



Program Development Issues in Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies: Learning from One University's Experience

Author(s): Max Stephenson Jr.

Source: *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Spring - Summer, 2007), pp. 301-313

Published by: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40212732>

Accessed: 06-10-2017 12:24 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/40212732?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Public Affairs Education*

JSTOR

Program Development Issues in Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies: Learning from One University's Experience

Max Stephenson Jr.
Virginia Tech

ABSTRACT

This article examines one university's efforts to institutionalize a graduate nonprofit curriculum. It does so through the lens of situational analysis and with an eye to five key challenges that have dogged the effort—operating in an inauspicious organizational environment, creating an interdisciplinary program in a discipline-rich context, securing a praxis analytical focus and shared pedagogical stance, ensuring a comparative analytical focus, and developing a sustainable balance between student needs and expert claims. These concerns are examined for what might be learned from each that may hold broader significance for nonprofit curriculum design, program development, and implementation. While some of these conditions are unique, what they suggest about the challenges for those seeking institutionalization of nonprofit curricula are not. The essay seeks to suggest how and why that might be so. The paper argues that, regardless of the case-specific factors at play in the present analysis, would-be nonprofit program builders would be wise to be attentive to their operating context, to the nature of existing program curricula and organizational cultures, and to the clear specification of their own curricular aims.

This article analyzes the founding premises and organizational context of the development of the Virginia Tech (VT) School of Public and International Affairs (SPIA) nonprofit and civil society program. In addition to describing the conceptual foundations of the program and the reasons these have been adopted, the essay addresses the curricular and pedagogic challenges associated with its development. Gleaning lessons from one program's experience can be valuable to others pondering developing such efforts. In particular, all nonprofit instruc-

tional designers can profit from sustained attention to institutional context, the specification of clear curricular goals, and careful management of the balance that must be attained between individual student and faculty interests and the diverse requirements of a broad and interdisciplinary field.

The analysis is organized around five central challenges that program designers have confronted in their efforts to institutionalize a civil society graduate program:

- the inauspicious university organizational context in which the SPIA nonprofit initiative was launched and has proceeded;
- the program's complex institutional and disciplinary setting, including its availability in more than one geographic location and academic department, and the implications of those realities for its capacity to develop a common culture among its students;
- the curricular and pedagogic challenges of securing praxis-based learning for graduate students, especially doctoral students who aspire to a career in the academy;
- the program's central aspiration to equip its students, especially its large doctoral cadre, with a comparative perspective, a goal that demands both a strong foundation of knowledge and equally vital analytical capacities; and
- the aim to provide a comprehensive educational curriculum while simultaneously allowing students flexibility to meet individual needs and interests.

Each of these core programmatic challenges is addressed in turn below. Each arguably may be considered a central shaping influence in the program's evolution. These issues are addressed throughout by means of a first-hand narrative of the evolution of this Virginia Tech curricular initiative.

THE APPROACH

I approached this effort as a participant observer and therefore am not a neutral analyst. My hope is that my engagement in this program-building project from its beginnings has provided insights into why certain choices have been taken and how those decisions have unfolded. Situational analysis served as the frame for attaining an understanding of the evolution of the Virginia Tech nonprofit effort. Following Clarke's grounded theory approach, this analysis charts the contextual conditions that confronted the initiative, the principal perspectives of the primary decision-makers as these came to be understood (including my own in some cases), and, finally, the positions that program leaders have adopted to address these (Clarke, 2005, xxii). Throughout, this analysis seeks to be attentive to the interaction between the program's development and its overarching environment; that is, in Clarke's terms, the situation. In a very real sense, this

effort is the result of decisions framed by the context in which it grew. Indeed, the challenges crucial to the design and evolution of the initiative nearly track the forms of analysis that Clarke argues are significant. (Clarke, 2005, 19) She suggests that researchers

- embody the situatedness of all knowledge producers as well as accept the simultaneous truths of multiple knowledges;
- use situation as the principal research focus
- assume complexities of perception and perspective rather than imagine that these may be simplified;
- assert sufficiency of analytics rather than seek formal theory building;
- undertake situational mapping efforts throughout the research process; and
- employ alternate discourses to expand the domains of social life included in grounded theory research (adapted from Clarke, 2005, 19).

