Building a Service Corps: Using Capacity Building Strategies to Promote Service-Learning and Social Entrepreneurship Within a Higher Education Consortium

Joseph Hampton Holland   Phillis L. George
University of Mississippi

Karson M. Nelson
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Abstract

This article entails a case analysis of a sample of schools from a higher education network or consortium in partnership with The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation. The Foundation seeks to empower students and communities through civic engagement and social entrepreneurship. A primary mechanism for doing so is by developing and cultivating a network of 70 colleges and universities, thereby enabling the Foundation's capacity to educate and prepare nearly 250,000 collegians for life-long and intentional careers in social change-making. To assist with this endeavor, the Foundation commissioned this study to assess the existing service corps and social entrepreneurship framework of its partner institutions. Using a capacity-building framework, the study includes findings from a survey of existing service-learning and social entrepreneurship programs and initiatives as well as recommendations for strengthening the Sullivan network or higher education consortium to provide more formal service-learning and social entrepreneurial experiences for collegians.
Keywords: service-learning, social entrepreneurship, higher education, capacity-building

Across the vast and expansive landscape that has come to shape and define American higher education, colleges and universities of all configurations and sizes are recognizing the need and importance of civility and respect (Campus Compact, 2015). Just as importantly, through their emphasis on social entrepreneurship, they are working to actively reconceptualize and reaffirm their commitment to the promotion and integration of civic engagement and social responsibility into their curricula through a 21st century lens (Harkavy & Hodges, 2012; Welch & Saltmarsh, 2013). Emphasis is placed on the societal period and context in which these institutional efforts are taking place. The 21st century, still very much in its infancy, is a time in which colleges and universities are tasked with honoring their original purpose—which includes (but is not limited to) the provision of a more educated, civic, and trained citizenry. To honor this social contract, the foundational aspects of a more learned (and arguably global) society must be revisited. In doing so, critical lessons regarding civility and respect for individuals, practices, and perspectives different from one's own become a focal point. Those lessons are then reinforced by curricular revisions and innovations that promote civic and social responsibility, including social entrepreneurism. Although robust and earnest in these endeavors, academic institutions are not alone in the quest to educate and train collegians so that they are well-versed in social change-making and entrepreneurism. This mission is shared by a multitude of civic entities and organizations that exist externally to higher education.

One such organization is The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation, which has a tripartite mission of honoring, supporting, and educating youth committed to transformational change through service (The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation, 2015). The foundation has an established history (since 1934) of working to advance this core mission. That history incudes partnering with a network and / or informal consortium of 70 higher education

institutions to help empower and educate service-oriented, civic minded, and socially responsible youth. Because of its extensive history of working toward this goal, the foundation has an operational reach that mirrors (albeit on a smaller scale) the social imprints of more known and global organizations, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Ford Foundation, Lilly Endowment, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

Each of these foundations continue to work in meaningful ways with academic institutions to promote and advance learning for the express purpose of transforming communities and improving the overall quality of life, as well as the life trajectory of America's citizenry. Vulnerable and marginalized citizens are inevitably a focal point of this critically important work. Thus, creating and building focused partnerships with higher education institutions is deemed by many of these foundations a worthwhile and mutually beneficial endeavor to help leverage and further expand resources. University and community partnerships have long been accepted as valuable and highly effective collaborations to help combat social injustices while training the next generation of social change agents to (a) value their communities and (b) use their knowledge and skills to improve those same communities (Battistoni & Longo, 2011; Campus Compact, 2015; Harkavy & Hodges, 2012). By the same token, university and corporate partnerships have also proven to be effective in eradicating educational, socioeconomic, health, and workforce disparities (Austin, Leonard, Reficco, & Wei-Skillern, 2004; Cooper, Kotval-K, Kotval, & Mullin, 2014; Dees & Anderson, 2003).

The intentionality with which these collaborative partnerships have been forged is commendable. However, it is worth noting the existing void among such partnerships concerning the deliberate pairing of private, non-profit organizations with higher education institutions for a shared cause relating to the promotion of student growth and community success through service and social entrepreneurship experiences. To clarify, there are existing partnerships to this effect. Additionally, there are many non-profit and social enterprise organizations seeking to address educational and social needs, but greater abundance is needed (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). This is, in fact, what makes the Sullivan Foundation so unique in its charge, and it is why the researchers have elected to write this article. This research article is driven by the following question, "What capacity building strategies can be used to promote and integrate service and social entrepreneurship into curricular and co-curricular experiences?"

The purpose of the research is to analyze the inner and strategic workings and programmatic offerings of selected institutions that work with a private, non-profit organization to advance social change through service endeavors. These institutions form a unified network or informal consortium committed to advancing a social change and civic agenda by aspiring and / or committing to integrate service-learning and social entrepreneurship into their academic and co-curricula. Given these aspirations, the researchers rely on capacity building as a primary framework to undergird the analysis.

Capacity Building: A Core Framework

Paul Light (2000) suggests capacity is "everything an organization uses to achieve its mission, from desks and chairs to programs and people" (p. 15). Moreover, Letts, Ryan, and Grossman (1999) suggest capacity falls within three organizational categories: program delivery, program expansion, and adaptive capacity. Importantly, the authors indicate adaptive capacity specifically refers to instances in which an "organization needs to be sure it is delivering on its mission" (Letts, Ryan, & Grossman, 1999, p. 21). This occurs as an organization develops the ability to adapt and identifies ways to improve and change. The goal is to better respond to clients' needs. Because of critical ties to organizational mission (i.e., the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation's organizational mission), adaptive capacity is a key

conceptual lens employed within this article. As such, the terms capacity and adaptive capacity are referenced as one and the same within the confines of this article. Building on these terms, De Vita and Fleming (2001) developed a framework to better understand the complex and multidimensional facets of capacity and capacity building. Focusing on literature from sustainable development, civil society and social capital, as well as organizational and management theory, De Vita and Fleming (2001) provide slightly deeper insight into organizational capacity building. Specifically, their construct of capacity building establishes priorities that (a) identify community or network needs and (b) highlight a balance between and among the competing interests of community or network constituents. The enclosed research merges Less, Ryan, and Grossman's (1999) representation of capacity and capacity building, in which honoring the organizational mission is equated with meeting clients' needs, with De Vita and Fleming's (2001) representation of capacity and capacity building—which also stresses the importance of balancing conflicting community or client needs. As a result of this conceptual merger, a more nuanced representation of capacity and capacity building emerges—one which arguably enhances equitability and promotes more just and ethical standards for organizational capacity building and sustainment. Therefore, within the analytic confines of this article, the current authors draw from this emergent and highly nuanced capacity building framework to provide greater understanding of how to promote and sustainably integrate service and social entrepreneurship into curricular and co-curricular experiences (i.e., within a higher education consortium).

