

How We Could Measure Community Impact of Nonprofit Graduate Students' Service-Learning Projects: Lessons from the Literature

Heather Carpenter
University of San Diego

ABSTRACT

Nonprofit management education scholars are asking the question, “How do we measure community impact of nonprofit programs?” One way to study the community impact of nonprofit management education is by studying the impact that service-learning projects have on the nonprofits for which they are developed. This paper synthesizes literature that studies the community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects. This paper also describes capacity building and evaluation tools and theories that can enhance future studies of community impact. Future studies of community impact should include analysis components from the fields of nonprofit management education, service learning, capacity building, and nonprofit evaluation, and take into consideration specific factors that may affect study outcomes.

A promising new area of practice in nonprofit management education has begun with the introduction of service learning. *Service learning* is defined as “an educational methodology that combines community service with explicit academic learning objectives, preparation for community work, and deliberate reflection” (Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, & Kerrigan, 2001, p. v). In nonprofit management education, students engage in a variety of experiential learning projects within local nonprofit organizations, also labeled as service-learning projects.

Although a great deal of literature has looked at the effects of service learning on the students themselves, fewer studies have measured the impact of service learning within nonprofit organizations or on the communities where the service was conducted (Perry & Imperial, 2001). This paper reviews literature that studied the impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects on the

nonprofit organizations. This paper also reviews capacity building and nonprofit evaluation tools and methods that can be used in future studies of community impact.

NONPROFIT MANAGEMENT EDUCATION LITERATURE

Much of the literature on graduate nonprofit management education focuses on the development of the field, classroom curriculum, and student or alumni learning outcomes (Fletcher, 2005; Mirabella & Wish, 2000; O'Neill, 2005; O'Neill & Fletcher, 1998; O'Neill & Young, 1988; Wilson & Larson, 2002). Several recent academic conferences were organized to discuss nonprofit management education (Ashcraft, 2007; Burlingame & Hammack, 2005), and scholars have written articles about the number of nonprofit graduate degree programs (Mirabella, 2007; Wish & Mirabella, 1998), where they are housed, (Dobkin Hall, O'Neill, Vinokur-Kaplan, Young, & Lane, 2001; Mirabella & Wish, 2001) and the types of courses offered (Mirabella, 2007).

Conventional wisdom holds that nonprofit management education is important for educating nonprofit managers. Yet very few studies have evaluated the impact of nonprofit-focused graduate programs on the nonprofit organizations themselves. This could be done by studying the impact that graduate students' service-learning projects have on the nonprofits for which they are conducted. In this section, two studies that attempted to evaluate the community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects are discussed. A third study that assessed the overall community impact of several nonprofit graduate degree programs is also discussed.

The first study evaluated the community impact of a "Nonprofit Clinic" at the University of Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Public and International Affairs (GSPIA) by studying the impact of graduate student projects conducted through the Nonprofit Clinic (Bright, Bright, & Haley, 2007). Although the Nonprofit Clinic is not connected to a specific nonprofit management education program, it engages graduate students in a variety of service-learning projects within the local nonprofit community. Local nonprofit organizations submit requests for proposal (RFPs) to receive technical assistance from the clinic. Then clinic staff assigns faculty members and students to semester-long projects.

To assess the impact of these service-learning projects, which they labeled as technical assistance projects, researchers administered surveys to seven nonprofit organizations that had received service from the clinic. The survey assessed satisfaction with technical assistance, benefits to receiving the technical assistance, organizational improvement as a result of the technical assistance, and interest in future involvement with the clinic. Of the respondents, 86% "[saw] significant improvements in their organizations since they received support from the Nonprofit Clinic" (Bright et al., 2007, p. 204), and the "services helped [these organizations] focus their attention on the critical issues [that] they were facing"

(p. 204). This study is important for understanding the community impact of student projects because it assessed organizational improvement and benefits to the organization as a result of service learning.

In the second study, researchers at New York University's Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service assessed the organizational impact of graduate students' capstone projects (Schachter & Schwartz, 2009). Forty-two client organizations were surveyed to determine the impact, helpfulness, and satisfaction of student projects. Most of these organizations reported high satisfaction with the student projects (4.2 on a scale of 5) and the helpfulness of student projects (3.9 on a scale of 5). The researchers conducted t-tests to compare satisfaction, helpfulness, and lasting impact between organizations that did or did not have resource and/or tool development as part of the student project. They also found that, of the 13 choices they gave in their survey, those projects that included an organizational assessment received higher ratings for helpfulness, lasting impact, and overall satisfaction than did those projects that had included an organizational assessment.

