

Clark University
MGT 255 (cross listed as ENT 255):
Navigating Nonprofit Dilemmas to Create Social Change

Fall Semester 2008

Instructor: Katya Fels Smyth

Phone: (617) 620-6718 (cellular)

(413) 625-6936 (office at the Full Frame Initiative)

Email: ksmyth@clarku.edu

Katya@fullframeinitiative.org (** this email is faster and more reliable)

Office hours: by appointment. I will almost always be available to meet with you before class, and can arrange other times to talk by phone or meet in person.

COURSE SUMMARY

This course will provide students with a practical grounding in the challenges encountered by people and organizations who seek to create social change. Each class will provide students with a richer understanding of the field and its state by focusing on an area of debate, tension, irresolution within the sector. Students will gain a deeper understanding of the multiple stakeholders who have a say in the provision of services and the creation of social value, and will be exposed to examples of how good intent can lead to inferior programming or failure in the absence of planning and mindful adaptation.

The course has a community engagement component that spans the semester and provides a balance to the often tidy prescriptions and descriptions of nonprofit practice.

This course meets the following undergraduate learning objectives:

- Effective written and oral communication, defined as that which is clear, concise, well organized, well reasoned, and appropriately presented:
 - This course requires students to weigh competing arguments, take a position in relation to these arguments and present their positions clearly, concisely and compellingly. In addition, the course is a seminar format, requiring students' presentation of materials and experiences that inform their opinions and conclusions.
- Critical and reflective thinking skills as demonstrated by the ability to apply concepts taught in the curriculum to managerial situations
 - The final project for this class requires students amalgamate the range of topics presented through the semester and focus on how theory plays out (or doesn't) in nonprofit organizations they are working with and in.
- The ability to work effectively in a team
 - Many assignments, including the final project, are team projects.
- The ability to identify and assess ethical and social responsibility issues.
 - The process of navigating nonprofit dilemmas requires recognizing how ethical issues impinge on and inform strategic and tactical decisions.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

The popular image of the social entrepreneur is increasingly one of an ardent, passionate, politically savvy individual, unfettered by doubt about purpose or direction, and possessing an informed and uncanny clarity about mission, strategy and tactics.

In fact, creating social value in the nonprofit sector — whether at the conception, launch, growth or mezzanine phase—is a process rife with uncertainty and dilemmas. Successful social entrepreneurs can and must navigate issues and times of uncertainty and ambiguity, and balance often conflicting demands and expectations even as they drive towards positive social change. Much of this ambiguity is inherent to the work; some is further complicated by tensions and unresolved issues in the field of social entrepreneurship itself. Much of this ambiguity comes from the need to act accountably to multiple stakeholders with disparate demands and expectations. Whatever the source, successful social entrepreneurs can tolerate a high level of ambiguity and can also make tactical decisions in the face of conflicting, often incomplete or imperfect information and political pressures.

Like a successful mountaineer, a successful social entrepreneur must have a developed sense of where the terrain may be the most treacherous, and arrive at these places with as much information and as many tools as is practical to manage the storms that may arise. A mountaineer who without gear summits having hit no ice patches or cross winds was lucky and foolish; a social entrepreneur whose work is successful without navigating dilemmas is also lucky and her work probably unsustainable.

This course therefore begins with the assumption that success is more likely with a studied understanding of particularly challenging domains—what I call inflection points. These are the places where dodging the issue is not a sustainable strategy, but successful, attentive navigation can be transformative for the individual and the organization and the social mission.

Each class will provide students with a richer understanding of the field and its state by focusing on an area of debate, tension, irresolution within the sector.

Students taking this course will gain:

- An understanding of the domestic nonprofit field and key challenges and questions facing the field;
- Greater comfort wrestling with ambiguity and increased ability to navigate in the face of compelling but contrary arguments;
- An understanding of the many stakeholders that nonprofit organizations serve and an ability to conceptualize competing demands;
- Experience reconciling the aspirations of best practices and texts with the reality doing on-the-ground work.

Students will explore current inflection points in social entrepreneurship through a lens of value creation—places where wrestling with ambiguity give us insight into how we might create new value for the field and for those whose lives we seek to improve.

This course will focus on the nonprofit sector, as this is still the primary structure for creating social change and obtaining third party payment for doing so in the United States. Certainly, many other models are being explored in the field, but a successful social entrepreneur will be well served by gaining knowledge of the traditionally understood channels of generating social good and social change. Many of the lessons of this course will generalize well across sectors.