Capacity Building within the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation

This research article is a case analysis of the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation, its affiliate higher education consortium, and their adaptive organizational capacity to provide service-oriented and socially entrepreneurial learning experiences and outcomes. The framework of (adaptive) organizational capacity was used in the context of this case analysis. As mentioned, the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation was founded in 1934, but its inception dates back 80 years prior. Attorney Algernon Sydney Sullivan of Indiana was of great financial means and used his knowledge of the law along with his assets to help individuals in need. Sullivan did this without any regard for his personal wealth nor investment of time. In 1856, he moved to New York, where he remained dedicated to the cause of helping those in need. He was an advocate of equality, sponsoring the first African-American member of the New York Bar Association. By his life's end in 1887, Sullivan was so respected that all judicial courts within the state of New York were closed to pay him homage. He was, in fact, the last private citizen in the state of New York to receive this honor.

In addition, Sullivan was honored posthumously in 1890 by an organization he founded, the New York Southern Society, with the establishment of the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award to recognize students with deep and fervent commitments to service. His son, George, honored his father by establishing the Sullivan Foundation in 1934. Since that time, the Sullivan Foundation has grown its network to schools, students, and faculty based on their commitment to and passion for service. As an organization, the Sullivan Foundation's mission has three core components: (a) supporting deserving students through college tuition and extracurricular scholarships; (b) honoring college students and community members who exemplify a strong commitment to community; and (c) educating collegians about change-making, civic engagement, and social entrepreneurship (The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation, 2015).

Presently, there are approximately 70 colleges and universities affiliated with the Sullivan Foundation.[1] The schools are largely populated within the American South: Arkansas, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. Most are small liberal arts institutions with a collective composition of more than 250,000 students. Each year, these institutions offer Sullivan Awards to selected students, and some institutions provide support through Sullivan Scholarships. To date, more than 7,000 students within the affiliate institutional network have received either an award or sponsored scholarship from the foundation. The Sullivan Foundation connects college students and faculty (i.e., across institutional types) through annual programming and applied learning workshops and activities.

The Sullivan Foundation's work centers on a comprehensive theory of social change and capacity building designed to promote engagement at all levels (i.e., with individuals and communities). From an organizational stance, higher education institutions are seen as vital community partners. As such, students and faculty are encouraged to develop their capacities for service. In keeping with its organizational mission, the Sullivan Foundation helps promote service and social entrepreneurship as tools for addressing core societal issues. In order to solve pressing social, economic, and environmental problems across a broad spectrum, the Sullivan Foundation supports innovative approaches and highly collaborative partnerships between colleges and universities and their surrounding communities. The foundation's ultimate goal is to expand and sustain its organizational capacity by (a) strengthening its existing institutional partnerships and programs and (b) building a larger and more change-oriented network with additional institutions.

Service-Learning and Social Entrepreneurship: Capacity Building, Instructional Tools

Service-learning and social entrepreneurship are efforts that are uniquely grounded in a deep commitment to promoting and transforming change within communities. Service-learning is widely accepted as a transformative learning model used to foster civic participation and confront systemic inequity, thereby promoting social change (Bell, 1997; Verjee, 2010). When integrated strategically into a postsecondary curricular sequence or discipline, service-learning presents instructors and students with specialized opportunities to apply thematic content to real-life situations. For the purposes of this analysis, service-learning was utilized as an instructional tool to help promote and develop (i.e., within college students) an understanding and appreciation of how they might use their skills and knowledge to better their communities (broadly defined). Although there are many varied definitions of service-learning, the operational definition employed within this case analysis acknowledged service-learning as "a teaching and learning strategy integrating meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the [collegiate] learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities" (Ryan, 2012, p. 4).

Many universities and colleges recognize the utility of service-learning as a useful pedagogy (and andragogy) to improve student learning and help transform communities (Bringle & Kremer, 1993; Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Driscoll, Holland, Gelmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Gelmon, Holland, & Shinnamon, 1998; Warchal & Ruiz, 2004). In response and with high hopes of improving student learning outcomes, institutions are initiating community service-learning programs that are seamlessly integrated into their core curricula (across disciplines). Research highlights the positive influence of service-learning curricular and co-curricular

---

[1] The names and geographic locations of the 70 colleges and universities which comprise The Sullivan Foundation network can be retrieved from https://sullivanfdn.org/about-us/our-network/

programs (i.e., across institutional types) on communities receiving services and on students actively engaging in and reflecting upon their service efforts (Eyler, 2002; Eyler & Giles, 1999). Accordingly, students' participation enhances their overall academic and self-efficacy, civic engagement, social skills, and academic achievement (Celio, Durlak, & Dymnicki, 2011). In addition, service-learning yields (i.e., within students) great social outcomes by (a) reducing stereotypes and facilitating cultural and racial understanding (Astin & Sax, 1998; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Johnson & Bozeman, 1998); (b) helping cultivate and develop collegians' sense of social responsibility and desires of civic engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Driscoll, Holland, Gellmon, & Kerrigan, 1996; Payne, 2000; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000); and (c) promoting civic engagement and participation beyond graduation (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999).

As mentioned, the authors greatly relied upon service-learning as a core contributing instructional model to assist with the embedded case analysis. In addition to service-learning, this analysis employed another instructional model that has been leveraged for social change (i.e., within higher education) known as social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is usually described as the process of employing market-based methods to solve social problems (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurship includes not only the familiar definition aligned with business management (i.e., growth-oriented, innovative practice associated with creative, sometimes aggressive management) but also definitions involving social change. Within the confines of this case analysis, social entrepreneurship is operationally defined as the application of business ideas, skills, knowledge, strategies, and techniques to systemic and social change processes designed to eradicate highly complex and persistent social, cultural, and environmental issues (ASHOKA, n.d.). Entrepreneurs guided by the latter definition are change agents who seize opportunities that others miss in order to improve systems, invent and disseminate new approaches, and advance sustainable solutions to 21st century problems.

