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Pidgeon & Henwood, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). A standard interview protocol was developed (Appendix 1) and used with each of the participants. One researcher conducted all of the interviews to reduce data collection bias.

Data Collection

The researchers employed a stratified-random sampling procedure (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003) to select the projects and organizations to be included in the study. The researchers selected a sample 40 out of the 276 possible projects. The projects selected represented specific strata (categories) including project types, project years, and those projects included in the students' portfolios. The researchers randomly selected projects from nineteen different project types and projects completed between 2002 through 2007. Due to the stratified-random sampling procedure, three rounds of interviews were conducted to include projects in different strata or categories. In round one, projects were selected based on the types that the students most often included in their portfolios. In round two, projects were selected based on the types that the students had frequently completed but only included a few times in their portfolios. In round three, projects were selected based on the types that the students had completed least often, but which were overrepresented in their portfolios. Although the students had completed more than one project for each organization, for the purpose of this study, researchers selected and interviewed a representative of each organization one time. For a detailed chart of sampling procedures, see Appendix 2.

After projects and organizations were selected, the researchers mailed consent requests to all alumni. The majority of the students (99%) allowed their projects to be included in the study. The researcher then requested interviews with the organizations' representatives, executives and staff members who worked closely with the student on the selected projects. There were four types of employees interviewed; two were exclusively employed by the organization, executives of the organization (hereinafter referred to as Executives) and organizational staff members (hereinafter referred to as Staff Members). The other two groups were students enrolled in the nonprofit program who were employed in an executive or staff capacity by the organization (hereinafter referred to as Student-Executives or Student-Staff). The researcher followed up several times by phone and e-mail to set up the interviews with Executives or Student-Executives, Student-Staff.

Table 1 below shows that forty interviews were attempted and nineteen interviews were completed. For a more detailed list of interviews completed, see Appendix 3. Eleven organizations did not respond to interview requests and six organizations had no knowledge of the project. This was due to the fact that the people who had knowledge of the project had left the organization. Two organizations were too busy to participate, one said the project was never presented to the organization, and one said the organization never implemented the project and did not wish to be interviewed.

In total, 19 interviews took place during the months of September 2008 through May 2009. The interviews were conducted using an established interview protocol of ten pre-set questions and related prompts (Appendix 1). Thirteen interviews took place at the Executives' and/or Student-Executives' offices. Three interviews took place over the phone and three interviews took place at the University of San Diego. Each Executive Director signed a letter of consent allowing the researcher to conduct the interviews at his or her office location. The interviews ranged from 15-45 minutes in duration and were audio recorded.

Table 1.
Interview Attempts and Completion

	Attempted	Completed
Round 1	17	7
Round 2	9	6
Round 3	14	6
Total	40	19

The 19 organizations varied in size and mission. Table 2 below shows the demographics of organizational respondents in total revenue and number of Full Time Equivalent Employees (FTE). The smallest organization had $10,000 in total revenue and the largest organization had over $42,000,000 in total revenue.

Even with this large span of size of respondent organizations, size did not affect the types of projects chosen for the organizations, nor did it affect organizational use of the project.

Table 2.
Demographic Information

Size (In total revenue)	Size (# of FTE Staff)	Number of Projects
≤ 500,000	0 to 2	5
501,000 to 999,999	3 to 12	5
1,000,000 to 2,999,999	4 to 21	5
≥ 3,000,000	145 to 1000	4

Because the study included projects completed between 2002 and 2007, many nonprofit staff had difficulty remembering many of the projects and did not wish to participate in the interviews because they had little knowledge of project. It was also a goal to interview multiple people within the organization about the project. This was also difficult due to people's busy schedules and little knowledge of the projects. A few Executives agreed to be interviewed even though they had little recollection of the project itself and they remembered pieces of the project process. Students were very receptive to being interviewed because they had pride and ownership over the work they had completed.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using coding methods developed by grounded theorists. Glaser and Strauss (1967) introduced methods and developed theory grounded in systematically gathered and analyzed data (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). The analysis (open coding) identified and described categories from the interview transcripts and field notes related to the relationship between the student and the organization, the types of impact and duration of impact, and the factors that led to these.