In keeping with these aspirations, this analysis is situated in context throughout, to acknowledge the multiple points of view at play in the account, to recognize that more than one of these may likely provide an adequate explanation, and to review multiple sources of evidence as the argument proceeds. This approach also assumes that alternate forms of discourse may illuminate the concerns treated.

CHALLENGE 1: AN INAUSPICIOUS OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

Charting the Social and Institutional Context:

A Program Born in a Period of Organizational Crisis

Virginia Tech's nonprofit curriculum effort began with the launch of a newly reorganized and restructured School of Public and International Affairs (SPIA). The "new" SPIA was placed within a single college, Architecture and Urban Studies, and was organized as a "super-department." Prior to this reorganization, SPIA had existed for several years as a so-called "soft school" that had spanned three colleges, had only the budget its partners provided, and existed only in so far as those programs agreed to cooperate to further common aims.¹ One might accurately describe this institutional arrangement as the university equivalent of the Articles of Confederation of early U.S. experience. The effort proved just about as successful as its early American confederal analogue. That is, its challenges and limited success convinced many operating within it that it needed a clearer structure and central operating authority and the capacity to succeed as a governing arrangement. What was lacking until 2003 was an opportunity to realize those needed changes.

That opening came with a university-scale restructuring aimed at better positioning Virginia Tech to secure sponsored research in an increasingly re-

source-starved and competitive environment. Indeed, the new SPIA was born of institutional crisis and change. In FY 2003, VT suffered a 15 percent cut in state support. As it struggled to respond to this sudden and massive reduction in aid, the university launched an effort to reorganize its colleges and departments in an attempt to cover existing curricular needs more adequately, reduce administrative obligations, and position itself better for the future. A recreated SPIA was justified as a part of this strategy.

In addition to the rationale for SPIA provided by massive reductions in state support, the university's president, Charles Steger, had, since his inauguration in 2000, been promoting the idea that the institution should seek to attain a top 30 ranking in National Science Foundation research expenditures and/or membership in the prestigious American Association of Universities by 2010 as a way to galvanize the VT community to look ahead to a larger national research role. SPIA was in part rationalized as a more effective way to create synergies that would result in more sponsored research. Finally, a new graduate school dean arrived in 2003 and also sought to expand Virginia Tech's post-baccalaureate student enrollment while improving their education experience in order to "foster changes in the ways graduate students are prepared for becoming engaged contributors in modern universities and contributing professionals in their communities" (<http://www.grads.vt.edu/news/mansi.html>, 2006). The new SPIA had the potential to provide an environment that would recruit more doctoral students to its two Ph.D. programs. Each of these factors contributed to a climate that convinced university leaders that a more academically integrated School of Public and International Affairs was necessary.

As it began operation, SPIA, now overseen by one dean and one director with line authority, consisted of two longstanding and nationally well-regarded programs—Urban Affairs and Planning (UAP) and Public Administration and Policy (CPAP)—and a new unit, Government and International Affairs (GIA). GIA consisted of three faculty transfers from elsewhere in the university, one split appointment with UAP, and six part-time faculty holding appointments in the department of Political Science. The three SPIA programs offered master's degrees in Urban and Regional Planning (MURP), Public Administration (MPA) and Public and International Affairs (MPIA), respectively. The last was originally a program of Urban Affairs and Planning, but the degree was transferred to GIA when that unit was created. As the new SPIA began, UAP and GIA faculty members actively participated in the College-wide Environmental Design and Planning (EDP) doctoral program and a few of those professors also served on committees in the CPAP doctoral program in Public Administration and Public Affairs. For their part, CPAP faculty were only rarely involved with EDP doctoral students.

In sum, SPIA was the product of an austere operating environment that at once encouraged cost reductions as well as new initiatives to respond to that context.