Course format:

The class will meet as a three hour weekly seminar from 6 – 9 pm, Wednesday evenings (two 1 hr 20 minute sessions with a break in between). Each session will have a framing question. In its first year, participation will be limited to (approximately) 16 students.

This course fulfills its fourth hour requirement through its semester-long nonprofit placement requirement and students' resultant creation of an annotated accountability map and related written materials.

Prerequisites:

The Art of the New, or Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship, or Making A Difference First Year Seminar. Students who have not taken either course but believe they belong in this course must obtain prior approval.

Required texts:

Required readings will be made available throughout the semester and will include a mix of current articles from the field, the popular press and particular disciplines.

The following books are required and are available through the campus bookstore:

- Bane, M. J. and Mead, L. (2003) *Lifting Up the Poor* Brookings Institution
- Crutchfield, L. R. and Grant, H. M. (2008) *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits* Jossey-Bass.
- Elkington, J. and Hartigan, P. (2008) *The Power of Unreasonable People: How Social Entrepreneurs Create Markets that Change the World*. Harvard Business Press

In addition, you will need to subscribe to the Stanford Social Innovation Review and/or ensure you have online access to it (not just the free content).

Grading:

Participation: (30%)

You must show up to class and actively participate. How much you say is of less importance to me than what you say and how your questions and comments further discussion, present alternative points of view, demonstrate relentless curiosity and help advance a shared agenda. It will be obvious if you haven't done the reading, and there is a good deal of reading. Passion is encouraged. Dogmatism is not.

Written assignments: (30%)

Throughout the semester, you will have approximately 5 very short (1 – 2 page) reaction essays. You will also have to write a letter to the editor of the Stanford Social Innovation Review responding cogently to a piece in a current issue (whether your letter is published is not part of your grade, but you must submit a copy of your letter to me for grading). You will have one 5 – 7 page paper in addition to the final project. Most written assignments are to be completed in the first half of the semester, allowing for you to concentrate more on your final project towards the end of the semester. Your written assignments will be 30% of your grade.

Final project: (40%)

You will, in groups of three or four, work with one of several pre-selected Worcester based organizations. Over the course of the term, your team will generate an annotated accountability map that demonstrates an understanding of the inner workings of the organization and how it functions (or doesn't function) and navigates these constraints and checks and balances. Your project will require a heavy annotation of this map, including a discussion of the larger context in which the organization is situated. This map will be drawn from interviews and observations (through volunteering) that take place over a six to ten week span during which time you will spend approximately 25 hours in the organization. This is very different from a stakeholder analysis—it's a strong and weak force linkage exercise that will require interviewing, context analysis, background research, understanding of the field in general and of the players in particular. It will require students to demonstrate themselves trustworthy and reliable to organizations to access the information they need. Grading of this project will involve your written submission, your class presentation and defense and my debriefing with your field sites. You will receive a group grade; your actual grade may be up to one full grade greater or below the group grade (for example, if your group grade is a B, your personal grade will vary from a C to an A). Almost every session of the course will provide necessary material for conducting this exercise and students will receive significant guidance through the semester.

Please note: In line with a recently adopted Clark University policy, the first five grammatical or spelling errors will be circled. Your grade is automatically reduced by a partial grade (i.e., from a B to a B- or a B+ to a B) if there are five or more grammatical or spelling errors.

Introduction

SEPTEMBER 3, 2008:

Session 1: Introductory discussion of what role do social entrepreneurs and nonprofits play in society?

In this country alone, millions of people live in poverty; children become adolescents before they can read; species are threatened at an astonishing rate—the crises and problems are myriad and deep. Each year, thousands of new organizations are formed to combat these ills—there seems no shortage of good ideas or plans to ensure no child ever goes hungry again or that every child learns to read. This session will scan the size and power of the nonprofit sector, and the magnitude and depth of some of the most significant social problems. It will also provide a brief overview of how “doing good” is still largely structured in the USA, namely through the nonprofit sector, with revenue provided through contracts, philanthropy and potentially earned income. Class discussion will illuminate the particular constellation of passions, experience and goals of the enrolled students, which will inform assignments through the term.

Session 2: How will this course help us think about contributing positively to a field that seems crowded, in a world where so many people still need help?