In the data analysis, most of the themes that emerged fell into specific categories that were expected responses based on the interview questions. These categories were: reasons for the project, team interaction and involvement, and organizational use of project. Each of these categories will be described in greater detail in the findings section. Some of the data were also unexpected and did not fall into specific pre-set categories.

General themes: Expected

The general themes that fell into expected categories were:

- Several of the Student-Executives interviewed said they benefitted from having an outside student's perspective on the project.
- The most successful projects were ones completed by students employed by the organization (Student-Executives, Student-Staff) where the students chose a project that the organization needed and it was the right "time" for the project.
- Communication within and across groups was the most important factor in the success of the project and the following factors were highlighted:
    - Communication between the organization and the team members during the project development process had an influence on whether the project was used by the organization.
    - Communication among team members facilitated successful projects.
    - Communication within the organization about next steps led to more clear and useful project designs.
- All projects were used by the organizations in some manner.

- Even if organizations did not fully use the project, one or more aspects of the project were useful and beneficial.
- In a few cases the projects could not be utilized because the organization lacked the funding or capacity for the project.
- In one or two cases, the organization was not yet ready, for a variety of reasons, to use the project.
- Some Executives or Staff could not remember the details of the project, but nevertheless realized the value of the students working with their organizations.
- Strategic Planning and Capital Campaign feasibility studies were never fully "used" in the way this study is examining use, because these projects were presented as recommendations for the feasibility of a specific campaign. The organizations decided whether or not to proceed with the campaign based on the work produced by the students.

General Themes: Unexpected

The general themes that did not fall into specific categories:

- There was a potential for misunderstanding between an organization and the student volunteer who proposed a change within the organization. In some cases students thought they knew what was best for the organization, when in fact it was not the right time or type of project for the organization.
- In one instance the Student-Executive realized during the project process that the project wasn't right for the organization so he recommended that the organization not fully utilize the project.

Findings

This section will describe in detail the expected general themes that emerged during the interviews. These themes included: motivation for the project, team interaction and involvement, and project use. The findings provide insights into understanding employer perspectives and the benefits and challenges of the applied project process.

Student and Client Motivation for Embarking on the Project

There were a variety of reasons why projects were started by the students or organizations. In fifteen of the projects, students had an idea for a project that they suggested to an organization. In eleven of the projects the students were employed by the organization (as Student-Executive or Student-Staff) for which they developed the project. In four of the projects, the organizations paid a fee for students to develop a project.

Projects were started because organizations wanted to diversify their funding sources, be strategic, attempt to measure impact, expand the relationship of the organization within the community, expand their facilities, build an endowment, develop legislation, create and formalize existing policies, have constituents work together on common issues, provide support to current staff and volunteers, reach more constituents, to create a new program, or build capacity of an emerging nonprofit organization. One Executive said, "We realized this would be a good opportunity without a high cost associated to it and the expertise of the leadership and the students to let us know if we were feeling the right thing."

Team Interaction and Student Involvement with Client Organizations

"[The project] wouldn't have worked well if I was doing this solo because I would not have any other resource; my partner was a great resource to me."

Team interaction and involvement were important for project success. At the beginning of the semester, students chose their teams members. Depending on the course, students either chose an organization where one team member was a Student-Executive, Student-Staff or they chose an organization where one team member volunteered for an organization. Students conducted projects either alone or in teams of 2-5 people. Over the course of the semester teams met as frequently as once a week to as little as every other month to discuss the project. Teams also met with the organizations for which they were completing the project on a regular basis. In many cases, team members distributed work evenly across the entire team, and each team member was in charge of a different aspect of the project.

The most successful projects were ones completed by students employed by the organization (Student-Executives, Student-Staff) where the students chose a project that the organization needed and it was the right 'time' for the project.

Team composition and interaction with the organization had both positive and negative effects on the project use. On the positive side, three organizations expressed the competency of the teams and their knowledge and expertise of the subject matter. Student-Executives and Student-Staff also expressed the benefit of having their team composed of both an internal staff member and external volunteer. When an external volunteer worked on the project, they pulled in outside resources, examples, and templates that the team could use during the project. This outside team member often asked tough questions and challenged the internal team members' assumptions. For example, one Student-Executive said, "[The project] wouldn't have worked well if I was doing this solo because I would not have any other resource; my partner was a great resource to me."