Its development was not so much sought by SPIA faculty as brought to them as propitious by College of Architecture and Urban Studies and SPIA leaders. The rationale for this new and more robust union was operational efficiency and effectiveness rather than any specific academic foundation, though synergies were thought to be helpful and likely to generate more research dollars—an instrumental and important claim.

The nonprofit initiative emerged as the first SPIA-wide effort following the restructuring. Although it received seed funding from the Provost, that dowry was short term, decreasing incrementally over three years. Although the program mixed research and curricular goals, financial benchmarks were a key performance indicator included in the initial business plan. The bulk of that plan consisted of a specific nonprofit research agenda focused on questions linked to accountability, but the proposal included and promoted the general expansion of the nonprofit curriculum across all three of SPIA's academic programs. However, while there were a number of explicit output measures for the academic agenda, the only specific outcome measure offered was visibility for Virginia Tech, particularly in the National Capital Region. This goal brought with it a tension between doctoral-level education, which is often invisible on a regional scale, and continuing professional education, which, while more visible, did not necessarily align with SPIA's historical strengths or the new graduate dean's vision for the future (Dolan, 2002, 277–292). These performance measures reveal the negotiated nature of the initiative, which had at once to satisfy the scholarly aspirations of the key faculty stakeholders in SPIA and the broader institutional aspirations of the university as a whole.

CHALLENGE 2: A DE FACTO INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM THAT FEW FACULTY AT FIRST RECOGNIZE AS SUCH

Building on the Past While Searching for an Elusive Core of Support

Prior to the new SPIA's creation, most VT social science graduate students interested in nonprofit organizations or civil society were affiliated with UAP and pursued either a concentration in international development planning in the MURP program or the MPIA degree. At the doctoral level, those who pursued doctorates with a civil society emphasis were enrolled in the College of Architecture and Urban Studies Ph.D. in Environmental Design and Planning, and especially its stream in Public and International Affairs. In fact, for many years, Virginia Tech's social science programs offered a single course directly concerned with nonprofits and only one UAP faculty member had a primary scholarly interest in the nonprofit sector. That began to change in 2000 when another nonprofit-focused faculty member, with interests in nongovernmental organizations and accountability, joined the Urban Affairs and Planning faculty.

By 2003, partly to accommodate these two professors' interests, UAP nonprofit offerings had expanded from one course to four. The two faculty members rou-

tinely offered these four courses. But this curricular change did not serve professorial interests alone. Since 2000, Urban Affairs had also witnessed growing interest among its students in nonprofit management and the role of nonprofit/nongovernmental organizations in civil society. So, as SPIA was created, there was growing recognition within at least one core SPIA program that this area might be a fruitful one for development and that growth appeared to be consonant with broader trends in public service management education (Mirabella and Wish, 2001, 30–41).

CHALLENGES IN THE QUEST FOR PROGRAM IDENTITY

Each of SPIA's three programs brought specific curricular strengths to the proposed nonprofit and civil society program, thereby lending it the possibility of developing a unique, and potentially powerful, normative and comparative focus. The UAP program brought a strong international development, accountability, and governance focus. GIA brought faculty strengths in international geopolitics and social movements. CPAP brought experts in ethics, organization theory, and network governance. These strengths would come to constitute the primary curricular comparative advantage of the civil society program as it emerged. Students could work with faculty who

- studied the role of NGOs in democratization and development processes;
- contextualized the roles of civil society in broader debates over the purport of economic, political, and social globalization processes;
- examined nonprofit and nongovernmental governance, ethics and leadership;
- explored the role of nonprofit organizations as implementation agents in increasingly complex forms of public governance;
- analyzed the relationships among social movements, nongovernmental organizations and patterns of governance.

