

USC Price

PPD 689: The Nonprofit Sector & Philanthropy

Spring 2017 Mondays 6:00 to 9:20 pm

Location: RGL 209

Alexandra Graddy-Reed

graddyre@price.usc.edu

222 Lewis Hall (RGL)

MW 2-3:00 pm or by appointment

Course Description & Objectives

Philanthropic and nonprofit organizations have a long history of community support and social change in the United States. Their unique position and regulation within the economy allows these organizations to be risk takers and sources of innovation. As a result many important changes have been the result of nonprofit organizations or their funding.

This course presents an overview of the nonprofit sector and the organizations that comprise it. We will discuss the history of the sector and its economic, political, and social rationale within a US context. Careful attention is placed on the relationships between nonprofit organizations and to government, for-profits, and social enterprise. The implications for and challenges of policy, strategy, and management are also discussed.

This course aims for students to:

1. Gain a deeper understanding of the nonprofit sector and philanthropy within the US
2. Develop critical assessments of nonprofit organizations and policies
3. Evaluate philanthropic strategies regarding public good provision

Required Readings

Articles & Cases: Required article and news readings are listed by citation or URL on the weekly schedule and are available through Google or Google Scholar.

Subscriptions: The following (free) news subscriptions are required:

- The Nonprofit Quarterly Newsletter [<http://nonprofitquarterly.org/category/newswire/>]
- The Chronicle of Philanthropy Weekly Newsletter [https://philanthropy.com/page/Get-Newsletters/543?cid=cpf_nws]
- Stanford Social Innovation Review Weekly Newsletter [<http://www.ssireview.org/>]
- Foundation Center Philanthropy News Digest [<http://foundationcenter.org/newsletters/>]

Reference Materials:

- Guidestar – create a free user account and access information on nonprofit organizations [<https://www.guidestar.org/Login.aspx>]
- CPPP lists of resources – [<http://cPPP.usc.edu/field-resources/>]

Assignments

1. *Nonprofit Organization Analysis & Presentation* (10% of final grade): Students will select a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization focused on service delivery and/or policy advocacy and create a profile of the organization, their structure, financial state, and public good provision. Groups of 3-4 students will then provide a presentation to the class on their chosen organizations, the similarities and differences, and strengths and weaknesses of the set.
2. *Private Foundation Analysis & Presentation* (10% of final grade): Similar to the nonprofit analysis, students will also select a private grantmaking foundation and create a profile of the organization and then make a group presentation.
3. *Giving Workshop* (15% of final grade): Throughout the semester, we will work on a giving workshop, where students will establish their own approaches to philanthropy. Elements include identifying a philanthropic mission, creating a giving strategy, identifying prospects, and evaluating grantees and strategies.
4. *Group Project* (25% of final grade): Throughout the semester students will work in small groups to tackle an issue facing the nonprofit sector and design a solution to a problem through a nonprofit organization. The project culminates in a group presentation of their proposed solution and approach.
5. *Final Exam* (25% of final grade): There will be a final exam at the end of the semester that assess your comprehension of the readings and discussions on the variety of topics presented throughout the semester.
6. *Class Participation* (15% of final grade): This course is a combination of lecture and discussion, thus its success depends on student participation. Students are expected to come to class prepared to discuss the current readings and topics with thoughtful commentary and questions. It is also expected that discussions are respectful of all participants and their views. Grades will reflect the quality of student participation in class discussion, respect to others, and attentiveness to presentations.

Grade Breakdown

Assignment	Grade %
Nonprofit Analysis	10%
Foundation Analysis	10%
Giving Workshop	15%
Group Project	25%
Final Exam	25%
Class Participation	15%
Total	100%

Assignment Submission Policy

Assignments are due at the start of class on the specified due date. Assignments must be submitted in hardcopy (and stapled!) and via Turnitin on Blackboard. Late assignments are not accepted unless prior instructor approval is received.