This study is a step forward for the field because it used statistical measures to determine impact of student projects on nonprofit organizations. The report of the research also raises some important questions and directions for further study. For example, what dimensions do satisfaction, helpfulness, and lasting impact include? These terms could be broken into more descriptive definitions to ensure that respondents mean the same thing when giving their ratings. In addition, specific aspects of the student projects could be examined in greater depth to determine degree and scope of implementation. Moreover, a more detailed presentation of the analyses would have provided a better understanding of the entire sample of respondents and their perceptions of student projects.

The last study, described next—although it did not directly evaluate the impact of student service-learning projects—is important because it attempted to study the overall community impact of several nonprofit graduate degree programs through focus groups. Mirabella and Wish (1999) examined nonprofits and many other stakeholders involved with nonprofit management education programs. They conducted focus group interviews at programs across the country and spoke to faculty, alumni, employers, and funders. They asked these stakeholders to “comment on the impact of the degree programs” (p. 335). Employers assessed students' acquisition of management tools and new collaboration opportunities with the university as determinants of impact.

Because relatively few funders participated, it is difficult to interpret these findings in the context of impact of nonprofit programs on nonprofit organizations. The data interpretation was aimed at faculty and program content. Additionally, the faculty, alumni, employers, and funder responses focused more on the students' skills and abilities as a program outcome and less on specific organizational impacts. Nevertheless, Mirabella and Wish described the research as “a first step

toward understanding stakeholders' perspectives" (p. 337). Research linking specific organizational and community outcomes from student service-learning projects would expand on what these studies have found.

To review, this section focused on three studies that attempted to study the community impact of graduate students' service-learning projects. One study explained satisfaction with organizational improvements; another study examined the organizational satisfaction, helpfulness, and impact of student projects; and the last study, although it did not directly evaluate student projects, explained that increased collaboration opportunities with the university were impactful to nonprofit organizations. Even though these studies are a step forward for the field, more can be done to study this phenomenon. For example, it is still not known if nonprofit education can be considered a capacity-building tool for nonprofit organizations or if nonprofit management education program directors want their programs to build capacity within local nonprofit organizations. Some researchers believe that the nonprofit management education program's potential as a capacity-building tool for nonprofit organizations is underappreciated (Bies, 2008). Other researchers in the community service-learning field are starting to recognize the importance of evaluating the community impact of students' service-learning projects.

SERVICE-LEARNING LITERATURE

Although nonprofit graduate students typically engage in service-learning projects throughout their degree programs, most of the current service-learning literature focuses on traditional undergraduate students' attitudes and learning outcomes (Killian, 2004; Imperial, Perry, & Katula, 2007; Lambright, 2008; McCarthy & Tucker, 1999; Miller-Millesen & Mould, 2004; Nichols & Monard, 2001; Schumaker, 2005). Little research studies nontraditional students, or adult learners engaging in service-learning activities and the impact these activities have on the nonprofits themselves. The research that focuses on these elements asks nonprofits what they want (Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004). It does not expand on the employer or organizational perspective (Peters, 2009).

The body of literature that has studied the community impact of service-learning projects has been slow to develop, due to several reasons explained by Cruz and Giles (2000). First, it is difficult to define the community. Is it the nonprofit organizations, the constituents of the nonprofit organizations, or the funders? Second, there are methodological problems in evaluating the community impact of service-learning projects. There are disagreements about what variables to study in an organization or community, what are the appropriate methods for data collection, and what analyses of the data would be useful. Notwithstanding these concerns, researchers are beginning to attempt to study the community impact of service learning. This section describes a few methods and studies that were developed to address the challenges described earlier.

Both qualitative and quantitative methods have been used to study the community impact of service-learning projects (Jorge, 2003; Schmidt & Robby, 2002). One mixed methods study is the work of Clarke (2000). Clarke created the 3-I model as a tool for use by nonprofits and evaluators in studying the community impact of service-learning projects. The 3-I model framed community impact as a process and addressed the question, "How should an evaluation model be designed in order to acknowledge, measure and reflect the dynamic community impact of service initiatives and specific service-learning programs?" (p. 162). Clarke created the model using interviews, a focus group, observations, and a survey. The 3-I model evaluated community impact in three parts.