Social entrepreneurs instinctively are innovative in their quests for solutions to society's pressing social problems (ASHOKA, n.d.). They are focused on their endeavors, not easily deterred, and ever mindful of macro-issues and the need to bring about macro-change (ASHOKA, n.d.). Rather than leaving societal needs to the federal or private sectors, social entrepreneurs identify problems and solve them by changing systems, advocating solutions, and persuading entire societies to move in different directions (Dees, 1998). Social entrepreneurs often commit their lives to changing the direction of their chosen fields. They are visionaries but also realists who are ultimately concerned with the practical implementation of their vision above all else. Social entrepreneurs present user-friendly, understandable, and ethical ideas that engage widespread support in order to maximize the number of citizens who will stand up, seize their idea, and implement it (ASHOKA, n.d.). Leading social entrepreneurs are mass recruiters of local change-makers—role models proving that citizens who channel their ideas into action can do almost anything (ASHOKA, n.d.).

As combined, instructional tools, both service-learning and social entrepreneurship help shape the enclosed analysis and orient the researchers' thinking to the desired change and capacity building processes the Sullivan Foundation seeks to promote.

Methodology

Study Design

Pursuant to the exploratory and descriptive information needs highlighted by the Sullivan Foundation for this study, the authors utilized a broader methodological approach. Specifically, they conducted a case analysis, which entails an exploration of an administrative or organizational situation involving a pressing decision or problem. The rationale for a case analysis was based on the organization's unique mission as well as its footprint serving colleges

and universities in the American South. The employed methodology was highly qualitative in nature. An online survey was developed to assess the service-learning and social entrepreneurship initiatives of the Sullivan-affiliated institutions as well as the capacity of these 70 institutions to build upon and enhance their programmatic offerings. The survey was administered online to participants (namely college administrators and faculty) associated with the institutions.

In their development of the online instrument, researchers relied upon the Delphi technique, which utilizes experts' opinions to develop the data collection instrument (Geist, 2010). Specifically, the researchers developed an advisory board and issued a charge that included two, overarching goals: (a) to oversee the project implementation and (b) assist in developing a survey to administer to all the institutions in the Sullivan Foundation network. This board was composed of former Sullivan faculty fellows who had an integral past relationship with the Sullivan Foundation. The board consisted of four associate professors, one full professor, one department chair, two associate deans, and one consultant. Through a three-hour conference call, using the advisory board as subject experts, the researchers used the Delphi technique to develop the instrument (see Appendix A). It is important to note the Delphi technique attempts to effectively utilize expert intuition in long-range planning (Geist, 2010). In their utilization of the Delphi technique, the researchers solicited the opinions of experts through specially designed questions which then determined whether a convergence of positive opinions were observed regarding sample research questions (Geist, 2010). When a convergence of opinions was not observed, the research question was then modified or dismissed (Geist, 2010). Upon completion of the survey, Qualtrics (an online survey software program) was used to administer the instrument to the advisory board for further testing, feedback, and completion (see Appendix A).

Survey Respondents

Once finalized, the survey was administered electronically using a database of 747 individuals. After filtering for unreceived emails (i.e., bounce backs), the sample size was reduced to 681. Using Vertical Response software, 181 sample subjects opened the email, 75 clicked the survey link, and 50 subjects completed the survey. The response rate was .073%.[2] Although this is a small sample size based on the aforementioned data, the 50 responses represent 20 of the 70 Sullivan affiliate colleges or universities. Therefore, 28% of consortium member's voices were highlighted in the data. After collecting the survey data, researchers conducted an ongoing process of data analysis and identified consistent and emerging themes. The researchers utilized a matrix in Excel to clarify thematic comparisons and identify inverse patterns of evidence (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013). This analytic process provided a platform for the researchers to develop a deeper understanding of programming gaps and needs regarding service-learning and social entrepreneurship endeavors among the affiliate institutions. In analyzing the survey results, the researchers also utilized descriptive statistics to capture the viewpoints of the survey participants. Approximately 60% of survey respondents were senior university personnel, ranging from office coordinators to a number of directors and university vice presidents. In addition, 33% of the respondents were academic professors, while 7% of the respondents identified as grant writers and / or librarians.

---

[2] Depending on the question, respondents did not complete each item. Therefore, from question to question, the number of respondents changed.

Findings

Current Programs and Initiatives

      A primary focus of the survey was to identify and understand more about existing capacity through the deliberate exploration of service-learning programs and social entrepreneurship initiatives at the affiliate institutions. To assist with this endeavor, the researchers employed The Capacity Framework, developed by McKinsey & Company (2001) to help organize and make sense of the findings (see Appendix B). The Capacity Framework (McKinsey & Company, 2001) describes seven elements that can be used to structure an organization's overall capacity: (a) *aspirations*, (b) *strategy*, (c) *organizational skills*, (d) *systems and infrastructure*, (e) *human resources*, (f) *organization structure*, and (g) *culture*. Through open-ended questions (i.e., with the aforementioned elements serving as a guide), the researchers observed three categories of responses: (a) unorganized or informal initiatives, (b) support and encouragement from institutions' leadership teams, and (c) full program or certificate implementation. To further clarify these categorical responses, the researchers found it helpful to use terminology from McKinsey & Company's Framework (2001).

      The first set of categorical responses regarding capacity building (i.e., unorganized or informal initiatives) speak to a general lack of strategy along with limited organizational skills; systems and infrastructure; and organizational structure. Many—in fact most—of the respondents indicated there was no formal service-learning or social entrepreneurship program on their respective campuses. Instead, they described very informal collaborations with community organizations. Collectively, these informal collaborations—while suggestive of limited organizational skills, strategy, and structure—afforded students modest (yet meaningful) opportunities to volunteer and engage their surrounding communities. For example, one institution referenced a local, non-profit organization that worked with its students to build and repair homes and give away toys during the holidays. Another referenced an area ministry that works with young collegians to offer ministry, help children with homework, and provide engagement opportunities with low-income families.

      Although lacking in formal program endeavors, many institutions and their representatives indicated strong support and encouragement from their senior leadership teams to integrate service-learning and social entrepreneurship into the core curricula. This second set of categorical responses (i.e., support and encouragement from institutional leadership) was, arguably, an interesting finding because an underdeveloped program and informal curricular infrastructure seemingly suggests a lack of aspiration, support, and encouragement from senior leadership—which then creates an institutional culture that devalues service-learning and social entrepreneurship. Survey respondents, however, indicated the exact opposite. One respondent noted the concerted efforts of numerous faculty members to create and further develop such programs for encapsulation within the academic curriculum. Although their efforts did not alter the fixed reality of limited, institutional resources, they are recognized (i.e., within this study) as focused efforts by a key campus constituency and therefore indicative of the requisite motivation and aspirations McKinsey & Company refer to in their framework (2001). More importantly, from an organizational capacity building stance, those faculty efforts were met with clear and unmitigated support from senior leadership. This observation of limited resources (juxtaposed with support from campus leaders) was made by many of the survey respondents and proved useful to the macro investigation and analysis of service-learning and social entrepreneurship capacity building efforts within the consortium. Using McKinsey & Company's (2001) terminology, this particular obstacle (i.e., limited human and monetary resources) ultimately prohibited faculty and senior

leadership teams from developing, implementing, and advancing formal curricula and programs devoted to service-learning and social entrepreneurship.