On the negative side, in some cases only the student employed by the organization actually conducted the project presentation, leaving out the other team members. The Executives had no difficulty remembering the Student-Staff member's role in the project, but remembered very little about the external team member's role in the project. Additionally, two of the four organizations that had paid for their projects wanted more interaction with the student teams and would have liked to meet more frequently with the students. Several Executives also believed that the quality of the projects suffered due to the time constraint of completing the projects within a semester. One Executive said, "The students had to gather the information so fast and they had to really analyze it overnight with really hard deadlines." And, "You put so much stress, so that the quality may not be there because of the time frame and the curriculum they have to complete."

Organizational Use of Projects by Client Organizations

All projects were used by the organizations in some manner.

One of the main issues that came up during the interviews was the degree to which organizations used the projects. Researchers had expected to be able to describe the implementation of the projects. However, after a few interviews, it became apparent that few of the projects were fully implemented. The researchers chose the word "use" to describe varying levels of implementation. There were two different levels of project use. Fully used and/or utilized (7 projects); and somewhat used and/or utilized (12 projects).

When organizations fully utilized the project, they did so because the project met a need in the organization. One Executive said, "The project validated information that the organization already knew and validated they weren't just making assumptions. [The project also] gave clearly defined tasks we could do to improve the organization."

Somewhat used and/or utilized means the organization used one or more components of the project. Even though an organization may not have fully used a project, they benefitted from the project in some way. Several of the ways in which the organizations benefitted were:

a) **Used parts of the project to secure additional funding for future projects:** One organization used the project to secure a $20,000 grant for another community outreach project, and another organization used constituent interview data in grant proposals. Funders responded to these direct quotes about the program and as a result provided additional funding to the organization.

b) **Learned how to conduct future business in a new way:** At the time the project was conducted the organization was not ready, but now it is. The board of directors is now using this project to plan for the future.

c) **Used part of the project as a template for their other work:** Several organizations used components of the projects in their future work. For example, one organization used part of the project in their volunteer manual, and another organization used part of project in their capital campaign.

d) **Thought about their work in a new way:** After an advocacy project a Student/ Executive became more open to changing legislation. Another project changed a Student/ Executive's attitude about how they recruited volunteers.

Functional or Capacity Issues

Either functional or capacity issues explain why projects were not fully utilized by an organization.

Either functional or capacity issues explain why projects were not fully utilized by an organization. Two out of the three organizations that had Capacity issues had less than $1,000,000 in total revenue.

Functional issues (9 projects) included:

- The organization wasn't ready for the project;
- Another issue was more important at the time the project was proposed;
- The current leadership did not agree with the direction of the project;
- More work needed to be done in order to use the project, and;
- The project wasn't right for the organization or certain aspects of the project were not right for the organization.

Capacity issues (3 projects) included:

- The organization did not have sufficient staff to implement the project, or staff to approve the project moving forward, and;
- There were inadequate funds available to implement the project.

Manuals for nonprofit Board of Directors were used the most.

The table below summarizes the projects by type and level of utilization within the organization. Manuals for nonprofit Board of Directors were used the most. These projects were the most manageable, most needed and easiest to implement. Nonprofits utilized all aspects of the manuals.

Community organizing plans were the least utilized. This could be due to the fact these projects were beyond the scope of the organization and required community support in order to occur. Nonprofits did utilize some aspects of the community action framework in their existing programs.

Table 3.
Project Type and Level of Utilization

Project Type	Level of Utilization (All, some, none)
Community Organizing Plan	All, Some, Some
Development/Fundraising	Some
Strategic Planning Environmental Scan	All, Some
Volunteer Manual	Some
Board Manual	All, All, All
Advocacy	Some
Capital Campaign Feasibility Study	Some, Some, Some
Collaboration	Some, All
Governance	Some
Marketing	Some
HR Manual	All

Feasibility Study Projects

The uniqueness of capital campaign and strategic planning projects also affected utilization of the projects. These types of projects are unique because they are requested by the organization. Students engage in these projects and present their recommendations to the organization at the end of the semester. No physical project is completed by the organization, so projects are not fully utilized in the traditional sense. However, nonprofits utilized project recommendations to determine whether or not to proceed with a capital campaign or create a strategic plan.