Nonetheless, as the new School began, few of these faculty members saw themselves as contributors to a possible new cross-SPIA curriculum. Instead, most professors worried about their existing program's possible loss of identity and standing (UAP and CPAP) or its perceived inadequate resourcing (GIA) in the new arrangement. Moreover, the faculty members of these programs were only loosely aligned organizationally around a still unspecified set of subject-oriented goals for SPIA, cross-disciplinary or otherwise. They came from several disciplines including planning, geography, political science, economics, public administration, and sociology. While one could argue that these all could contribute strongly to a graduate program in nonprofit studies, the capacity to do so depended on faculty seeing this as possible, prudent, and aligned with their professional interests, and not feeling threatened that it might impair the "core" in-

terests (however defined) of their respective programs (Mirabella and Wish, 2000, 219–229). Faculty also had to be willing to develop and act on a meta-level analytic perspective that saw value in working beyond their own disciplinary boundaries. The natural tendency for faculty engaged with globalization theory would be to focus on those competing theoretical lenses and perspectives, while planning faculty can always focus on environmental design concerns broadly defined and public administration faculty can, similarly, always emphasize the challenges confronting public sector institutions.

To this normal balkanization of faculty disciplinary perspectives and organizational alignments, the complicating factor of geography must be added. All of SPIA's master's degree programs were offered at the home campus and in the national capital region. The public administration master's degree was offered in the Washington, D.C., metro area, and, although newly created, the MURP degree was strongly supported there. In fact, UAP had transferred faculty lines to the metro region believing that its enrollments would grow as a result. The MPIA was also offered "up north," although with limited full-time faculty support. CPAP offered its doctorate in the university's D.C. location, and UAP also offered the Ph.D. option via EDP to a limited number of students there.

With distance and alternate locations came tensions over how to teach and what to offer, as well as more subtle differences over what sorts of research make sense and how to marry research and practice, an aim of all of these graduate degrees. SPIA's leaders had to manage large-scale internal organizational change and do so across disparate geographic locations and in the face of the competing claims of unlike stakeholders. The first would constitute a significant challenge. Both at once suggested another level of concern altogether.

These tasks were significant for SPIA's leaders and in crafting an identity for the nascent School, but also for how students would identify themselves. Would the students view themselves as uniquely equipped by interdisciplinary inquiry to address complex problems, or would they instead see concerns through more narrow technical and professional lenses? How would location affect the resolution of this concern? These issues confronted the School and any effort to work across its programs to create a nonprofit and civil society program.

THE UNEVEN PATH TO INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY: THE ROLE OF POLICY ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND INSTITUTIONAL PATH DEPENDENCE

As the new School began operations, two UAP faculty members interested in establishing a nonprofit program within SPIA worked with the School's new director and the university's executive vice president and chief operating officer—who was personally and professionally interested in civil society institutions—to take a proposal forward to the provost and request three years of seed funding to undertake research, teaching, and civic engagement in the area of nonprofit organizations and civil society.

The provost funded the nonprofit effort as just the sort of initiative the university should now support in its increasingly entrepreneurial climate, an interdisciplinary effort that held promise for developing a robust educational and outreach program as well as considerable sponsored research. Nonetheless, the Provost's decision to fund the nonprofit initiative represented one of the few investments the university undertook in the social sciences during an otherwise spartan period. The proposal might not have been funded without the strong support of the university's top administrative official, its executive vice president and chief operating officer. He had taught a course in public and nonprofit management at the university for several years, and his years of service to a variety of public and nonprofit organizations had impressed upon him the great need for management capacity within the nonprofit sector. He also recognized VT's opportunity to engage the growing nonprofit sector, especially in the national capital region. Upon his retirement, the chief operating officer became a university senior fellow for resource development at the behest of the Board of Visitors. As a part of the responsibilities of that new role, the university provided him with office space and funding for six graduate assistants as well as two full-time administrative staff. Although the assistantships are available to students throughout SPIA and beyond, the vast majority of the students are affiliated with the nonprofit program, and these posts quickly emerged as a mechanism to recruit excellent students, particularly doctoral students, to Virginia Tech. While in office, the former chief operating officer developed many friends among the university's prominent alumni, whom he continues to consult in his new role as senior fellow for resource development. His position has been important in raising donor awareness of the nonprofit and civil society program; as a result, friends of the university have sponsored a number of events in support of the effort, including its doctoral symposium series, and continue to be involved in its mission. He has functioned as a classic "fixer" or policy entrepreneur, as policy scholars have labeled this role, throughout the development of the civil society graduate program. He continues to participate actively as a partner in the development of the effort from his new institutional position (Bardach, 1977, 1998).