Attendance Policy

Attendance is not mandatory, or recorded. However class participation is 15% of the final grade, and repeated absences makes participation quite challenging. Tardiness is disrespectful to others and as a result will be reflected in participation grades. Notice of planned absences is appreciated but not required. Class participation, presentations, and exams may not be made-up unless in the case of an emergency, religious, or major personal obligation. If religious or major personal obligations will conflict with any of these, prior notification is required so please speak with me as soon as possible so we may find an optimal solution.

Use of Technology in Class

The use of cell phones in class is not permitted. Use of phones will be reflected in class participation grades. The use of laptops for the purpose of taking notes is tentatively permitted. However, if this privilege is abused and distracting to others, all will lose the privilege. No recording or photography is allowed in the class.

Statement for Students with Disabilities

“Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website and contact information for DSP:

http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html, (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.”¹

Statements on Academic Integrity & Conduct

Don’t cheat. Don’t plagiarize. Don’t be dishonest. It will not be tolerated. Any incident will be reported.

“USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one’s own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another’s work as one’s own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *SCampus*, the Student Guidebook, (www.usc.edu/scampus or <http://scampus.usc.edu>) contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.”

“Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with

¹ All quoted text is required and taken from the USC syllabus template

the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Section 11, Behavior Violating University Standards <https://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions>. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct>.”

“Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the Office of Equity and Diversity <http://equity.usc.edu> or to the Department of Public Safety <http://adminopsnet.usc.edu/departments/departments-public-safety>. This is important for the safety of the whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. The Center for Women and Men <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/> provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage <http://sarc.usc.edu> describes reporting options and other resources.”

Support Systems

“A number of USC’s schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the American Language Institute <http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali>, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. The Office of Disability Services and Programs http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations.”

Emergency Preparedness & Course Continuity in a Crisis

“In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies.”

Detailed Course Schedule

This tentative schedule provides the topics, reading, and assignments for each class. It is expected that all readings are completed before class. Weekly readings range from approximately 50 to 175 pages. Assignments are due at the start of class. Any changes to the schedule will be announced in class and noted on Blackboard. Readings followed by (BB) are posted on Blackboard. Academic articles are available through Google Scholar. Otherwise, links are provided. Should the link no longer work, search for the article. Some links will require you to be logged in via the USC library to access their subscriptions.

Part I: The Nonprofit Sector

Week 1: January 9th

Overview: Course

Lecture: Framework & Theories of the Nonprofit Sector

Exercise: Understanding the Form 990

Group: Interest Areas & Experience

Readings:

- Hall, P. D. (2010). Historical perspectives on nonprofit organizations in the United States. *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management*, 3-41.
- 2007 Form 990 (BB)
- 2014 Form 990 (BB)
- 2007 Form 990-PF (BB)
- 2014 Form 990-PF (BB)
- Panepento, P. (2007). IRS Revises Proposed Tax Form in Response to Critics. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 1, 2007. [<https://philanthropy.com/article/IRS-Revises-Proposed-Tax-Form/163361>]
- Guidestar (2009) The door has opened: new form 990 creates strategic opportunities and risks for nonprofit organizations [<https://trust.guidestar.org/the-door-has-opened-new-form-990-creates-strategic-opportunities-and-risks-for-nonprofit-organizations>]
- Simpson Thacher (2008). Changes to 2008 IRS Form 990 and Instructions. *Client Memorandum*, October 14, 2008. (BB)

Week 2: January 16th – No Class, Martin Luther King Jr. Day

Week 3: January 23rd

Lecture: Government & Public Accountability

Overview: Giving Workshop

Exercise: Defining Fairness

Group: Group Assignments & Brainstorming

Readings:

- (2011). Options for Changing the Tax Treatment of Charitable Giving. Congressional Budget Office, May 2011. (BB)