Another obstacle highlighted within the second set of categorical survey responses was a concern for the lack of spatial resources and structural opportunities to embed and advance service-learning and social entrepreneurship within and across academic and co-curricula. The latter obstacle notably concerned limited physical and environmental resources (e.g., buildings, offices, meeting rooms, interactive technology, etc.) to accommodate the development of service-learning and social entrepreneurship programs. While not exclusive nor exhaustive, all of the obstacles capture inherent challenges in developing and promoting service-learning and social entrepreneurship as preferred instructional models and integrating them into academic curricula and co-curricula—even when there is support from institutional leadership.

Although these obstacles are concerning, the survey responses did offer some encouragement. Survey respondents overwhelmingly suggested wherever there is administrative (and other stakeholder) aspiration and will, there is always a discernible way for institutions to promote and advance service-learning and social entrepreneurship. One of the college representatives described a speaker series on campus which promoted social entrepreneurship via a formal Social Entrepreneurship Week. The annual week entails keynote talks from notable guest speakers who are successful entrepreneurs and an entrepreneur forum for students to present their ideas and business plans. The week is open to the public and fully inclusive of its surrounding community. In fact, students are encouraged to present ideas and plans at the forum that are collaborative and facilitative in efforts to engage and benefit multiple community stakeholders. Another institution indicated "each division on the campus captures some form of social entrepreneurship within class activities," and "service-learning hours are required in every major." Through a capacity-building lens and with McKinsey & Company's Framework (2001) in mind, this particular institution has made a very earnest attempt, with the support of campus leadership, to enhance its institutional or organizational skills by developing and inculcating the curriculum with service-learning and social entrepreneurial experiences that provide holistic student growth, learning, and engagement opportunities. Their attempts, however, have been somewhat stifled due to the à la carte approach by instructional faculty regarding their social entrepreneurship activities and informal policies (i.e., across majors) concerning the frequency and type of service-learning hours required for students. Although not completely formalized across the curriculum through fixed policies and unambiguous procedures, these loose, yet intentional actions helped create culture and institutionalize service-learning and social entrepreneurship in unexpected and beneficial ways by integrating the two models into the curriculum core (i.e., curricular systems and infrastructure). Without question, these unintended consequences were deemed good in the eyes of the researchers because of the inherent promotion of service-learning and social entrepreneurship. Such promotion helps develop and sustain the Sullivan Foundation's and its affiliate institutions' capacity building efforts regarding the consortium.

It is worth noting by definition, a consortium refers to the general association of related and smaller businesses, entities, or organizations. Restated, a consortium is a compound organization that is comprised, shaped, and fully defined by its constituent entities. Within the confines of this study, the term consortium is used to refer to the intentional association of numerous and varied institutions of higher and civic learning for the strategic purposes of strengthening and expanding service-learning and socially entrepreneurial endeavors. Pairing this logic with McKinsey & Company's Framework (2001), the capacity of the referenced consortium is only as strong and effective as the capacity of its comprising institutions. By attending to the capacity of its affiliate institutions, the consortium improves its own capacity to effect change.

Such change can then lead to highly developed service-learning and social entrepreneur programs with an implementation track record of sustained success, as was evidenced by some institutions within the formal consortium. Although smaller in number, these institutions enjoyed strong cultures and well-developed systems and infrastructures. This was, in fact, the third and final set of categorical survey responses evidenced within the study (i.e., full program or certificate implementation). For example, Catawba College recently started an academic program in entrepreneurship through their Center for Entrepreneurship and Experiential Development (CEED). CEED focuses on developing students' critical and analytical thinking skills and abilities through an innovative, highly experiential, and business-oriented lens. Embedded within the program is the opportunity for students to focus on social entrepreneurial business models that generate profitable revenue. This portion of Catawba's CEED curriculum emphasizes the development of focused skills and knowledge to help students solve pressing, social problems and issues, but the program also stresses the importance of sound, creative, and innovative business practices so that profits and revenues are not compromised during implementation. Catawba College was not alone in its institutional efforts to promote and develop social entrepreneurship and service-learning experiences for students.

Another college cited the formation of an Office of Community Engagement with formal staff and faculty appointments supported by hard funds or monies. Some would argue the development of an Office of Community Engagement is not a major feat, but the researchers—in their evaluation of current program offerings—found such an occurrence rare. One university which actually fit the criterion of formalized organization and implementation was Duke University. Specifically, Duke offers an interdisciplinary and multi-partner Social Entrepreneurship Accelerator program in addition to a Civic Engagement and Social Change certificate for undergraduates. The formal program and certificate are interdisciplinary in scale and scope. They function as programming and curricular vehicles for promoting: (a) undergraduate research; (b) entrepreneurial endeavors; (c) faculty and community mentoring and networking; (d) university and community partnership development; (e) engaged citizenship; (f) ethical leadership; and (g) sustainability efforts around complex and persistent issues of global health, education, and economic disparities. The programs are highly successful and garner support via multi-leveraged resources from multiple constituencies, both internal and external to the university.

Duke University's targeted strategies, resources, and programming—along with each of the aforementioned program and curricular examples—highlight institutions that have demonstrated great aspiration and heightened organizational skills through their intentional development of robust and thoughtfully implemented systems, structures, and infrastructures to support and promote service-learning and social entrepreneurship as institutionalized components of their core culture. In doing so, they serve as capacity-building exemplars for other institutions, as they exhibit all seven elements of The Capacity Framework (McKinsey & Company, 2001): (a) *aspirations,* (b) *strategy,* (c) *organizational skills,* (d) *systems and infrastructure,* (e) *human resources,* (f) *organization structure,* and (g) *culture.*

Strengths and Weaknesses of Programs and Initiatives

Strengths. On average, the service and entrepreneurial programs at Sullivan-affiliated institutions are well advertised and customized to meet student (individual or group) interest, time, and skill level. The focused attention, support, and encouragement offered by campus programming staff helps students develop and appreciate their emerging entrepreneurial talent and community engagement efforts. The training provided by institutions fosters a safe environment for students and the communities they serve. As a collective, emphasis is placed on people over productivity to encourage students to interact and connect with the people and

communities they serve. The researchers observed this to be a general and implied sentiment among the majority of survey respondents.