Recommendations from Study Participants

Executives, Staff, Student-Executives and Student-Staff all provided specific recommendations for students engaging in future projects. These recommendations were grouped into three categories: communication, team composition, and project scope. Not everyone offered suggestions. Those that did offered suggestions were applicable to the majority of the projects. Recommendations below are listed and described within these categories.

Communication

1) **Increase formal university contact.** One Executive expressed the frustration of the student not communicating fully about the project process. She said, “I would have liked a letter from the professor explaining the project before hand” which will help “create clarity with the organization and what the student needs to be able to develop a project an organization can really use.”
2) **Schedule frequent meetings between students and the client organization.** Several teams only met with organizations two times during the semester. Executives and Staff agree that more meetings between the organizations and student teams would be preferable. One Staff member said, “It was hard to find a time to meet that worked for both the student group and the staff.”
3) **Have students follow up with the client organization after the project is completed.** One Executive wanted students to follow up with his organization after the semester was over and projects were completed to ensure that the project was being fully used by his organization. He suggested that students follow up with organizations after six months, twelve months and two years.
4) **Have students engage with organizations in active listening and communication.** One Student-Staff member suggested that students engage in active listening, internalize what the organization says and communicate clearly with the organization when they are working on the project. When students do not engage in active listening, they may choose a project that is not in alignment with the organization. For example, one student proposed specific items in a marketing plan that the organization had already tried and did not work. If the student had engaged in active communication with the organization throughout this project, this could have been avoided. With increased listening and communications students can create meaningful projects for organizations. Another Student-Executive expressed that students need to ask specific questions to find out what projects are possible within the organization and if the organization is ready for the particular project that the student wants to complete.

Team Considerations

1) **Team composition should ideally include:**

   a. **A staff member**: multiple Executives expressed the benefits of students working for the organization in which projects were conducted. Student teams that included a staff member were better able to pick projects that were aligned with the organization’s mission: One Executive said, “My reception to the idea isn’t directly correlated to the importance of it, much as it is like, my priorities have already been set and I don’t know if there is a greater possibility of not being as receptive” (sic). And “I can’t see it being done without the input of those who are more likely going to be implementing it or authorizing the implementation.” This also means students should pick projects with input from organizational executives.

b. **An outside volunteer** (students who volunteer for the organization for the purpose of the project): several Student-Executives benefitted from having an outside team member be a part of the project team and provide their input to the process. One Student-Executive also wished she had another student volunteer working with her on the project to gain an outside perspective and resource.

2) **Team members should ideally self-disclose their individual strengths and weaknesses:** Teams that understood members' strengths and weaknesses were able to capitalize on the strengths of each member. For example, one Student-Executive said, "One team member's strength was in finances so she could look at the financial systems of the organization."

3) **Team members should be prepared to be flexible because changes will occur during the project:** One Student-Staff member said, "Be open to change… I think community organizing is about listening to what is being echoed in the community, and to really listen to that deeply and to embrace it and create it in a way that what you need to get done to meet the needs of your organization. It is a fine and delicate balance."

Project Scope

"The challenges with these types of projects [are] they have to be short enough and small enough where they can be done in the time for the class. Projects need to be large enough to be substantial and make a real contribution in the allotted time."

1) **Maximize project time:** Equally important to the Executives was the speed of the project. Several Executives who paid for the project noticed how rushed the students appeared to be during the project development process. One Executive said, "The challenges with these types of projects [are] they have to be short enough and small enough where they can be done in the time for the class. Projects need to be large enough to be substantial and make a real contribution in the allotted time."

The project has to match what the organization needs. One Student-Executive said, "I learned about what was realistic for my organization."

2) **Select manageable projects:** Manageable projects are projects that can be completed within the constraints of the semester. In several courses, large-scale feasibility studies and research projects are completed and it is difficult for students to complete these projects within the time frame of one semester. One Executive suggested that the students identify organizations before the course begins so the organization can set up meetings with the student and the student can meet with the right people at the beginning of the course. Additionally, students do not have to include everything in the project. The project has to match what the organization needs. One Student-Executive said, "I learned about what was realistic for my organization."

3) **Ensure that students select a topic they enjoy:** One Executive said, "Students will have more fun, be more interested and organizations will benefit if it is a subject student is interested in and vested in."

It is clear from these recommendations that a manual should be created to orient students to the project process.

It is clear from these recommendations that a manual should be created to orient students to the project process. This manual could consist of a one to two page document explaining the best practices for students to engage and complete successful projects.