- *Initiator (The first I)*: The story of planning and goals of the service-learning project from the perspective of the service-learning initiator.
- *Initiative (The second I)*: The story of implementation and what activities took place during the service-learning project from the perspectives of the organization and university.
- *Impact (The third I)*: The story of impact, including the results of service-learning project and its impact in the community from the perspectives of the organization and university. (p. 163–164)

For the 3-I model to work, an organization must also understand its "good practice indicators, utilization of the project, method of change and inclusion of community impact" (p. 163).

Clarke tested this model in the community for validity and reliability using a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods. The model met its purpose of "acknowledging, measuring, and reflecting community impact" (p. 165). For example, the model measured the success of community and campus partnerships and found universities were vital in helping nonprofits utilize the 3-I model (Clarke, 2003).

The model was created using utilization-focused evaluation, which is evaluation developed from the perspectives of many stakeholders. This study is an important step away from foundations' perspectives of nonprofit evaluation and toward nonprofits' view of evaluation. Whereas foundations evaluate nonprofits on the basis of outcomes and impact, nonprofits use a variety of methods to show their accomplishments. For example, Carman (2007) stated, "Some community-based organizations do not understand or distinguish between reporting, monitoring, and management practices and evaluation" (p. 72).

Other researchers also agree with the nonprofit view of evaluation. In fact, some evaluate the effectiveness of service-learning projects based on successful university and nonprofit partnerships, and some provide best practices for university and community partnerships (Basinger & Batholomew, 2006; Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; D'Agostino, 2008; Ikeda, Cruz, Holland, Rice, & Sandy,

2007; Jacoby 2003; Worrall, 2007). Dorado and Giles (2004) assessed successful partnerships in terms of continued partnership between nonprofits and universities, specifically partnerships that lasted more than two semesters. They described the development process of successful partnerships from both the nonprofit and university perspective.

Gelmon (2003) developed a framework for assessing the community impact of service learning from the organizational perspective. This framework included assessing how the organization's involvement in the service-learning partnership influenced its "(a) capacity to fulfill organizational mission; (b) economic benefits; (c) social benefits; (d) nature of community-university partnership; (e) satisfaction with partnership; and (f) sustainability of partnership" (pp. 52–53). This framework is part of a larger assessment model in which evaluators could assess the organizational and university impact. Gelmon cautioned evaluators using the entire model, saying, "Individuals designing and collecting the assessment must be cautious to avoid criteria that may be interpreted as a performance review of the community organization" (p. 56). This shows there is a fine line between assessment and capacity-building evaluation efforts.

Bacon (2002) assessed nonprofit and university partnerships by analyzing how each group viewed learning and knowledge. Through focus group interviews of four service-learning professors and four nonprofit employers, Bacon found that these groups viewed the impact of service learning differently. The study reported that nonprofits and universities had disparate views of knowledge creation and learning. For example, they did not agree on the project's needs assessment. Universities assumed the nonprofits would tell the students what they needed the service-learning project to accomplish. Nonprofits wanted guidance from students to help them determine the needs the projects would address. Bacon's focus group research contributed to helping community organizations and universities understand the benefits of collective learning during the service-learning process.

In another partnership study, Sandy and Holland (2006) interviewed almost 100 community partners about their experiences in partnering with eight California universities, using focus groups. The community partners assessed impact in terms of "client outcomes and sustaining and enhancing organizational capacity" (p. 35). Additionally, students undertook projects in organizations that would not otherwise have been completed by the organizations. The authors did not report some information that would have informed this review, including the types of service projects and if the students were traditional or adult learners.

Slightly beyond the scope of partnerships, one study evaluated adult learners engaging in service-learning projects. Faculty in a Public Administration course at Troy University identified local nonprofit and government organizations for students to conduct projects in (Walder & Hunter, 2008). At the end of the semester, representatives from these organizations attended the student

presentations. The client organizations provided feedback to the students about their presentations. Researchers noted there was an unexpected benefit to the organizations that participated in this process. During the student presentations, organizations met and made lasting connections with other organizational representatives.

In research that contributed to an understanding of community impact, one researcher evaluated the efforts of adult learners in a nonprofit-focused graduate degree program that engaged in service-learning projects (Bushouse, 2005). Members of 11 organizations were interviewed using questions focused on three main areas: the service-learning relationship between the student and organization, the organization's attitude toward continuing in the service-learning relationship with the university, and the utilization of the project within the organization.