This session will provide a preview of the course in the context of session 1’s discussion. Discussion and related readings will begin an exploration of the variety of definitions of Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise. It will also be a first of a series of student stepping stones in thinking about gain, and the balancing of personal gain, organizational gain, and field/cause gain.

A significant portion of this session will be spent on a discussion of the community involvement expectation for the class, and students will be introduced (ideally through discussion with staff from these programs) to each of the four pre-selected organizations (these organizations will be selected and partnerships arranged in concert with Micki Davis).

Part I: We all want the same thing---don't we?

SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

READINGS DUE:

The debate over social entrepreneurship:

- Light, P. (2006). "Reshaping Social Entrepreneurship." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Fall 2006
- Martin, R. and Osberg, S. (2007). "Social Entrepreneurship: the Case for Definition." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Spring 2007

How we conceptualize good works and what is a "proper response" is a social construct:

- Bane, M. J. and Mead, L. (2003) *Lifting Up the Poor* Brookings Institution (portions to read will be divided up among class members)

How our social construct fits into framing a response:

- C. Thorp and Linda Mills (1994) "The First Steps" in *Ideas in Motion: Tools for Transforming Your Community and the World* internally published manuscript, the Echoing Green Foundation.
- Introduction to theory of change: available for download at: www.granncraft.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.viewPage&pageID=808
- Project Superwoman: a guided example of the Theory of Change, available for download from www.theoryofchange.org.

Boards:

Reading from the Massachusetts Secretary of State's Office (will be provided to you).

ASSIGNMENTS DUE:

1/3 of class will be responsible for representing Lawrence Mead's position in *Lifting up the Poor*; 1/3 will be responsible for presenting Mary Jo Bane's position (details will be provided in the prior class). Remaining 1/3 of class will be responsible for presenting Project Superwoman—where are values embedded in that example? Did the Theory of Change process help unearth values and assumptions? (more details will be provided in the prior class).

Spend time on the websites of the field placement sites and rank order the organizations in terms of which you would like for your field placement. Write a compelling paragraph for why you would like to be placed in your first and second choices (1 short paragraph each).

Session 3: How do we conceptualize good work?

There are many frameworks to think about purpose: a theory of change, a problem and purpose statement—what most have in common is that they identify a problem

that the introduction of a new agent—an organization, a program, an initiative—might mitigate, ameliorate or solve. But how do values inform how we frame a problem to begin with? We'll explore the necessity of understanding not only a problem, but its causes and the different ways a problem is understood by different stakeholders, and how this drives policy and practice and what happens in communities.

Session 4: How is good work structured, and is it structured for the best results?

This session will explore the basics of nonprofit structures.

Organizational structure: The nonprofit model: its position and purpose (theories of a third sector filling in where government and markets fail; legal considerations)

The role of the Board: Although not the only player in creating social value, Boards are important. We will explore the traditional role and evolving thinking about the role of the board in creating value—for the organization itself, for the community and for the social entrepreneur.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Goetz, A. M. and Jenkins, R. (2002) “Voice, accountability and human development: The emergence of a new agenda” *Human Development Report Office Occasional Paper/Background Report for HDR 2002: Poverty Eradication and Democracy in the Developing World* (read pages 3 – 10), available at: http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2002/papers/goetz-jenkins_2002.pdf

Kissane, R. J. and Gingerich, J. (2004) “Do you see what I see? Nonprofit and resident perceptions of urban neighborhood problems.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 33(2). 311-333.

Forces for Good, Introduction and Chapter 1

Newspaper readings (see assignment, below)

ASSIGNMENT DUE:

- The power of place to frame what’s important:
 - Read The New York Times, the Boston Globe and the Worcester Telegram for one day (must be the same day for all three, but any day this week is fine) and prepare a short essay (1 – 2 pages) on how national problems are or are not mirrored on a regional/state and local level.
- Accountability matters:
 - Prepare a personal list of the people you are accountable to as a student at Clark, and what each person or constituency demands of you as a mark of “success.” If there are any conflicts, make a note of how you manage these, whatever the strategy is.

Session 5: Accountability is bean-counting and boring. Or is it?

This session will explore one of the main themes of the course through a group exercise. We will create an annotated accountability map for a fictional organization—a visual representation of the forces that constrain and enable doing good within an organization and external to the organization, and how these forces might lead to mission drift, or positive adaptation to do even more good. We begin to appreciate that accountability is not always aligned and can be a significant force for sidelining important work.