Weaknesses. Regarding program weaknesses, clear themes emerged. First, lack of money and the need for more focused resources were mentioned a number of times. One respondent suggested, "Funding and transportation are key issues." Second, low levels of faculty and staff engagement (not to be confused with support) and underdeveloped competencies were highlighted as barriers to implementation or sustainability of initiatives. One person indicated there is not "one champion" who can effectively and knowledgeably implement these projects, and there is a lack of "involvement and support from faculty and staff," while another person cited "low levels of participation from our institution." Third, centralized organization was highlighted as a weakness. Either students could not organize or there was no organizational home for faculty to create serving-learning and social entrepreneurship classes and programs. This lack of institutional infrastructure is a barrier for creative programming. As cited by one survey respondent, there is "no centralized office to coordinate and support academic service-learning," and there is also "the lack of the university's ability to connect with our local community." Although 79% of respondents felt like their institution supported service-learning and social entrepreneurship initiatives, their survey responses indicated glaring weaknesses in institutional capacity-building, actual engagement, and sustainability endeavors.

Future Programs and Initiatives

In addition to analyzing current service-learning programs and social entrepreneurship initiatives and highlighting their strengths and weaknesses, the researchers sought to examine the receptivity among consortium members to programing ideas and initiatives designed to strengthen the Sullivan network's capacity for future endeavors. Over 50% of survey respondents suggested the Sullivan Foundation was doing a good job of supporting faculty and staff—even when that support was not available within a given institution.

Respondents suggested ways to enhance support. For example, increased funding and resource opportunities were highlighted as major suggestions. Assistance with institutional curriculum design and development and more Sullivan Foundation-hosted retreats and outreach programs were all recommended. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the respondents highlighted their desire for the Sullivan Foundation to be more visible on their respective campuses. In addition to greater awareness, survey respondents indicated a pronounced need to better articulate and communicate the Foundation's mission and how it aligns with the individual and collective missions of its affiliate, higher education institutions.

Survey respondents also offered specific suggestions for improvement with Sullivan Foundation programming efforts. Among the most noted was the desire for a speaker or sponsored lecture series that communicates best practices regarding social entrepreneurship and service-learning endeavors. In addition, respondents indicated a need for more travel support, curriculum design assistance, and research development for faculty. Finally, respondents indicated a desire for more subject-matter workshops and a two-week summer program to enhance faculty and student knowledge.

It is worth noting survey respondents were polled to determine how they felt about the Sullivan Foundation's overall support of students. Over 68% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed the foundation does an excellent job of supporting students. This, in fact, corroborates the researchers' earlier findings regarding student support as a core strength of existing programming efforts. Since student support was already deemed a strong suit, the researchers asked for more focused feedback which indicated additional interest in more student funding and resource support opportunities (e.g., professional development, community engagement workshops, entrepreneur skills development, etc.) as well as higher visibility within the student

population. In addition, real-world experiences in social entrepreneurship and service-learning were desired along with direct opportunities for student mentoring. Finally, respondents suggested online resources and additional funding to sponsor more students at annual Sullivan Foundation retreats.

Implications and Conclusion

As mentioned, McKinsey & Company (2001) developed a capacity assessment grid that leaders can use to help structure an organization's capacity. The grid or The Capacity Framework (see Appendix B) describes seven essential elements—three of which are higher-level elements and include (a) *aspirations,* (b) *strategy*, and (c) *organizational skills* and four foundational elements which include (d) *systems and infrastructure*, (e) *human resources*, (f) *organization structure*, and (g) *culture*. The researchers posit organizations like the Sullivan Foundation (i.e., with multiple stakeholders and expansive organizational reach) should draw from McKinsey & Company's (2001) Capacity Framework and transition from a micro-perspective to a macro-perspective—thus enabling capacity building exploration and achievement within large systems, networks, and / or organizations.

The Sullivan Foundation has essentially adopted the latter (macro) perspective as it endeavors to further develop and sustain its organizational capacity. It is worth noting that depending on an organization's mission and goals, capacity building and expansion may or may not be considered ideal. In essence, it may not result in positive social and civic change, whereby the core principles of social justice, equity, and ethical practice reign supreme. In fact, the end result may be the exact opposite, but within this study, the researchers were very careful to stay mindful of and focused on the Sullivan Foundation's prime mission and goal (i.e., since 1934) of honoring, supporting, and educating youth committed to transformational change through service (The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation, 2015). With this stated mission, it is clear the prime initiative is to expand and inculcate cultures of civic and entrepreneurial service. Through an organizational capacity-building lens, the Foundation and its constituent network or consortium are well positioned to further this mission and goal. However, to be successful, the Foundation must attend to the capacity efforts of its affiliate institutions. Only then can the consortium truly realize its goals and maximize its capacity efforts.

One important aim of capacity building is to work toward developing sustained structures that will assist stakeholders within a larger system, network, or organization to better interact with each other and achieve a shared goal. Within institutions, senior leaders, faculty, and students all serve as critical stakeholders who work individually and collectively to engage entire communities. Considering the unique scope of the Sullivan Foundation and the parameters of engagement among its stakeholders, the researchers employed McKinsey & Company's (2001) Capacity Framework to explore and expound upon the implications of the enclosed findings.

Given the Sullivan Foundation's aspirations and engagement of approximately 70 institutions of higher learning, there is no mistaking its thumbprint on what is arguably a shared, emergent, and very pressing 21st century agenda for all of higher education—an agenda which speaks to the promotion of civic engagement and social change-making and entrepreneurism (Kenny, Simon, Kiley-Brabeck, & Lerner, 2002; Musil, 2003). Although still very much in its infancy, the 21st century has been shaped by global and democratic agendas that demand a more educated, socially responsive, and democratically engaged service corps. Recognizing these increased demands amidst a growing shortage of public funds, colleges and universities across the nation need to partner with community entities and corporations to leverage shared resources in ways that promote civic growth among students and a strengthened understanding of social responsibility.

The benefits of such strategic and collaborative partnerships are multifold. Specifically, universities, communities, and corporations are all greatly enhanced because of the heightened levels of mutuality and respect as well as the attentiveness to shared societal problems and existing resources. This, in turn, increases the likelihood of resolutions to long-standing and shared problems. Additionally, there is great benefit to partnering with organizations external to higher education, like the Sullivan Foundation, because they are not beholden to the programming outreach and financial support parameters of many colleges and universities— both public and private. In essence, external organizations can pursue strategies (i.e., in consultation and collaboration with campus stakeholders) that promote social programming and service agendas that are universally beneficial and agreed upon. The latter point is very important. Just because an external organization has an identified mission, resources, and goals of expansion does not infer that higher education institutions should immediately partner (if at all). Rather, the decision to partner and strategically collaborate for a mutually agreed upon purpose (e.g., promoting service-learning and social entrepreneurism) should be made in careful consultation with key stakeholders. A further point of clarification is that the list of stakeholders should be as inclusive and diverse as possible.