The document could include key areas and recommendations for communication, team composition, and project scope. Additionally, the document should provide recommendations for students to work with the faculty in completing the project in the most efficient manner within the confines of each semester. With an orientation manual in place students are likely to address the majority of recommendations above.

A similar study undertaken by the University of Pittsburg (Bright, Bright, and Haley, 2007) recommended important lessons for successful projects, including:

- A "pre-project discussion with the program staff, faculty supervisor, and the potential client organization;"
- A "commitment for the project from both the organization's Executive Director and board of directors, and;"
- "Clarity [between] students and faculty supervisors about the expectations of projects" (p. 342).

Limitations of the Study

Every effort was made to minimize the limitations and bias of this research. However, there were some limitations in this study. First, in order to avoid bias, a researcher in the Caster Family Center conducted this study. Program Directors and other program staff of the NLM program were not involved in the design, data collection, analysis and writing of the report. Also, the researcher from the Center is currently enrolled in the doctoral program within the School of Leadership and Education Sciences (SOLES), has completed several NLM courses, co-teaches the Nonprofit Finance course and has positive views of the program. This bias was addressed by having the report reviewed by the Director of Assessment Support for SOLES.

Second, the total number of organizations interviewed was a small sample out of the possible 276 projects completed for more than 130 organizations. The researcher used a stratified random sampling procedure to address this limitation.

In addition, the range of years of projects selected for the research was too broad and did not include the most recent years (projects completed in 2008 and 2009). In many of the earlier projects the people involved in the development and implementation were no longer with the organization. For projects developed more than three years ago, those involved found it difficult to remember the circumstances of the project. It would have been better to study all projects completed in the last two years by students. There would have been fewer non-responses and more Executives and Staff would have remembered the projects. Even so, it is important to note that year the project was completed did not appear to influence project use and impact by the organizations.

Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

Because such an in-depth study assessing the community impact of nonprofit focused graduate degree programs had not been conducted previously, this study is a step forward for the field.

Because such an in-depth study assessing the community impact of nonprofit focused graduate degree programs had not been conducted previously, this study is a step forward for the field. Additionally, the nonprofit management education field as a whole is interested in the direct impact nonprofit graduate degree programs can have on organizations within the community. Nonprofit graduate program directors can utilize these results and recommendations when creating and or managing the experiential learning components within their programs.

Future research on experiential learning in nonprofit focused graduate degree programs must begin with a common vocabulary which will facilitate the sharing of research methods and results among nonprofit academic researchers. Because little research has been conducted to study and measure the community impact, this study provides a good first step.

The next step in future research should be to conduct a comprehensive inventory of the types of experiential education included in nonprofit focused masters programs. After an inventory of the field is completed, researchers should assess experiential learning components at universities that have similar experiential learning components.

As the current study highlights, future research of experiential learning should assess projects completed by students in the last two years. Projects completed more that two years prior to the study are difficult for nonprofit Staff and Executives to remember. In addition, the person who developed the project may have left the organization.

Finally, future research on experiential learning components should compare the effectiveness and use of student projects on the nonprofits themselves using nonprofit evaluation and capacity building models. Survey and interview protocols should also be developed using literature from the following fields: nonprofit education, service-learning, nonprofit evaluation, capacity-building, and experiential learning.

References

Bacon, N. (2002). Differences in faculty and community partners' theories of Learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 34-44.

Basinger, N., Bartholomew, K. (2006). Service-learning in nonprofit organizations: Motivations, expectations, and outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 14, 15-26.

Bright, L., Bright, C., & Haley, L. L. (2007). Nonprofit outreach services: Using outreach to increase nonprofits' capacity and to provide a quality educational experience for students. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. 13, 335-343.

Bushouse, B. K. (2005). Community nonprofit organizations and service-learning: resource constraints to building partnerships with universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12, 32-40.

Dorado, S., & Giles, D. E. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: Paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11, 25-37.

Fletcher, K. (2005). The impact of receiving a master's degree in nonprofit management on graduates' professional lives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34, 433-447.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Adeline.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2007). Nonprofit management alumni knowledge, skills, and career satisfaction in relation to nonprofit academic centers council curricular guidelines: The case of one university's master's of public administration alumni. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36, 98S-109.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersima, W., Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Jorge, E. (2003). Outcomes for community partners in an unmediated service-learning program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10, 28-38.