Session 6: Listening for resonance and difference

This course—the work in class, the outside readings, experiences you have in your fieldwork—will often present you with several vantage points on important issues. A key goal of the class is to help you become more comfortable navigating differing opinions or discordant information. But how, beyond reading, do we learn what’s

really going on? Researching by observing and asking, as well as by reading and spending time on line or in a library, is a skill few of us have naturally, but which is critical to a social entrepreneur's success. How do we ask a few questions to stimulate candor and conversation? How do we gather information? This session will require students to engage in a series of exercises to understand their own listening tendencies and develop interviewing, observing, and analytic skills. This session will give students a baseline to begin their community engagement work.

SEPTEMBER 24, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Review website of field organization, and begin background research on the issue the organization is addressing

Staples, L. (2000). "Insider/Outsider Upsides and Downsides" *Social Work with Groups* 23(2). 19- 35.

Forces for Good, Chapter 4 (we'll read chapters 2 and 3 later)

ASSIGNMENT DUE:

You will be assigned to one of three topics at the end of the September 17th class:

- JOBS: work force development/economic development in urban centers; training seminars
- ENTERTAINMENT: ballet companies and sports teams
- HEALTH: community health centers and doctors' offices

Come to class on September 24th prepared (this means you may have to do some research!) to describe why the first of each pairing qualifies for tax-exempt status, why the latter doesn't, whether there are other ways the latter half of each pairing is supported directly or indirectly by government, and what this says about social values and priorities.

Session 7: You have to get your hands dirty to learn this stuff—introduction to community field work.

Students will present their exercises as a lead in to the deepening discussion of how societal values inform what work falls to the nonprofit sector. That society has determined that some people and issues deserve assistance from others, and that government will indirectly (by giving tax-incentives for philanthropy) and directly (through contracts) subsidize this work, mirrors these social values. But the work of actually helping those who live in poverty, or struggle to escape domestic violence, or bring nature back to blighted communities, or decrease racial disparities in education or health is complicated, both compromised and enabled by forces internal to the organization, and external expectations and requirements.

This session will fully launch the field work element of the class and will present guidelines for doing the work in community. Students will have been assigned to teams for this work. The final project will be an accountability map for each organization, heavily annotated to reflect the particulars of each organization's governance and staffing structures, funding models and challenges, community visibility and cache, sector based challenges, and community capital. We will discuss this project, but in this session we will focus on the accountability of students to the organization and each other as an initial frame for the exercise.

We will then talk about the importance of place and identity. Short films and an in class exercise will illuminate how people experience the same place differently, and how context matters, and we will begin an exploration of the role of the target community in forming, shaping, enabling or damning community change efforts.

Session 8: Why Doesn't Anyone Want My Great Idea?

Enduring projects are integrally entwined with the values and priorities and hopes of those they wish to assist. But what if these aren't readily apparent? Do communities always have to create their own social change, or is there a role for an "outsider?" This session will explore the important of community and program participant voice, and the costs of straying far from community input, or relying on community input solely.

Part II: Who pays, and what are they paying for?

OCTOBER 1, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Kelly, K. (1998) "Learning the ROPES" *Case Currents*, v24 n6 p26-28,30-31 Jun 1998

The Power of Unreasonable People, Introduction, Chapters 1 and 2 (Chapter 3 is great, but optional)

Seedco Policy Center (2007) "The limits of social enterprise: A field study and case analysis." Available for download at:
www.seedco.org/publications/publications/social_enterprise.pdf

Funding proposal for your organization

*Note: A "fundraising 101" with links is available at:
<http://nonprofit.about.com/od/fundraising/a/fundraising101.htm>*

Sessions 9 and 10: Who picks up the tab?

The nonprofit sector, in general, relies on those who do not benefit directly from the program or service to subsidize the work. These sessions will provide background on the major means nonprofits use to support their work—private philanthropy, government contracts, earned income, and the benefits and costs of each model. We will also explore trends including venture philanthropy, and hybrid organizations both for their specific content areas, and as exemplars of how the nonprofit field is itself struggling to innovate with mixed results. We will explore how the traditional roles of philanthropy as funding initiation and launch, and government funding sustainability and spread, are changing dramatically, and what implications this has for those seeking capital.

OCTOBER 8, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Brest, P. (2003) “Smart money” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 1(3) 44-53.

Miller, C. (2008). “The equity capital gap” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 6(3) 40-45.

Session 11: What will funders fund?