This case analysis, as a reminder, was designed to assess the capacity of the Sullivan Foundation's partnership and programming efforts with an informal consortium of higher education institutions. In addition, the enclosed analysis sought to identify fertile areas for additional programming and support initiatives. Regardless of institutional origin, survey respondents indicated great appreciation for the Sullivan Foundation's existing and continued support. Financial support for faculty and students was also deemed a much needed and appropriate growth area. These findings imply the Sullivan Foundation's organizational skills should be employed in a targeted manner that promotes and responds to the focused needs of the consortium.

The most significant of findings suggest there is a great deal of variation between and among affiliate institutions and the (a) soundness of their programs as well as the (b) developed nature of their institutional infrastructures. There are great implications here regarding expansion growth in systems and infrastructure. First and foremost, the variability among affiliate institutions and their social change-making and entrepreneurial programming efforts needs to be reduced and streamlined in such a way that there is greater continuity and uniformity as well as transferability between and among affiliate institutions, at least regarding the existence of transdisciplinary service-learning and social entrepreneurship learning opportunities. This would, essentially, strengthen the consortium and better leverage foundation and institutional resources.

Together, streamlined programming efforts and strengthened institutional infrastructures can work to emphasize an organizational culture that promotes service-learning and social entrepreneurial programs. This need, if ignored, has far-reaching and long lasting implications. Essentially, no institutional programming efforts—be they internal or external to the institution—will take root. Without a supportive and well-sourced service infrastructure, such efforts will potentially only gain traction and sustainability during annual service drives and national days of service, such as the Martin Luther King Jr. Day of Service or the September 11 National Day of Service and Remembrance.[3] Arguably, these designated days of service are frequently deemed default service programming days for many colleges and universities. Such service efforts are important, but more strategic and sustained programming efforts are needed. This is where, when, and how attention to developing a focused infrastructure and strategic institutional plan that supports such initiatives and channels

---

[3] While both of the aforementioned are important and meaningful to our national service efforts, social entrepreneurial opportunities are not the focus on these days.

diverse resources toward meeting programmatic goals comes into play. Developing an institutional infrastructure and strategic institutional plan that works to seamlessly integrate service-learning and social entrepreneurship learning opportunities into the academic and co-curricula will greatly benefit all institutional, community, and corporate stakeholders due to the reinforced training and skills development students receive in social change-making and entrepreneurism.

In conclusion, the authors believe external organizations like the Sullivan Foundation need to develop stronger and more targeted relationships with senior leaders and administrators. Developing a presence with institutions' leadership teams will support and reinforce future partnerships, thereby enhancing an institution's confidence in and ability to successfully implement service-learning and social entrepreneurship initiatives. By accessing the senior leadership team, the work can be driven strategically to plant a seed of understanding and appreciation that could then potentially lead to organizational and fiscal support for faculty and students, while encouraging more faculty, staff, and students to participate. In addition, because of focused infrastructural and strategic planning needs, organizations like the Sullivan Foundation may be better positioned to work with institutions to develop a stronger and more streamlined message that effectively communicates the purpose and vision of social change-making and entrepreneurship.

Finally, external organizations stand ready to benefit from offering enhanced training and curricular program modeling. This is an active area in which the Sullivan Foundation can expand via more focused retreats, faculty and student exchanges, and workshops. More specifically, by following a centralized-hub model and offering year-round convenings, stakeholders will be equipped and empowered to engage in professional development, knowledge exchange fora, and mentoring opportunities designed to transform communities and improve the overall quality of life and trajectory of America's citizenry.

The encouraging news is that each of these ideas and suggestions for capacity building is well within reach. What is presented within the current analysis through focused findings is a blueprint of how to develop effective university partnerships with a private, non-profit organization for the express purpose of promoting civic engagement, social change-making, and entrepreneurism among collegians. As an external entity to higher education, the Sullivan Foundation is an example of a community partner with resources and a recognized platform for building and strengthening a service corps. In closing, although the study focuses on the Sullivan Foundation and its affiliate institutions, these opportunity-based findings apply to other private, non-profit organizations seeking to collaborate strategically with colleges and universities.

References

Ashoka. (n.d.). *Social entrepreneurship.* Retrieved from
       https://www.ashoka.org/social_entrepreneur

Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation.
       Journal of College Student Development, 39(3), 251-263.

Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long term effects of volunteerism during the
       undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-202.

Austin, J. E., Leonard, H., Reficco, E., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2004). *Corporate social
       entrepreneurship: A new vision of CSR* (Harvard Business School Working Paper No.
       05-021). Boston: Harvard Business School.

Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship:
       Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 30*(1), 1-22.
       doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x

Battistoni, R. M., & Longo, N. V. (2011). Putting students at the center of civic engagement. In J. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose:" Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 199-216). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3–15). New York: Routledge.

Bringle, R. G., & Kremer, J. F. (1993). Evaluation of an intergenerational service-learning project for undergraduates. *Educational Gerontology*, *19*(5), 407-16.

Campus Compact. Maryland-DC CONNECTS Task Force. (2015). *College, Career, and Civic Readiness through Civic Engagement.* Retrieved from https://www.mdccc.org/events/files/white-paper-2015.pdf

Celio, C. I., Durlak, J., & Dymnicki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impact of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *34(2)*, 164-181.

Cohen, J., & Kinsey, D. F. (1994). Doing good and scholarship: A service-learning study. *Journalism Educator*, *48*(4), 4-14.

Cooper, J. G., Kotval-K, Z., Kotval, Z., & Mullin, J. (2014). University community partnerships. *Humanities*, *3*(1), 88-101. doi:10.3390/h3010088

Dees, J. G. (1998, October 31). The meaning of "social entrepreneurship" [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://entrepreneurship.duke.edu/news-item/the-meaning-of-social-entrepreneurship/

Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (Eds.). (2003). For-profit social ventures [Special issue]. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 2, 1–26.

De Vita, C. J. & Fleming, C., (2001). *Building capacity in nonprofit organizations.* Retrieved from The Urban Institute website: http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/building_capacity.pdf

Driscoll, A., Holland, B., Gelmon, S., & Kerrigan, S. (1996). An assessment model for service-learning: Comprehensive case studies of impact on faculty, students, community, and institutions. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3, 66-71.

Eyler, J. (2002). Reflection: Linking service and learning—linking students and communities. *Journal of Social Issues*, *58*(3), 517-534.