McCarthy, A. M., & Tucker, M. L. (1999). Student attitudes toward service learning: Implications for implementation. *Journal of Management Education*, 23, 554-573.

Mirabella, R. M., & Renz. D. O. (2001). Nonprofit management outreach programs: An examination of institutional mission and setting. *Public Performance &*

Management Review, 25, 14-29.

Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B. (1999). Educational impact of graduate nonprofit degree programs: Perspectives of multiple stakeholders. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 9, 329-340.

Nichols, A.H., & Monard, K. (2001). Designing intergenerational service-learning courses based on student characteristics*. Educational Gerontology*, 27, 37-48.

Petkus, E. (2000). A theoretical and practical framework for service-learning in marketing: Kolb's experiential learning cycle. *Journal of Marketing Education.* 22, 64-70.

Pidgeon, N. & Henwood, K. (1996). Grounded theory: Practical implementation. In Richardson, J. T. E. (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. (pp. 86-101). New Jersey: Wiley Blackwell.

Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 13, 30-43.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Wilson, M. I., & Larson, R. S. (2002). Nonprofit management students: Who they are and why they enroll. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31, 259-270.

Worrall, L. (2007). Asking the community: A case study of community partner perspectives*. Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 14, 5-17.

Appendix 1: Interview Protocol

Project Initiation

1. Tell me about your organization.
2. Please describe the project that Nonprofit students did at your organization.
3. What approach was used to initiate the project?
    a. What approach would you suggest for future students?
    b. How actively involved was _______ before they started the project?
    c. What was their role/position in the organization?
    d. How did ________ find out about the project or get involved?
4. Tell me what the students did with the project.
    a. How did that mesh with your expectations?
5. Tell me who was involved at the organizational level in this project.
    a. Did organizational involvement go as high as the board level?
    b. Can you describe a need that the project addressed?

Project Development Process

1. Please describe the project development process. What happened while the student was working on the project?
    a. During the project how actively was _____ involved in the organization?
    b. How often did you meet with ___________?
    c. Was ________ a staff or volunteer? Position? Title?
2. How actively involved were other members of the organization in contributing to the work?
    a. How long did the project take?

b. What factors could have been changed or improved during the project development process?

After Project Completion

1. How did the results of the project meet or not meet your expectations?

2. How were the project results used by your organization?

    a. In what ways? Or Why do you think they weren't used?

    b. Has the project been integrated into the organization?

    c. Please explain. Or (d)

    d. What factors might have increased the likeliness of implementation?

3. How has the project and process affected your organization overall?

Appendix 2: Stratified-Sampling Procedure

Type of Project	Total	Total in Portfolio	Pilot Round 1 (High # in portfolio & High # overall)	Round 2 (Low # portfolio & High # overall)	Round 3 (High # portfolio & Low # overall)
Advocacy	9	5		3	
Board Manual	12	4		3	
Board Assessment/Plan	15	2			
Business Plan	5	2			
Bylaws	4	1			
Capital Campaign Feasibility Study	7	4		3	
Collaboration	11	0			3
Community Organizing Plan	22	5	3		
Development/Fundraising	29	9	3		
Ethics	30	3			3
Finance	31	3			3
Governance	8	0			3
HR Manual	5	3			
Marketing	32	3			3
Research Project	16	11	3		
Risk Management	3	0			
Strategic Planning Environmental Scan	15	8	3		
Technology	11	1			
Volunteer Manual	11	6	3		
Totals	276	70	15	9	15

Appendix 3: Interviews Completed

Type of Project	Round	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total	Total in Portfolio
Community Organizing Plan	1			1	1	1		3	1
Development/Fundraising	1					1		1	1
Strategic Planning Environmental Scan	1					1	1	2	1
Volunteer Manual	1				1			1	
Research Project	1							0	
Board Manual	2			1	2			3	1
Advocacy	2		1					1	1
Capital Campaign Feasibility Study	2			1	1	1		3	2
Collaboration	3				1		1	2	
Ethics	3							0	
Finance	3							0	
Governance	3		1					1	
Marketing	3					1		1	
HR Manual	3			1				1	1
Totals		0	2	4	6	5	2	19	8