Overall, the nonprofits in Bushouse's study reported great utility of the service-learning projects. Most of the organizations implemented the students' recommendations in some manner. The organizations conveyed that it was beneficial for them to engage in the RFP process from the university. This process allowed them to gauge the opportunity cost of the project ahead of time. Bushouse designed her study based on Enos and Morton's (2003) framework for developing campus-community partnerships, which focuses on relations between the university and the community. As a result, the study did not discuss service learning as a capacity-building tool, and Bushouse stipulated that the research could not be generalized. Moreover, there was difficulty defining the community because nonprofits did not equal the community but were an important part of the community.

Even though the service-learning literature is beginning to focus on the community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects, many see a need for further development of this work. Ward and Wolf-Wendell (2000) investigated this work by looking for ways community organizations and universities can partner more effectively in service-learning projects. They asked, "How do we get campuses to do with their communities rather than do for them?" (p. 774). They proposed the following recommendations:

- Connect through commonalities.
- Blur boundaries between campus and communities.
- Consider the position, history, and the power or powerlessness of all involved in the service relationship.
- Encourage reciprocal assessment.
- Rethink service missions to include and reward public service and genuine community partnerships. (pp. 774–776)

Although these recommendations have face validity, they are not backed by evidence. There is also little empirical evidence to support service learning

as a potential capacity-building tool for nonprofits, as evidenced by the lack of articles asserting service learning as a capacity-building tool.

This section reviewed several studies within the field of service learning that attempted to measure community impact of nonprofit graduate students' projects. As noted earlier, although scholars in the field of service learning have difficulty measuring community impact, studies are beginning to include community impact components. In one article, the process of community impact was studied; and in several other studies, community impact was measured in terms of successful partnerships. In yet another study, organizations benefited from the networking opportunities with other organizations during the student project presentations. In the last study described earlier, organizations expressed utility from the student projects and implemented project recommendations. Many of these studies did not directly measure the community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects, but they represent a step forward in understanding how universities and nonprofit organizations partner and view community impact. Researchers recognize that more work needs to be done to evaluate the community and organizational impact of these programs. One researcher said, "In hindsight we should have employed a more formal mechanism for securing feedback from our community partners" (Lowery, 2007). This is where researchers in nonprofit management education and service learning can utilize best practices tools and methods in capacity-building and nonprofit evaluation to study community impact.

CAPACITY-BUILDING TOOLS AND METHODS

Capacity building, a well-known term in the nonprofit sector, is linked to improving organizational performance. Wing (2004) defined *capacity building* as "increasing the ability of an organization to fulfill its mission" (p. 155). Since organizational missions differ, it can be challenging to define specific types of capacity-building activities that lead to mission fulfillment. Backer, Miller, and Blegg (2004) described three types of capacity-building activities, or "interventions," that would lead to overall nonprofit effectiveness. These interventions are (a) assessment, or, "readiness to undertake the kinds of internal changes capacity building will require" (p. 3); (b) technical assistance and organizational development consultation from the outside; and (c) direct financial support from funders or donors for capacity-building efforts. These three interventions need to occur simultaneously in order for nonprofits to perform effectively.

The challenge with the proposed interventions is that they do not include a strategy for measuring nonprofit effectiveness, which is difficult to do. Herman and Renz (2008) described many difficulties with measuring nonprofit effectiveness; one is that nonprofit effectiveness is multidimensional. They argued that there is no single measure or group of indicators for nonprofit effectiveness. This same argument can be used with nonprofit performance; as with nonprofit effectiveness,

there is no consensus on standard performance measures for nonprofit organizations (Wing, 2004). Since nonprofit effectiveness and performance are related as well as linked to capacity-building efforts, it can be challenging to evaluate capacity-building efforts as well. However, researchers are starting to work around the complexities of nonprofit effectiveness and nonprofit performance by creating measures to evaluate capacity-building efforts. This section provides examples of three proposed methods of such efforts that can be used to evaluate efforts within nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects.