Eyler, J., & Giles, D. E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Geist, M. R. (2010). Using the Delphi method to engage stakeholders: A comparison of two studies. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *33*(2), 147-54. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2009.06.006

Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., & Shinnamon, A. F. (1998). Health professions schools in service to the nation: Final evaluation report. San Francisco: Community Campus Partnerships for Health.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17, 327–339.

Harkavy, I, & Hodges, R. A. (2012). *Democratic devolution: How America's colleges and universities can strengthen their communities* (Policy Memo). Retrieved from Progressive Policy Institute website: http://www.progressivepolicy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/10.2012_Harkavy-Hodges_Democratic-Devolution.pdf

Johnson, S. D., & Bozeman, M. (1998). *Service learning and the development of social responsibility.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Central States Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Kenny, M. E., Simon, L. A. K., Kiley-Brabeck, K., & Lerner, R. M. (2002). *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service learning.* Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Light, P. C. (2000). *Making nonprofits work: A report on the tides of nonprofit management reform.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Letts, C. W., Ryan, W. P. & Grossman, A. (1999). *High performance nonprofit organizations: Managing upstream for greater impact.* New York: Wiley.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Musil, C. M. (2003). Educating for citizenship. *Peer Review, 5*(3), 4-8.

Payne, C. A. (2000). Changes in involvement as measured by the Community Service Involvement Preference Inventory. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 41–45.

Ryan, M. (2012). Service-learning after Learn and Serve America: How five states are moving forward. *Report of the Education Commission of the States.* Retrieved from https://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/01/02/87/10287.pdf

The Algernon Sydney Sullivan Foundation. (2015). *What we do.* Retrieved from https://sullivanfdn.org/about-us/

Verjee, B. (2010). Service-learning: Charity-based or transformative? *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 4*(2), 1-13.

Vogelgesang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2000). Comparing the effects of service-learning and community service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 25- 34.

Warchal, J., & Ruiz, A. (2004). The long-term effects of undergraduate service-learning programs on postgraduate employment choices, community engagement, and civic leadership. In M. Welch & S. H. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 87–106). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Welch, M., & Saltmarsh, J. (2013). Current practice and infrastructures for campus centers of community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(4), 25-55.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR INSTITUTION'S EXISTING PROGRAMS:

Q1 What programs or initiatives does your department/school or institution offer to teach skills related to social entrepreneurship or service-learning?

Q2 What are the strengths and weaknesses of these programs or initiatives?

Q3 Do you feel like your department supports service-learning or social entrepreneurship initiatives?

❍ Strongly agree (1)
❍ Agree (2)
❍ Neutral (3)
❍ Disagree (4)
❍ Strongly disagree (5)

Q4 Do you feel like your institution supports service-learning or social entrepreneurship initiatives?

❍ Strongly agree (1)
❍ Agree (2)
❍ Neutral (3)
❍ Disagree (4)
❍ Strongly disagree (5)

QUESTIONS REGARDING POSSIBLE SULLIVAN FOUNDATION PROGRAMMING:

Q5 Related to your department/school or institution, how do you view the Sullivan Foundation's relationship with your institution?

❍ Very strong (1)
❍ Strong (2)
❍ Neutral (3)
❍ Weak (4)
❍ Very weak (5)

Q6 Do you feel that the Sullivan Foundation supports faculty and staff?

❍ Strongly agree (1)
❍ Agree (2)
❍ Neutral (3)
❍ Disagree (4)
❍ Strongly disagree (5)

Q7 How can the Sullivan Foundation better support you as faculty/staff on your campus?

Q8 How can the Sullivan Foundation better support social entrepreneurship and service-learning on your campus?

Q9 Do you feel that the Sullivan Foundation supports students at your campus?

❍ Strongly agree (1)
❍ Agree (2)
❍ Neutral (3)
❍ Disagree (4)
❍ Strongly disagree (5)

Q10 How can the Sullivan Foundation better support your students on your campus?

Q11 What do you believe is the most important metric the Sullivan Foundation should be measuring when working with students?

_____ Confidence in their ability to create positive change (1)

_____ Degree to which they anticipate service playing a role in their lives (2)
_____ Familiarity with the field of change-making and social entrepreneurship (3)
_____ Degree to which they self-identify as an entrepreneur (4)
_____ Access to, and the ability to participate in, opportunities that will grow them as a leader and change-maker (5)
_____ Degree to which they feel supported by a community of peers and mentors on their change-making journey (6)

QUESTIONS REGARDING REGIONAL CHANGE EFFORTS:
Q12 Related to regional off-campus efforts, how could the Sullivan Foundation support a regional model promoting social entrepreneurship and service-learning for you and your students?
Q13 What type of service-learning and social entrepreneurship programs provided regionally would you and your students be interested in?
Q14 With regard to the following list of possible offerings at a regional location, please rank those in the order that you feel you and your students will most strongly support. (Please rank the initiative that would be of the greatest value for you and your school with 1 being the highest priority and 10 being the lowest priority.)
_____ Change-Making 101: two-day event designed for beginners who are new to and want to learn about social entrepreneurship and change-making (1)
_____ Sullivan Institute (w/Watson University): two-week social venture incubator program offered in the summer or over January term; focused on ideation, business model validation, fundraising and finance for social enterprise, team building, and personal development for change-makers (2)
_____ Business Bootcamp (with 3-day startup): three-day event designed for students with an understanding of social enterprise and who have tangible projects or businesses they want to launch (3)
_____ Campus Catalyst Training (with University Innovation Fellows): six-week online course that helps students map their entrepreneurial ecosystem on campus through design thinking methodology; program also offers the chance to spend a four-day retreat at Stanford's Design School (4)
_____ Find My Roadmap (with Roadtrip Nation): 12-week online course that helps students identify their strengths and interests and gives them the tools to reach out to and interview potential mentors to learn from their stories (5)
_____ Faculty Train-the-Trainer (with We!): one-day event designed for faculty who are interested in learning and applying techniques from the Ignite Retreat in their classes and through project-based learning (6)
_____ Speakers Series: 90-minute talks curated for campuses from the Sullivan Speakers Bureau; designed for campuses who want to bring change-making experts to their campus (7)
_____ Freshman Seminar Workshops: one-day events built into existing Freshman Seminar and Orientation programs on campus to introduce students to careers in change-making (8)
_____ Field Trips: two-day events designed for students who want to visit social entrepreneurs in their hometown and see their ventures first-hand (9)
_____ Roadtrip Film Series (with Roadtrip Nation): one-month road-trip for a select number of students who want to drive an RV around the country interviewing social entrepreneurs; the experience will be filmed and produced into a feature documentary and short interviews available online (10)
Q15 How far is too far for you or your students to travel to attend regional, social entrepreneurship or service-learning events?