- Chaves, M. (2003). Debunking Charitable Choice: The Evidence Doesn't Support the Political Left or Right. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2003, 28-36. [http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/debunking_charitable_choice/]
- Bradrick, E. (2015) California's New Regulations: The start of a new problematic trend in state charity oversight? *Nonprofit Quarterly*, December 18, 2015. [https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2015/12/18/are-californias-new-regulations-the-beginning-of-an-ominous-trend-in-state-charity-oversight/]
- Strom, S. (2011). California Scrutinizes Nonprofits, Sometimes Ending a Tax Exemption. *The New York Times*, August 14, 2011. [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/15/business/california-scrutinizes-property-tax-exemption-of-nonprofits.html]
- (2014). Tax-Exempt Organizations: Better Compliance Indicators and Data, and More Collaboration with State Regulators Would Strengthen Oversight of Charitable Organizations. *Government Accountability Office*, Report 15-164, December 17, 2014. (BB)
- Daniels, A. (2016) More than 75% of voters want charities to get a bigger say in policy making poll finds, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, September 22, 2016. [https://www.philanthropy.com/article/More-Than-75-of-Voters-Want/237867]
- Perry, S. and O'Neil, M. (2015). Four Cancer Charities Charged in \$187 Million Fraud Case. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, May 19, 2015. [https://philanthropy.com/article/4-Cancer-Charities-Charged-in/230263]
- Perry, S. (2012). Lack of Serious Oversight of Charities Undermines Public Trust. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 28, 2012. [https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Lack-of-Charity-Oversight/155901]
- Garment, S. & Lenkowsky, L. (2016). Clinton Fund Controversy Stems from Americans' Support of Nonprofits Over Government, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, August 30, 2016. [https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Opinion-Clinton-Fund/237627]
- Drezner, D. (2016) The tricky thing about studying the politics of philanthropy, *The Washington Post*, July 26, 2016. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/07/26/the-tricky-thing-about-studying-the-politics-of-philanthropy/?utm_term=.015a42185a7e]
- Carnegie, A. (1889). Wealth. *The North American Review*, 148(391), 653-664. {AKA: The Gospel of Wealth}
- Reich, R. (2005). A Failure of Philanthropy. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2005. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/a_failure_of_philanthropy]

Part II: Private Foundations

Week 4: January 30th

Lecture: Private Foundations

Overview: Group Project

Giving Workshop Part I Mission

Group: Problems Identified

Due: Select private foundation for analysis

Readings:

- Carson, E. (2015). 21st Century Community Foundations: A question of geography and identity. *Foundation Center, Grant Craft*. (BB)
- Ostrower, F. (2003). Family Philanthropy: What we don't know. National Center for Family Philanthropy, *Passages*, 5(5). (BB)
- Sansing, R., Yetman, R. (2006). Governing private foundations using the tax law. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, 41, 363-384.
- Di Mento, M. (2015). Personal toll of Dyslexia, Alzheimer's spurs \$50-Million gift to USC. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, March 25, 2015. [<https://philanthropy.com/article/Personal-Toll-of-Dyslexia/228741>]
- Gift letter from Buffett to Gates, June 26, 2006. (BB)
- Sievers, B. (2006). Eight questions reporters should've asked about the Buffett donation. *Stanford Social Innovation Opinion Blog*, November 28, 2006. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/eight_questions_reporters_should_have_asked_about_the_buffett_donation1]
- Review the Giving Pledge website [<http://givingpledge.org/>]
- Strom, S. (2010). Pledge to give away fortunes stirs debate. *The New York Times*, November 10, 2010. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/11/giving/11PLEDGE.html?pagewanted=all>]
- Review the Global Philanthropists Circle website [<http://www.synergos.org/philanthropistscircle/>]
- McConnon, A. (2007). The most elite club in the world. *Bloomberg Businessweek*, November 25, 2007. (BB)
- Branswell, H. & Berke, R. (2016). Philanthropist Bill Gates talks public health, biotech, and the race for the White House, *STAT*, June 17, 2016 [<https://www.statnews.com/2016/06/17/bill-gates-interview/>]

Week 5: February 6th

Lecture: Venture & Strategic Philanthropy

Overview: Foundation Presentations

Giving Workshop Part II Strategy

Group: Solution Brainstorming

Group assignments for foundation presentations

Readings:

- Letts, C., Ryan, W., and A. Grossman. (1997). Virtuous Capital: What Foundations Can Learn from Venture Capitalists. *Harvard Business Review*, 75(2), March/April, 2-7.
- Frumkin, P. (2003). Inside Venture Philanthropy. *Society*, May/June 2003.
- Cha, A. E. (2014). Cari Tuna and Dustin Moskovitz: Young Silicon Valley billionaires pioneer new approach to philanthropy. *Washington Post*, December 26, 2014. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/billionaire-couple-give-plenty-to-charity-but-they-do-quite-a-bit-of-homework/2014/12/26/19fae34c-86d6-11e4-b9b7-b8632ae73d25_story.html]

- O’Neil, M. (2015). \$45 Billion Zuckerberg-Chan Pledge Has Charities Excited — and Wary, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, December 4, 2015. [<https://www.philanthropy.com/article/45-Billion-Zuckerberg-Chan/234490>]
- Guo, J. (2015). Why a German billionaire says that pledges like Mark Zuckerberg’s are really bad, *The Washington Post*, December 2, 2015. [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/12/02/why-some-people-feel-billionaire-pledges-like-mark-zuckerbergs-are-really-bad/?utm_term=.1cbf276f5f36]
- Daniels, A. (2015). New MacArthur President Promises Grant Making with a More Immediate Impact. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, March 11, 2015. [<https://philanthropy.com/article/New-MacArthur-President/228441>]
- Reed Wasson, R. (2016). The Future of Prize Philanthropy, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2016 [<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1792217728/fulltextPDF/6123AEECF1974B4DPQ/1?accountid=14749>]
- Starr, K. (2016). The Lazy Funder’s Guide to High-Yield Philanthropy, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, April 5, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_lazy_funders_guide_to_high_yield_philanthropy]
- Kania, J., Kramer, M., Russell, P. (2014). Strategic Philanthropy for a Complex World. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2014. [http://ssir.org/up_for_debate/article/strategic_philanthropy?utm_campaign=SPCWAnnounce061214&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter]
- Kimball, K. and Kopell, M. (2011). Letting Go. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2011. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/letting_go/]
- Eckhart-Queeran, J., Etzel, M., & Prasad, S. (2016). Pay-what-it-takes Philanthropy, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2016 [https://ssir.org/up_for_debate/article/pay_what_it_takes_philanthropy]
- Buchanan, P. & Patrizi, P. (2016). Ditch Strategic Philanthropy — but Don’t Throw Out Strategy With It, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 4, 2016. [<https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Opinion-Ditch-Strategic/237938>]

Week 6: February 13th

Foundation Presentations

Part III: Public Charities

Week 7: February 20th – No Class, President’s Day

Week 8: February 27th

Lecture: Nonprofit Organizations & Structures

Overview: Due Diligence Research

Giving Workshop Part III Prospects

Group: Design Methods

Due: Select nonprofit organization for analysis

Readings:

- Salamon, L. (1994). The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4), 109-122.
- Reich, R., Dorn, L., & Sutton, S. (2009). Anything Goes: Approval of nonprofit status by the IRS. *Stanford University Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society*, October 2009. (BB)
- Chaves, M., & Wineburg, B. (2009). Did the faith-based initiative change congregations. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(2), 343-355.
- Matthews, C. (2015). How Much Does Scientology pocket from its tax exempt status? *Fortune*, April 8, 2015. [<http://fortune.com/2015/04/08/scientology-tax-exempt/>]
- Gauss, A. (2015). Why we love to hate nonprofits. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, July 29, 2015. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/why_we_love_to_hate_nonprofits]

Week 9: March 6th

Lecture: Nonprofit Finances & Governance

Overview: Nonprofit Presentations

Exercise: Salary Regulation

Group: Solution Development

Group assignments for nonprofit presentations

Readings:

- (2015). Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice: A Guide for Charities and Foundations. *Independent Sector*. (BB)
- Ostrower, F. (2007). Nonprofit Governance in the United States. *The Urban Institute, Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy*. (BB)
- Goggins Gregory, A. & Howard, D. (2009). The Nonprofit Starvation Cycle. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Fall 2009. [http://ssir.org/images/articles/2009FA_feature_Gregory_Howard.pdf]
- Schaffer, J. & McCambridge, R. (2016). Should board members of large nonprofits be paid?, *Nonprofit Quarterly*, September 6, 2016. [<https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2016/09/06/should-board-members-of-large-nonprofits-be-paid/>]
- Goldstein, A. (2003). What Price Salary at a Nonprofit? *The Washington Post*, April 14, 2003. [<http://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/business/2003/04/14/what-price-salary-at-a-nonprofit/c7d3781b-5d84-4ba1-9efc-f70f491d9ded/>]
- Schwinn, E. (2004). Big Nonprofit Salaries Face Government Scrutiny. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, June 24, 2004. [<https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Big-Nonprofit-Salaries-Face/164665>]
- Glater, J. (2007). Increased Compensation Puts More College Presidents in the Million-Dollar Club. *The New York Times*, November 12, 2007. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/12/us/12compensation.html>]
- Lemming, M. (2016). \$450K cap proposed on hospital CEO salaries in California, *Nonprofit Quarterly*, June 6, 2016. [<https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2016/06/14/450k-cap-proposed-on-hospital-ceo-salaries-in-california/>]
- (2015). Grassley concerned about nonprofit CEO pay, not donor-advised funds, *Philanthropy News Digest*, September 11, 2015. [<http://philanthropynewsdigest.org/news/grassley-concerned-about-nonprofit-ceo-pay-not-donor-advised-funds>]

- Levine, M. & McCambridge, R. (2016). Nonprofit reactions to new overtime rules run the gamut, *Nonprofit Quarterly*, May 20, 2016. [<https://nonprofitquarterly.org/2016/05/24/unhappy-paradox-nonprofit-reactions-new-overtime-rules/#>]

Week 10: March 13th – No Class, Spring Break

Week 11: March 20th

Nonprofit Presentations

Part IV: The Public Good Marketplace

Week 12: March 27th

Lecture: Grantmaking Market

Exercise: Hospital Grant Agreement

Group: Solution Development

Readings:

- Fairfield, K. and Wang, K. (2008). Collaboration in Foundation Grantor-Grantee Relationships. *Nonprofit Management Leadership*, 19(1). 27-44.
- Frumkin, P. and Kim, M. (2001). Strategic Positioning and the Financing of Nonprofit Organizations: Is efficiency rewarded in the contributions marketplace? *Public Administration Review*, 61(3), 266-275.
- Yermack, D. (2015). Donor Governance and Financial Management in Prominent US Art Museums. *National Bureau of Economic Research*, Working Paper 21066.
- Kaplan, R. and Grossman, A. (2010). The Emerging Capital Market for Nonprofits. *Harvard Business Review*, October 2010.
- Hewlett Foundation. (2008). The Nonprofit Marketplace: Bridging the information gap in philanthropy. (BB)
- Ettinger, J. and Ettinger, J. (2015). Understanding Risk Tolerance in Grantmaking. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, July 22, 2015. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/understanding_risk_tolerance_in_grantmaking]
- Cortes Culwell, A. & McLeod Grant, H. (2016). Bridging the divide between nonprofits and philanthropy in Silicon Valley, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, October 25, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/bridging_the_divide_between_nonprofits_and_philanthropy_in_silicon_valley]
- Strom, S. (2003). Donors add watchdog role to relations with charities. *The New York Times*, March 29, 2003. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/29/us/donors-add-watchdog-role-to-relations-with-charities.html>]

Week 13: April 3rd

Lecture: Mixed Markets, Networks & Partnerships, Mergers & Exits

Overview: Writing and Citing

Exercise: Running into the Sunset

Group: Writing

Readings:

- Hirth, R. (1997). Competition between for-profit and nonprofit health care providers: Can it help achieve social goals? *Medical Care Research and Review*, 54(4), 414-438.
- Horwitz, J. (2005). Making profits and providing care: Comparing nonprofit, for-profit, and government hospitals. *Health Affairs*, 24(3), 790-801.
- Rosenau, P. and Linder, S. (2003). Two decades of research comparing for-profit and nonprofit health provider performance in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(2).
- Ostrower, F. (2005). The Reality Underneath the Buzz of Partnerships. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 34-41.
[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_reality_underneath_the_buzz_of_partnerships/]
- Henig, J., Houston, D. M., & Lyon, M. (2016). The changing face of collaboration, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, May 9, 2016.
[https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_changing_face_of_collaboration]
- Bugg-Levine, A. & Sullivan, K. (2015). Improving Corporate-Nonprofit Partnerships, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, July 23, 2015.
[http://ssir.org/articles/entry/improving_corporate_nonprofit_partnerships]
- Pollack, A. (2014). Deal by Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Raises Cash and Some Concern. *The New York Times*, November 19, 2014. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/19/business/for-cystic-fibrosis-foundation-venture-yields-windfall-in-hope-and-cash.html>]
- Hinkes-Jones, L. (2015). Stop Subsidizing Big Pharma. *The New York Times*, January 5, 2015. [<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/06/opinion/stop-subsidizing-big-pharma.html>]
- Kirkpatrick, K., Gammal, D., and D. Haider (2007). The Merger Proposal. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer, 41-55. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_merger_proposal/]
- Flynn, D. and Tian, Y. (2015). Nonprofit deaths, near deaths and reincarnations: part 1 of 5, Hull House. *Nonprofit Quarterly*, February 10, 2015.
[<http://nonprofitquarterly.org/2015/02/10/nonprofit-deaths-near-deaths-and-reincarnations-part-1-of-5-hull-house/>]
- Grivna, K. and Toben, S. (2015). The Transformation of one Nonprofit, the Creation of Another, and the Impending Closure of Both. *Nonprofit Quarterly*, February 17, 2015.
[<http://nonprofitquarterly.org/2015/02/17/the-transformation-of-the-otto-schiff-housing-association-the-creation-of-the-six-point-foundation-and-the-impending-closure-of-both/>]
- Irvin, R. (2007). Endowments: Stable Largesse or Distortion of the Polity? *Public Administration Review*, 67(3), 445-457.
- Laskowski, K. (2008). Perpetuity is a long time. National Center for Family Philanthropy. May 15, 2008. [<https://www.ncfp.org/blog/2008/may-perpetuity-is-a-long-time.html>]
- Beatty, Sally (2006). Gates Foundation Sets its Lifespan. *The Wall Street Journal*, December 1, 2006. [<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB116493514082937519>]

Week 14: April 10th

Lecture: Evaluation & Measuring Success

Overview: Exam

Giving Workshop Part IV Evaluating Prospects

Group: Presentation Prep

Readings:

- Brest, P. (2010). The Power of Theories of Change. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2010. [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_power_of_theories_of_change/]
- Bradach, J. (2003). Going to Scale: The Challenge of Replicating Social Programs. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2003. [http://www.socialimpactexchange.org/sites/www.socialimpactexchange.org/files/publications/Going%20to%20Scale_0.pdf]
- Cunningham, K. and Ricks, M. (2004). Why Measure. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2004 [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/why_measure/]
- Fiennes, C. (2013). Most Charities Shouldn't Evaluate Their Work: Part 1. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, May 29, 2013 [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/most_charities_shouldnt_evaluate_their_work]
- Fiennes, C. (2013). Most Charities Shouldn't Evaluate Their Work: Part 2. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, May 30, 2013 [http://ssir.org/articles/entry/most_charities_shouldnt_evaluate_their_work1]
- Daniels, A. (2016). Gates CEO Pledges to Listen More and Share Fund's Failures Along With Successes, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, May 23, 2016. [<https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Gates-CEO-Pledges-to-Listen/236561>]
- Twersky, F., Nelson, J., Ratcliffe, A. (2010). Actionable Measurement Guide. *The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation*. (BB)
- Conway, M. (2016). Philanthropy won't solve big problems unless it stops obsessing about metrics, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, September 6, 2016. [<https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Opinion-How-Metrics-Get-in/237637>]
- Plummer, J. (2016). Using measures that really matter, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, October 5, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/using_measures_that_really_matter]
- Ruff, K. & Olsen, S. (2016). The next frontier in social impact measurement isn't measurement at all, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, May 10, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/the_next_frontier_in_social_impact_measurement_isnt_measurement_at_all]
- Wright, B. (2016). Getting to evidence-based policy: three perspectives, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, April 27, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/getting_to_evidence_based_policy_three_perspectives]