Wing (2004) addressed capacity building and nonprofit effectiveness challenges through seven questions:

- How [can we measure such] an abstract concept [as nonprofit capacity building]?
- How can we measure performance improvement when we cannot measure performance?
- Against whose goals should we measure improvement?
- What can be done about unrealistic timetables for both capacity building and its evaluation?
- How can we document how soft people relate to hard systems?
- Should we measure participants' behavioral change or clients' internal learning?
- How can researchers design a study when consultants keep changing what they are working on? (pp. 154–159)

Wing also argued that it could be challenging to actually evaluate the capacity-building efforts of an organization if stakeholders have disparate goals for measuring improvement. For example, if the funder, consultant, and nonprofit organization were not to reach goal consensus, capacity-building efforts would not be aligned. Although Wing (2004) expressed the belief that nonprofit performance is difficult to measure, he nonetheless proposed a systems approach to evaluate capacity-building efforts. In this approach, evaluators must understand the relationship and balance of the system of the organization and the people in it. By evaluating people's ability to engage in the evaluation process and by evaluating an organization's capacity to handle capacity-building efforts, researchers and practitioners can create more effective capacity-building tools. This is something that researchers could attempt to do in assessing service-learning projects. Although Wing's (2004) assertions are plausible, they are not backed by empirical evidence. Another method for evaluating capacity-building efforts is through a model approach.

Connolly and York (2002) proposed a logic model for evaluating capacity-building efforts. They define a logic model as "a pictorial representation of why and how a capacity-building effort will happen" (p. 37). This logic model consists

of inputs, also known as resources employed; activities that will occur during the evaluation; outputs, also known as results; and outcomes or changes in the program. Connolly and York addressed all the issues that Wing proposed. Wing's and Connolly and York's assertions would be bolstered by empirical evidence.

The Program Accountability Quality Scale (Poole, Nelson, Carnahan, Chepenik, & Tubiak, 2000) was created as a performance measurement scale for capacity-building efforts. The scale challenges Wing's assertion that performance cannot be measured and consists of seven categories, many similar to those in the logic model of Connolly and York (2002). These are resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, goals, indicators, and evaluation plan. In developing the scale, the authors attempted to find similarities among nonprofit organizations and how they defined capacity-building activities. The authors addressed interrater reliability by randomly assigning 20 cases to 3 different evaluators for rating, and they achieved an interrater reliability coefficient of .84. Through further testing of interrater reliability, the researchers eliminated some items in the tool that were not strongly associated with the total set of items. The resulting scale was intended to help organizations identify their technical assistance needs and may provide insight into measuring the impact of nonprofit management education and service-learning projects. The authors stipulate that further research needs to be conducted to test how the scale might be generalized and used sector-wide. A variety of other factors may affect the validity of this performance management scale, such as organizational size and culture.

This section highlighted the challenges of evaluation capacity-building efforts and nonprofit effectiveness. The studies reviewed earlier provide alternative approaches to evaluating capacity-building efforts through a systems approach, a model approach, and a performance management scale. These studies suggest how one might go about measuring community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects. More empirical research needs to take place to study the commonalities among nonprofit organizations and how they define capacity-building methods and organizational effectiveness. Some researchers stipulate that nonprofits need to become better consumers of capacity-building efforts (Millesen & Bies, 2007). Researchers within the field of nonprofit evaluation are starting to understand how nonprofits relate to and respond to community impact studies.

NONPROFIT EVALUATION TOOLS AND METHODS

Nonprofit organizations struggle with conducting evaluation activities to show their organizational effectiveness and community impact. The emerging field of nonprofit evaluation has expanded in recent years due to a push from funders. In fact, a special issue of the journal *New Directions for Evaluation* was devoted to this topic (Carman & Fredericks, 2008a). When researchers attempt to study community impact of nonprofit graduate students' projects, they must understand the history of evaluation efforts within specific nonprofit organizations,

because a community impact study is a form of an evaluation. Three specific studies are described to show how nonprofits understand and relate to evaluation efforts.

In one study, Carman and Fredericks (2008b) assessed how nonprofits engaged in evaluation activities. The nonprofits included in their study conducted written observations, face-to-face interviews, surveys, and focus groups; they collected evaluation data on program expenses, people served, client demographics, satisfaction levels, and/or program outcomes and results. Logic models, a popular tool for professional evaluators, were not used by these nonprofits. Many nonprofits included in this study viewed evaluation as “a resource drain and distraction, an external, promotional tool, and as a strategic management tool” (pp. 58–59). This position is important for understanding how nonprofits may respond to community impact studies.