We will explore in greater depth the legal limits on what kinds of revenue can be applied to what kinds of activities, the far greater traditional and cultural limits, and how organizations adjust their activities, or their communication with funders about activities, to secure and maintain funding.

Session 12: Guest panel

A guest panel of practitioners from philanthropy (getters and givers) and government granting/contracting will further enhance our understanding of the price of each kind of capital and the processes of tapping into each stream.

OCTOBER 15, 2008

READINGS DUE:

“The Pros and Cons of Financial Efficiency Standards,” Brief no. 5 of the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy, Urban Institute and the Center on Philanthropy, Indiana University. Available for download at:
<http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/kbfiles/521/brief%205.pdf>

Day, D. (1952) “Poverty and Precarity” *The Catholic Worker* May 1952 available at:
[www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/daytext.cfm?TextID=633&SearchTerm=pove](http://www.catholicworker.org/dorothyday/daytext.cfm?TextID=633&SearchTerm=pove%20rty)
rty

ASSIGNMENT DUE:

With your field team: Review the 990s (three years minimum) of three organizations whose mission overlaps, broadly speaking, with the one you are profiling for your community project, plus that organization (four total). In your group, create a tabular summary of the funding models each uses, calculate the overhead rate for each organization, and come to class prepared to discuss your findings.

Session 13: Does more cents on the dollar to programming mean better efficiency?

Organizations are increasingly judged not only by evaluative outputs (we’ll touch on these briefly, and explore them in the next section), but by a set of benchmarks and common wisdom that may not actually be so common, or so wise. We will continue our session 11/12 discussion by focusing more closely on one particularly hot issue: the overhead debate—what fraction of a nonprofit’s revenue is spent on direct program activities, versus management and fundraising, and whether this is a useful proxy for efficiency.

Session 14: Are nonprofits (and the people who work in them) supposed to be poor?

The popular image of a nonprofit is of an organization struggling to meet payroll, desperate for cash, with workers barely faring better than those they are seeking to help. We will examine and debate whether this is, in fact, an accurate portrayal of effective organizations, and whether there is such a thing as having too much money. Does organizational wealth change community perception about an organization? About an issue? Make it easier or harder to attract capital? Is it ethical to pay a fundraiser several times more than a frontline worker? What if the pursuit of capital mirrors the social injustice dynamic and organization was established to counteract?

OCTOBER 22, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Lewis, J. C. (2008) “Microloan Sharks” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (6) 3 54-59.

Forces for Good Chapter 6

Session 15: Getting cozy: Dilemmas in fundraising and capital partnerships.

Through a series of in class exercises, we will explore several common, but vexing dilemmas: is some money dirtier than other money? Should your top funders be on your board? Are there ever conflicts of interests with funders? How can you increase the visibility of your cause without exploiting those whom you seek to assist?

Part III: Is it working?

Session 16: Introduction to program evaluation and models of evaluation

Students will learn the basics of how programs answer the generic question, What are your results, and are you helping? and gain familiarity with standard reporting formats—the United Way, foundation reports, government contracts (annual performance reports).

OCTOBER 29, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Smyth, K. and Schorr, L. (2008) “A Call to Rethink What Constitutes ‘Evidence’ in Finding Social Interventions that Work.” Under Review

Snibbe, A. C. (2006) “Drowning in Data” *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 4(3) 39-45.

ASSIGNMENT DUE:

Essay choice (4 – 6 pages)

Ethical challenges of fundraising OR

Given the constraints and challenges of philanthropic fundraising, why would an organization choose to be a nonprofit?

Sessions 17 and 18: Does it only count if we can count it?

One of the biggest, most important debates in the field of social services and social change is what constitutes progress and results. We will explore whether the search for certainty privileges certain types of interventions over others based on program type versus effectiveness, and we will discuss what level of certainty can and should be demanded of practitioners by various stakeholders.

In the second half of this double session, we will be joined by a program evaluator who will deepen and contextualize our conversation and concerns:

What if it doesn't add up? (with guest program evaluator)

Sometimes, evaluative data is inconclusive or even indicates “this program is not working,” but those doing the work and perhaps others with less at stake are convinced it's an important, valuable program. What is the responsibility of the practitioner to stay the course and change the evaluation tool, to change tactics to show progress on the original tool's measures, or to make a case for why the work is valuable in spite of the evidence? What if what matters to you or to your community doesn't matter to your funder?