Week 15: April 17th

Lecture: Social Enterprises, Technology, & Future Issues

Overview: Group Presentation

Giving Workshop Part V Strategy Evaluation and Reflection

Exercise: The Nonprofit Marketplace

Readings:

- Dees, J.G. (1998). Enterprising Nonprofits, *Harvard Business Review*, January-February Issue.
- Martin, R., and S. Osberg. (2007). Social Entrepreneurship: The Case for Definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Spring 2007. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/social_entrepreneurship_the_case_for_definition]

- Battilana, J., Lee, M., Walker, J., and C. Dorsey. (2012). In Search of the Hybrid Ideal. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Summer 2012. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/in_search_of_the_hybrid_ideal]
- Hemphill, T. and Cullari, F. (2014). The Benefit Corporation: Corporate Governance and the For-profit Social Entrepreneur. *Business and Society Review*, 119(4), 519-536.
- Strom, S. (2011). A quest for hybrid companies that profit, but can tap charity. *The New York Times*, October 12, 2011. [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/13/business/a-quest-for-hybrid-companies-part-money-maker-part-nonprofit.html]
- Braiker, B. (2014). The ‘Ice Bucket Challenge’: A case study in viral marketing gold. *Digiday*, August 14, 2014. [http://digiday.com/brands/ice-bucket-challenge-case-study-viral-marketing-success/]
- Guengerich, G. (2014). Case Study: Charity Water. *Nonprofit Resources*, December 9, 2014. [https://upleaf.com/nonprofit-resources/online-fundraising/case-study-charity-water]
- Smith, A. (2016). Collaborative: Crowdfunding Platforms, *Pew Research Center*, May 19, 2016. [http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/05/19/collaborative-crowdfunding-platforms/]
- Lindsay, D. (2015). Local Government and Nonprofits Test Crowdfunding for Civic Projects. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 7, 2015. [https://www.philanthropy.com/article/Local-Governments-and/152005]
- Thorpe, D. (2015). Impact investing goes mainstream; is it time you thought about it? *Forbes*, June 27, 2015. [http://www.forbes.com/sites/devinthorpe/2015/06/27/impact-investing-goes-mainstream-is-it-time-you-thought-about-it/]
- Buchanan, P. (2015). Technology start-ups don’t hold all the answers for ‘broken’ nonprofits. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 20, 2015. [https://philanthropy.com/article/Opinion-Technology-Start-Ups/151967]
- Bhagat, V., Loeb, P., Rovner, M. (2010). The Next Generation of American Giving. *Convio, Edge Research, and Sea Change Strategies*. (BB)
- Miller, C. (2016). Millennials and hybrid legal structures are here to stay, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, July 1, 2016. [https://ssir.org/articles/entry/millennials_and_hybrid_legal_structures_are_here_to_stay]
- Lindsay, D. (2016). What’s the big idea? *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 4, 2016. [https://www.philanthropy.com/article/breaking-away-how-creative/237962]
- Buffett, Peter. (2013). The Charitable-Industrial Complex. *The New York Times*, July 26, 2013. [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/27/opinion/the-charitable-industrial-complex.html?_r=0]

Week 16: April 24th

Final Exam

Final Period: May 8th

Group Project Presentations