In a second study, Carman reported that funding agencies affected the scope and capacity of nonprofit evaluation activities. Although funders requested nonprofits to conduct evaluations, very few provided funding and support for such evaluations. Moreover, funders did not utilize the evaluation data in their funding decisions (Carman, 2009). Funders at the federal level are pushing nonprofits to do more evaluation, but those at the state and local level are not. This stance affects nonprofits because those that receive federal funding are engaging in evaluation activities as required by their funders.

Since nonprofits may not understand the type of evaluation work that the community impact study is trying to achieve, researchers must take this situation into consideration when attempting to study the community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects. For example, when researchers go into organizations using evaluation mechanisms such as surveys or interviews, nonprofits may not have engaged in this type of evaluation work before.

The final study that focused on the evaluation capacity of nonprofit organizations is relevant because nonprofits regularly struggle with evaluation funding and capacity issues. Alaimo (2008) used Volkov and King's (2007) evaluation capacity-building checklist as well as action steps of executive directors to assess evaluation capacity within nonprofit organizations. He reported that executive directors who could balance internal organizational contexts as well as external pressures, like pressures from funders, had longer-term evaluation capacity. These organizations were more likely to prioritize evaluation efforts and to embed evaluation in the organizational culture.

The evaluation capacity issue is important because nonprofits may not have the capacity to participate in studies of community impact. Additionally, most of the community impact studies described in this article focused on the partnership aspect, and very few assessed the impact of student work on nonprofit operations. It is unknown if the lack of studies that assessed the impact of student work relates to the capacity of nonprofits to participate in such assessments or if other factors are at play. Despite these considerations, researchers must understand

capacity issues within nonprofit organizations when conducting community impact studies.

The preceding section described nonprofit evaluation activities, funding support for nonprofit evaluation, and evaluation capacity issues. These studies indicate the difficulties researchers may encounter when studying the community impact of graduate students' service-learning projects.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This section integrates the lessons learned from the nonprofit management education and service-learning literature and provides recommendations for future studies of community impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects. These recommendations are divided into two categories, community impact analysis components and factors to take into consideration.

Analysis of community impact should include these components:

- The Program Accountability Quality Scale developed by Poole and his colleagues (2000) to measure impact of nonprofit graduate student projects
- Evaluation mechanisms that nonprofit organizations may understand (e.g., written observations, face-to-face interviews, surveys, and focus groups)
- The ways in which service learning might be used as a capacity-building tool within nonprofit organizations
- Service-learning models and frameworks, such as the 3-I model (Clarke, 2000, 2003) and Gelmon's framework (2003)

Factors to consider in future studies of community impact:

- Recognize that capacity may be a major factor in community impact studies.
- Understand dimensions of adult learners in studies of impact. Adult learners are nontraditional students, and most nonprofit management education programs cater to these adult working professionals.
- Create partnerships with nonprofit evaluation scholars to complete joint studies of community impact.
- Work with capacity-building scholars to develop empirically built logic models in studying the community impact of service-learning projects.

CONCLUSION

This article reviewed literature that studied the impact of nonprofit graduate students' service-learning projects on the nonprofits themselves. It is clear from the studies described earlier that researchers have not yet bridged the relationships

across the disciplines, because most scholars focus on just one area (nonprofit management education, service learning, capacity building, or nonprofit evaluation). The studies described earlier have helped define and increase our understanding of service learning's contributions to nonprofit organizations, and more research is needed to pinpoint specific contributions. In addition to the capacity building and nonprofit evaluation tools and methods described earlier, further research should also inventory the types of service-learning activities that nonprofit graduate students conduct within the nonprofit community. Mirabella and Renz (2001) began this work with a study of the outreach activities of nonprofit management education programs. Future research on service learning in nonprofit management education programs can expand on this work by inventorying and categorizing the service-learning components at graduate-level nonprofit management education programs across the United States and then comparing these components across programs.