To gain funding, the nonprofit initiative required a home within SPIA. As matters unfolded, and as a result of the university's interest in attaining sponsored research funds, the new program's *de facto* home became a research institute. Each of the two faculty members involved (the two "original" nonprofit-oriented faculty) led research institutes whose overlapping goals included nonprofit and civil society institutions. One of the two partner institutes that administered the nonprofit initiative, the Institute for Innovative Governance (IIG), was a previously existing institutional shell loosely associated with the "soft" SPIA. The IIG no longer had an active faculty and had few funded research or outreach activities. It had traditionally been housed in the Department of Agricultural Economics (for synergies with extension), and its director was scheduled

to retire in 2004. The IIG was moved to the new SPIA in 2003, and the chair of Urban Affairs and Planning was selected to replace the IIG's director, following a year of transition. None of the Institute's existing programs or staff made the institutional transition to SPIA. Instead, the "new" IIG became the fiscal and administrative agent for the School's nonprofit initiative.

The second partner institute, the Institute for Global Accountabilities, was never formally created in the university's governance process. After about a year and a half of operating in tandem with the IIG on various proposals and projects, the two faculty members involved decided to merge their efforts into one, the Institute for Governance and Accountabilities (IGA), which would be the lead institutional actor for the development of the nonprofit and civil society program within SPIA and at Virginia Tech.

The merger was accomplished by amending the IIG charter (left over from its association with Agricultural Economics) to incorporate the aims of the Nonprofit Initiative and the Center for Global Accountabilities. The IGA was unusual in that its university charter explicitly gave it responsibility for spearheading the development of SPIA's nonprofit and civil society program. Its curricular responsibilities, which ultimately rested with the various academic departments, had to be advanced through partnerships and dialogue with faculty in those programs. In due course, the Institute for Policy and Governance (IPG) replaced IGA. The new institute was itself the product of a merger of three existing entities. IPG retains responsibility for shepherding the VT nonprofit and civil society program but now operates as a university-wide research center that also offers research and outreach services to public sector entities. Thus, the School may be said to house the nonprofit program, but the effort is overseen and shepherded by faculty closely aligned with a university research institute affiliated with SPIA.

CHALLENGE 3: THE PRAXIS CHALLENGE

The Certificate Strategy: One Way to Secure Links among Programs and Between Theory and Practice

In 2002, before the beginning of the nonprofit initiative, the Graduate School placed a master's degree in nonprofit management on its three-year institutional plan. This status permitted programs to develop such an effort. Despite this standing, by 2003, the directors of IGA and SPIA decided that the nonprofit and civil society curriculum should be developed across all three SPIA programs. This choice reflected the strong existing identities and organizational cultures of two of SPIA's departments, while also acknowledging that these brought special potential advantages to the nonprofit program curriculum. So, in lieu of seeking to create a stand-alone graduate degree, the IGA's directors focused on developing a graduate certificate-oriented program. A graduate certificate in nonprofit/nongovernmental management would require fewer new resources and would be more likely to gain support of the faculty in the various SPIA programs. The directors

of the institute began to work closely with faculty across the School to incorporate important elements and concepts that reflected the comparative research and teaching capabilities of that faculty. Institute leaders also began the process of cross-listing nonprofit courses with advanced topics seminars in the public administration (CPAP) curriculum. The first certificate established required 12 credit hours in nonprofit management courses, one required core course, and an additional nine hours of electives. It was designed to fit into the program of study for any of the school's three master's or two doctoral degrees. The certificate could also be taken as a stand-alone recognition of graduate-level work, independent of a degree program.