NOVEMBER 5, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Dees, J. G., Anderson, B. B., and Wei-Skillern, J. (2004) "Scaling Social Impact: Strategies for Spreading Social Innovations." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 1(4). 24-32.

Kramer, M. R. (2005) "Scaling social impact." *FSG Perspectives for Private Foundations*. Available for download from www.fsg-impact.org/app/content/ideas/item/362 or from the February 3, 2005 issue of the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*

Note: A very thorough bibliography can be found at: www.scalingsocialimpact.org, along with papers, discussions and resources.

The Power of Unreasonable People, Chapter 7

Session 19 and 20: What's the obligation if it is working?

We've spent a lot of time worrying about if it's not working. What if it is? Is there an obligation to do more of it? Where and how? This session will explore the idea of "going to scale" and the mechanisms organizations employ to scale themselves, their impact, and their ideas.

Guest speaker on practical experience scaling organizations and the importance of understanding context.

Part IV: Don't you want some help? Collaboration and partnership for social change.

NOVEMBER 12, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Forces for Good Chapters 2, 5 and 7

The Power of Unreasonable People, Chapters 4 and 6

Wei-Skillern, J. and Marciano, S. (2008) "The Networked Nonprofit" *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 6(2). 38-43.

Session 21: What is social change work anyway?

Is feeding the poor social justice work, or does there also need to be an effort to change the conditions that lead people to be poor? To draw on a familiar proverb, is it so wrong to give someone fish? Must we always teach others to do for themselves? How do organizations and people manage and mismanage this tension? Can a single organization help people and create social change?

Session 22: Working collectively—is collaboration possible, and who gets credit?

Organizational credit and action through networks: Tying together the pressures and forces explored so far, we will look at the difficulties of creating change outside the boundaries of a single entity and the conditions under which it's most likely to occur.

NOVEMBER 19, 2008

READINGS DUE:

(Review) Forces for Good, Chapters 2 and 3

Shiffman, J. (2003) "Generating Political Will for Safe Motherhood in Indonesia"
Social Science and Medicine, 56(6). 1197-1207

Sessions 23 and 24: So you think you're so pure: how social entrepreneurs engage strange bedfellows to create change.

One understanding of the nonprofit sector is that it exists to balance the excesses of the for-profit sector and mitigate the fall out of bad or inept public policy (the government sector). But are business and government really the enemy? Or are they often overlooked allies? What is the potential for social transformation in partnerships, and the areas of conflicting need, accountability and expectations? We will also discuss the cross sector role of evangelizers to build alliances, interest and change thinking.

Part V: Putting it all together

DECEMBER 3, 2008

READINGS DUE:

Reread initial readings on social entrepreneurship

Power of Unreasonable People, Conclusion

(review) Forces for Good, Chapters 8 and 9

Listen to Gavin Newsom at [sic.conversationsnetwork.org/shows/detail3615.html](http://www.sic.conversationsnetwork.org/shows/detail3615.html)

Session 25: What's the role of the Social Entrepreneur? Or if Entrepreneurship Can be Taught, Do I Really Matter?

We will revisit the definition of social entrepreneurship through an in class exercise, which will, in part, require students to reflect on whether the organization they were in qualifies for their definition of a socially entrepreneurial organization. We will revisit key points from the semester to examine how use of self, passion, character and integrity inform how particular situations are navigated, and will discuss a framing of the social entrepreneur as a value based leader.

Session 26: Staying alive: accountability to self and purpose.

It's easy to be crushed by the demands of the sector, the community, staff—answering to everyone but yourself. We will hear reactions from those who have been branded (or who call themselves) social entrepreneurs. They will reflect on their personal paths as leaders and as non-leaders, share how they have survived their toughest moments, and describe how personal ambition has helped and hindered their organizations.

DECEMBER 10, 2008

Sessions 27 and 28: Presentations (EXTENDED, FOUR HOUR SESSION)

Students will present their accountability maps for their field organizations in overview (full version submitted for grading due by December 19th *NO EXTENSIONS*). 20 minutes presentation with 10 minutes for questions, feedback.

Pizza AND Final discussion: What work survives the pressure?

YOUR FINAL ASSIGNMENT WILL BE DUE THE LAST DAY OF EXAM PERIOD. If you haven't already submitted a letter to the editor of the Stanford Social Innovation Review, this will be due at the same time (submit it to SSIR and submit a copy to me).