REFERENCES

- Alaimo, S. P. (2008). Nonprofits and evaluation: Managing expectations from the leader's perspective. *Nonprofits and evaluation: New directions for evaluation, 119*, 73–92.
- Ashcraft, R. (Ed.) (2007). Benchmark 3: The third decennial conference on nonprofit and philanthropic studies. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*.
- Backer, T. E., Miller, A. N., & Blegg, J. E. (2004). Donor perspectives on nonprofit capacity-building. Retrieved from Human Interaction Research Institute http://www.wvdo-or.org/uploads_wvdo/resources/Non-Profit_Capacity_Building.pdf
- Bacon, N. (2002). Differences in faculty and community partners' theories of learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 9*, 34–44.
- Basinger, N., & Bartholomew, K. (2006). Service-learning in nonprofit organizations: Motivations, expectations, and outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*, 15–26.
- Bies, A. (2008, August). *Nonprofit management education: Considerations of context and capacity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Bright, L., Bright, C., & Haley, L. L. (2007). Nonprofit outreach services: Using outreach to increase nonprofits' capacity and to provide a quality educational experience for students. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 13*, 335–343.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus & community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 503–516.
- Burlingame, D., & Hammack, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Education for a civil society: A summary of the 2004 conference*. Indianapolis: Indiana University, Center on Philanthropy.
- Bushouse, B. K. (2005). Community nonprofit organizations and service learning: Resource constraints to building partnerships with universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*, 32–40.

Community Impact of Nonprofit Graduate Students' Service-Learning Projects

- Carman, J. G. (2007). Evaluation practice among community-based organizations: Research into the reality. *American Journal of Evaluation, 28*, 60–75.
- . (2009). Nonprofits, funders, and evaluation: Accountability in action. *American Review of Public Administration, 39*, 374–390.
- Carman, J. G., & Fredericks, K. A. (Eds.). (2008a). *Nonprofits and evaluation: New directions for program evaluation, 119*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carman, J. G., & Fredericks, K. A. (2008b). Nonprofits and evaluation: Empirical evidence from the field. In J. G. Carman & K. A. Fredericks (Eds.), *Nonprofits and evaluation: New directions in evaluation, 119*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 51–71.
- Clarke, M. M. (2000). *Evaluating the community impact of service initiatives: The 3-I model*. (Doctoral dissertation, Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 2000). ProQuest Digital Dissertations. AAT9991711.
- . (2003). Finding the community in service-learning research: The 3-“I” model. In S. H. Billing & J. Eyler (Eds.), *Deconstructing service-learning* (pp. 3–21). Nashville: Information Age Publishing.
- Connolly, P., & York, P. (2002). Evaluating capacity-building efforts for nonprofit organizations. *Organizational Development Practitioner, 34*, 33–39.
- Cruz, N. I., & Giles, D. E. (2000). Where's the community in service-learning research? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, SI2000*, 28–34.
- D'Agostino, M. J. (2008). Fostering a civically engaged society: The university and service learning. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 14*, 191–204.
- Dicke, L., Dowden, S., & Torres, J. (2004). Successful service learning: A matter of ideology. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 10*, 199–208.
- Dobkin Hall, P., O'Neill, M., Vinokur-Kaplan, D., Young, D., & Lane, F. S. (2001). Where you stand depends on where you sit: The implications of organizational location for university-based programs in nonprofit management. *Public Performance & Management Review, 25*, 74–87.
- Dorado, S., & Giles, D. E. (2004). Service-learning partnerships: Paths of engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 11*, 25–37.
- Enos, S., & Morton, K. (2003). Developing a theory and practice of campus-community partnerships. In B. Jacoby et al. (Eds.), *Building partnerships for service learning* (pp. 20–41). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Fletcher, K. (2005). The impact of receiving a master's degree in nonprofit management on graduates' professional lives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 34*, 433–447.
- Gelmon, S. B. (2003). Assessment as a means of building service-learning partnerships. In B. Jacoby et al. (Eds.), *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 42–64). San Francisco: Wiley.
- Gelmon, S. B., Holland, B. A., Driscoll, A., Spring, A., & Kerrigan, S. (2001). *Assessing service-learning and civic engagement: Principles and techniques*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2008). Advancing nonprofit organizational effectiveness research and theory: Nine theses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 18*, 399–415.