While one required course and three electives might serve as a reasonable introduction, they hardly constituted a comprehensive examination of the nonprofit sector. For that purpose, the Institute turned to the newly published curricular guidelines from the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council. The Institute's directors began seeking ways to fit a comprehensive curriculum into the plan of study for each of the School's programs. To accomplish this, nonprofit offerings would need to align with each of the programs to use electives effectively and to introduce civil society content into existing courses. In addition, program leaders took the initiative in developing several new courses in the areas of finance, law, ethics, philanthropy, and civil society to round out the curriculum.

Each of the School's programs seeks to assist its students in developing the analytical wherewithal to join theory and practice, because each addresses the professional world in some form. This requires a capacity in meta-level cognitive mapping that allows students to analyze practice against the premises of relevant theory. Such cross-walking of theory to practice and vice versa allows students to make sense of the organizational situations and contexts they confront. This order of reasoning is extremely difficult to attain and must be practiced if it is to be maintained by those who must rely on it. Meta-level analytical reasoning demands that students not only understand theory but also develop the capacity to apply it to situations they encounter in the field. This aptitude serves professional masters' students as they prepare to address daily managerial responsibilities and doctoral candidates whose aim is to produce findings of moment for the professions served by nonprofit sector research.

The challenge these claims suggested for the nonprofit and civil society program was ensuring that the limited curricular exposure that some students obtain to the sector is nonetheless sufficient to ensure at least their awareness of the import of this set of capacities as well as how these may be developed and maintained. For doctoral students, this challenge requires not only the development of discipline-relevant capabilities of analysis but also an additional ability to apply these across realms of inquiry as institutions operate in practice. To maximize the potential for students to witness and to engage in this form of analysis, the program has created a rich mentoring strategy while also emphasizing the develop-

ment among students of peer mentoring networks centered on shared substantive interests.

CHALLENGE 4: DEVELOPING COMPARATIVE ANALYTIC CAPABILITY

Developing High-Order Analytical Reasoning and Socio-Cultural Awareness

SPIA faculty members offer interested students deep substantive knowledge of national cultures and institutions as disparate as Ukraine, Rwanda, India, and Brazil. Many also offer profound knowledge of U.S. institutions and society. A key difficulty when aspiring to develop in students genuine comparative capability lies in ensuring that such knowledge is integrated across curricular offerings. Accordingly, program nonprofit courses have been developed to encourage faculty to offer comparisons of the United States and other national contexts as an integral part of syllabus design. To succeed, this approach must familiarize students with alternate settings and must allow each to come to understand that many organization-scale issues are common across civil society organizations, irrespective of differences in their cultural context. This challenge demands high-order analytic reasoning of the sort described above and keen awareness of differences in operating contexts and their significance for organizational, cultural, and social practice (Ashcraft, 2002, 101–117). Securing a truly comparative curriculum requires time and painstaking negotiations with faculty responsible for providing nonprofit-related courses. Developing the relationships necessary to permit the honest exchange of perspectives has been the ongoing responsibility of IPG leaders and staff.

CHALLENGE 5: SECURING CURRICULAR FLEXIBILITY

WHILE ENSURING “EXPERT” KNOWLEDGE

How Much Expert Knowledge of What Sort Is Sufficient?

Virginia Tech nonprofit program faculty daily confront the question of how many courses of what sort to require all students to complete in order to ensure a common base of knowledge (O'Neill, 2005, 6–11). This tension is especially sharp within SPIA's two doctoral programs. The CPAP Ph.D. in public administration and public affairs has historically required a great deal of coursework of students in specifically delimited areas. These have not traditionally included much emphasis on nonprofit organizations and civil society. By contrast, the School's EDP Ph.D. program was designed at its inception to serve learner interests and to be as flexible as possible. EDP has always sought to permit its students broad latitude to draw from multiple departments as necessary to secure their curricular aims and interests. One program controls curricula carefully so as to legitimate the domain of knowledge it represents, while the other takes an opposing epistemological stance and assumes the capacity of faculty and students to discern what is necessary to make informed curricular judgments, even when offerings are not of those individuals' design. Each approach can be legitimate,

as each represents different underlying perspectives concerning the role of expert knowledge and the processes by which it is legitimated. A major and ongoing negotiation for nonprofit program faculty has been navigating this divide across programs for students interested in civil society and nonprofit concerns and issues. Since the gulf in perspectives is great, negotiations are frequently delicate, whether undertaken by student advisory committees or among program leaders.