❍ Under an hour (1)
❍ Between 1 and 2 hours (2)
❍ Between 2 and 3 hours (3)
❍ Over 3 hours (4)

Q16 What price range would students and faculty pay for a two-day workshop with room and board as listed above:
❍ $150-$200 (1)
❍ $200-$300 (2)
❍ $300-$400 (3)
❍ $400-$500 (4)

Q17 Would your school be interested in being a Sullivan Foundation host school for regional programming?
❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
❍ Maybe (3)

QUESTIONS REGARDING SUMMER PROGRAMMING:

Q18 The Sullivan Foundation has supported summer college courses in social entrepreneurship for many years and in several different formats and locations. We need your help in designing what, if any, type of summer program we should develop. The Sullivan Foundation is considering redesigning its summer program to allow a greater number of students and faculty to participate. Do you believe a summer program in general is something you and your students would support?
❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
❍ Maybe (3)

Q19 Should Sullivan also attempt to promote/create courses taught during January term or spring break? Please rank what you think you and your students would most likely support:
_____ January term course (1)
_____ Spring break course (2)
_____ Short-term summer course (3)
_____ Long-term summer course (4)

Q20 Please rank the length of a summer program based on which you believe will be most popular with your students:
_____ 2 weeks (1)
_____ 4 weeks (2)
_____ 8 weeks (3)
_____ 10-12 weeks (4)

Q21 Please rank the following locations based on your belief of students' likelihood to attend a summer program in these areas. (Rank with 1 being most likely to attend.)
_____ Europe (1)
_____ Latin America (2)
_____ Nashville, TN (3)
_____ Raleigh/Durham, SC (4)
_____ Washington, D.C. (5)
_____ Atlanta, GA (6)
_____ Charlotte, NC (7)
_____ Location outside the American South (8)
_____ Rural Location (9)

Q22 Should there be a component of faculty participation or training during the summer
program? If so, what length is appropriate?
_____ Yes, 1 week. (1)
_____ Yes, 2 weeks. (2)
_____ Yes, as long as the program is scheduled. (3)
_____ No (4)
Q23 What are barriers to supporting the summer program as you see it being developed?

**QUESTIONS REGARDING THE SULLIVAN FOUNDATION HIGHER EDUCATION
CONSORTIUM:**
Q24 The Sullivan Foundation is considering developing a consortium so that classes taught
(and credits earned) under the umbrella of the Sullivan summer / January term courses would
be able to be transferred back to a home campus and allow the student to possibly earn a
minor in an area not offered at the home campus. Do you believe your school would support
such a consortium?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ Maybe (3)
Q25 Do you believe your school would contribute courses to the consortium?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
Q26 In addition to social entrepreneurship courses, please rank other service-related courses
you believe your students would support? (Please rank with 1 being most likely to support.)
_____ Non-Profit Management (1)
_____ Public Policy Leadership (2)
_____ Community Engagement (3)
_____ Alternative Career Planning (4)
_____ Design Thinking (5)

QUESTIONS REGARDING A SULLIVAN FOUNDATION PUBLICATION:
Q27 A number of faculty have suggested the Sullivan Foundation sponsor a scholarly
publication in the topic areas of service-learning and social entrepreneurship. How important
do you feel a publication like the one described above would be?
○ Very important (1)
○ Important (2)
○ Slightly important (3)
○ Neither important nor unimportant (4)
○ Unimportant (5)
Q28 Have you written for publications on these topics in the past?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
Q29 Are you planning on doing additional publishing on these topics in the future?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ Maybe (3)
Q30 Would you be interested in writing for this type of publication?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)
○ Maybe (3)

Q31 Have you served on editorial or review committees for scholarly publications in the past?
❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
Q32 Would you be interested in serving on the review/editorial committee of this type of publication?
❍ Yes (1)
❍ No (2)
❍ Maybe (3)
Q33 What other publications are you aware of related to social entrepreneurship and service-learning?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING SULLIVAN FOUNDATION PROGRAMMING:
Q34 How should the Sullivan Foundation spend its time and resources on the initiatives below? (Please rank with 1 being the option that should receive the most time and resources.)
_____ Develop a regional service-learning program during the semester (1)
_____ Develop a regional social entrepreneurship program during the semester (2)
_____ Develop a social entrepreneurship and service-learning summer program that connects students to learning environments (3)
_____ Develop a social entrepreneurship practitioner directory (4)
_____ Develop a social entrepreneurship and service learning-scholarly publication (5)
_____ Develop a social entrepreneurship faculty travel grant program to enhance faculty collaboration that stimulates initiatives between Sullivan Foundation schools (6)
_____ Develop a service-learning and social entrepreneurship academic conference to share ideas and best practices (7)
_____ Develop a regional social entrepreneurship student pitch competition that provides a showcase for teams of students to highlight their ideas in a pitch competition (8)
_____ Develop a study abroad program that concentrates on developing students as social entrepreneurs (9)
_____ Develop a consortium for social entrepreneurship and other classes (10)
_____ Develop a social entrepreneurship speaker circuit where speakers travel to particular schools (11)
_____ Develop internships with social ventures and Sullivan Alumni (12)
_____ Develop a venture fund with Sullivan Alumni to fund a club launching a social venture at a particular Sullivan school (13)
Q35 What is the name of your department/school?
Q36 What is the name of your institution?
Q37 What is your job position?

Appendix B

Table 1: The Capacity Framework

Aspirations	An organization's mission, vision, and overarching goals, which collectively articulate its common sense of purpose and direction
Strategy	The coherent set of actions and programs aimed at fulfilling the organization's overarching goals.
Organizational Skills	The sum of organization's capabilities, including such things (among others) as performance measurement, planning, resource management, and external relationship building.
Human Resources	The collective capabilities, experiences, potential and commitment of the organization's board, management team, staff, and volunteers
Systems and Infrastructure	The organization's planning, decision making, knowledge management, and administrative systems, as well as the physical and technological assets that support the organization.
Organizational Structure	The combination of governance, organizational design, interfunctional coordination, and individual job descriptions that shapes the organization's legal and management structure.
Culture	The connective tissue that binds together the organization, including shared values and practices, behavior norms, and most important, the organization's orientation towards performance

Source: The information was extracted from the report "Effective Capacity Building in Nonprofit Organizations" Copyright 2001, Venture Philanthropy Partners (VPP), which was prepared for VPP by McKinsey & Company.