Community Impact of Nonprofit Graduate Students' Service-Learning Projects

- Ikeda, E., Cruz, N., Holland, B., Rice, K., & Sandy, M. (2007). *Community voices: A California campus compact study on partnerships*. San Francisco: California Campus Compact.
- Imperial, M. T., Perry, J. L., & Katula, M. C. (2007). Incorporating service learning into public affairs programs: Lessons from the literature. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 13*, 243–264.
- Jacoby, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Building partnerships for service-learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jorge, E. (2003). Outcomes for community partners in an unmediated service-learning program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 10*, 28–38.
- Killian, J. (2004). Pedagogical experimentation: Combined, traditional, distance, and service-learning techniques. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 10*, 209–224.
- Lowery, D. (2007). Community-based quality of life indicators: A service-learning exercise in a graduate statistics class. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 13*, 425–438.
- Lambright, K. (2008). Lessons outside of the classroom: Examining the effectiveness of service-learning projects at achieving learning outcomes. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 14*, 205–217.
- McCarthy, A. M., & Tucker, M. L. (1999). Student attitudes toward service-learning: Implications for implementation. *Journal of Management Education, 23*, 554–573.
- Miller-Millesen, J. L., & Mould, D. H. (2004). Project-based learning in nonprofit management education: Results from an educational partnership between the United States and Kyrgyzstan. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 10*, 247–258.
- Millesen, J. L., & Bies, A. L. (2007). Nonprofit capacity building: Who is doing what for who and to what end? *Journal for Nonprofit Management, 11*, 18–27.
- Mirabella, R. M. (2007). University-based educational programs in nonprofit management and philanthropic studies: A 10-year review and projections of future trends. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 364*, 11S–27S.
- Mirabella, R. M., & Renz, D. O. (2001). Nonprofit management outreach programs: An examination of institutional mission and setting. *Public Performance & Management Review, 25*, 14–29.
- Mirabella, R. M., & Wish, N. B. (1999). Educational impact of graduate nonprofit degree programs: Perspectives of multiple stakeholders. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 9*, 329–340.
- . (2000). The “best place” debate: A comparison of graduate education programs for nonprofit managers. *Public Administration Review, 60*, 219–229.
- . (2001). University-based educational programs in the management of nonprofit organizations: An updated census of U.S. programs. *Public Performance and Management Review, 25*, 30–41.
- Nichols, A. H., & Monard, K. (2001). Designing intergenerational service-learning courses based on student characteristics. *Educational Gerontology, 27*, 37–48.
- O'Neill, M. (2005). Developmental contexts of nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 16*, 5–17.

Community Impact of Nonprofit Graduate Students' Service-Learning Projects

- O'Neill, M., & Fletcher, K. (1998). *Nonprofit management education: U.S. and world perspectives*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- O'Neill, M., & Young, D. R. (1988). *Educating managers of nonprofit organizations*. New York: Praeger.
- Perry, J. L., & Imperial, M. T. (2001). A decade of service-related research: A map of the field. *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30, 462–479.
- Peters, R. A. (2009). Using focus groups and stakeholder surveys to revise the MPA curriculum. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15, 1–16.
- Poole, D., Nelson, J., Carnahan, S., Chepenik, N., & Tubiak, C., (2000). Evaluating performance measurement systems in nonprofit agencies: The program accountability quality scale. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21, 15–26.
- Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13, 30–43.
- Schachter, D. R., & Schwartz, D. (2009). The value of capstone projects on participating client agencies. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 15, 445–461.
- Schmidt, A., & Robby, M. A. (2002). What's the value of service-learning to the community? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 9, 27–33.
- Schumaker, A. M. (2005). In search of a model for effective group projects: From the MPA student perspective. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11, 21–34.
- Volkov, B. B., & King, J. A. (2007). A checklist for building organization evaluation capacity. Retrieved from http://www.wmich.edu/evalctr/archive_checklists/ecb.pdf
- Walder, L. S., & Hunter, D. (2008). Client-based courses: Variations in service learning. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 14, 219–239.
- Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendell, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 767–780.
- Wilson, M. I., & Larson, R. S. (2002). Nonprofit management students: Who they are and why they enroll. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31, 259–270.
- Wing, K. T. (2004). Assessing the effectiveness of capacity-building initiatives: Seven issues for the field. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33, 153–160.
- Wish, N. B., & Mirabella, R. M. (1998). Curricular variations in nonprofit management graduate programs. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 9, 99–109.
- Worrall, L. (2007). Asking the community: A case study of community partner perspectives. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14, 5–17.

Heather Carpenter is a PhD candidate at University of San Diego, where she serves as a Research Associate in the Caster Family Center for Nonprofit and Philanthropic Research. Heather's research interests are nonprofit education, experiential education, nonprofit leadership, nonprofit workforce issues, and nonprofit technology. She authors the nationally known blog, Nonprofit Leadership 601 (<http://www.nonprofitalternatives.org/page/blog>).