CONCLUSIONS

The method of study employed here, situational analysis, neatly captures the central and enduring struggles that have typified the nonprofit and civil society program at Virginia Tech. The program has resulted from its leader's reactions to changing circumstances and opportunities, even as it has been driven by a desire to ensure consistency with Nonprofit Academic Centers Council criteria and its own aspirations for analytical and comparative excellence. The program reflects its leaders' choices as they have scanned a dynamic and changing context in light of their ongoing aims, which are at least partly the product of serendipity and the consequences of prior choices. Well-positioned policy entrepreneurs have been crucial to the program's development, but so too has deliberation about possible strengths and intellectual comparative advantage.

Program leaders have quite literally constructed this effort in light of the circumstances posed by social and political demands, as well as the existing epistemological lenses and organizational culture claims of SPIA faculty and programs. In an important and unavoidable sense the program is rooted in the challenges and circumstances its leaders have confronted as it has been constructed. Its architecture is, in strong measure, path dependent. In making choices, program leaders have had to be aware of differences in stakeholder needs occasioned by geographic location and of the imperatives posed the goal of realizing the high-level intellectual development of a broad and diverse student body. The nonprofit program reflects pedagogical aspiration and a series of negotiated meanings over what constitutes appropriate academic inquiry and preparation. These have occurred with a long list of participants in an evolutionary dialogue. Given SPIA's complex programs, their many aims and the reality that only a supra-level organizational identity may ever be attained for the civil society program, the surprise is not that these challenges and tensions have dogged the program's development, but that they have been navigated thus far with some measure of success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author acknowledges with sincere thanks the research assistance of Courtney Jensen in the preparation of this article.

NOTE

1. These included Arts and Sciences, Agriculture and Life Sciences, Architecture and Urban Studies, and seven different academic entities—Urban Affairs and Planning and Public Administration and Policy (Architecture and Urban Studies), Political Science and International Studies and, at varying times, Geography and Science and Technology Studies (Arts and Sciences), and Agricultural Economics (Agriculture and Life Sciences).

REFERENCES

- Ashcraft, Robert. 2002. "Philanthropic Studies Curricula in Higher Education." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 36:101–117.
- Bardach, Eugene. *The Implementation Game: What Happens after a Bill Becomes a Law*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1977.
- _____. *Getting Agencies to Work Together: The Practice and Theory of Managerial Craftsmanship*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1998.
- Clarke, Adele. *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory after the Post-Modern Turn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Dolan, Drew. 2002. "Training Needs of Administrators in the Nonprofit Sector: What Are They and How Should We Address Them?" *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12(3):277–292.
- Graduate School, Virginia Tech. "Highlight: Postdoctoral Contribution to Transformative Graduate Education." Available at <http://www.grads.vt.edu/news/mansi.html>. Retrieved Nov. 9, 2006.
- Mirabella, Roseanne, and Naomi Wish. 2000. "The 'Best Place' Debate: A Comparison of Graduate Education Programs for Nonprofit Managers." *Public Administration Review*, 60(3):219–229.
- _____. 2001. "University-based Educational Programs in the Management of Nonprofit Organizations." *Public Performance and Management Review*, 25(1):30–41.
- O'Neill, Michael. 2005. "Developmental Contexts of Nonprofit Management Education." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 16(1):5–17.

Max Stephenson, Jr., is director of the Virginia Tech Institute for Policy and Governance, Virginia Tech School of Public and International Affairs, in Blacksburg. He may be reached at mstephen@vt.edu.