

Cleveland State University

From the Selected Works of Stuart C Mendel

Fall 2019

Social Enterprise

Stuart C Mendel



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/stuart_mendel/57/

Social innovation, enterprise, and entrepreneur-ism: what nonprofit students need to know

A. Introduction

Interest in concepts that cross the boundaries of nonprofit, business, and government institution forms has been associated with the nonprofit leadership and management literature since the 1980s and early 1990s (Dees and Anderson, 2003; Weisbrod, 1997; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Hansmann, 1980). From the standpoint of nonprofit sector processes, the earliest scholarly writing recognized what we now call *social innovation* as contributing to the conditions for social change and issues advocacy. Thinking on *social enterprise* centered on-cause related marketing involving collaborative relationships between nonprofits and businesses. The scrutiny for *social entrepreneurship* led to discourse on revenue producing earned income activities and the resulting income obligations for unrelated business income tax (UBIT), with a prominent example in nonprofit sector course- work involving the actions leading to ownership by New York University Law School of the Mueller Pasta Company in 1947 (Rose-Ackerman, 1982; Steinberg, 1991).

In the nearly two decades of the 2000s, nonprofit scholars and leaders have come to understand that social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship are concepts assignable to study for all three institutional sectors (Jones and Donmoyer, 2015; Harris, 2012). “Social innovation” has come to be viewed as “a break from practice, large or small, that leads to significant social impact” (Ashoka Innovators for the Public, 2000; Sahni, Lanzerotti & Pike, 2017. Scholars also posit that in its many forms, *social enterprise* offers innovative pathways to draw on all the sectors of the economy to create social and environmental impact through sustainable funding models for nonprofit organizations (Mirabella and Young, 2012; Dees and Anderson, 2003). Discussion also now considers that social entrepreneurs exist in all three sectors of the North American economy with the promise that its adherents can achieve: competitive advantage for market share; creative nonprofit mission fulfillment; and the creation of public value (Young, 2018; Bryson, 2006).

Students of nonprofit management, philanthropy and leadership studies will be familiar with social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship as driving nonprofit action and social change within the framework of creating a healthy civil society (Mendel, 2010; Bryson, Anderson, and Alston, 2011; Mulgan, 2006). Through this lens, social innovation aligns with greater, common good outcomes and is linked with core nonprofit principles such as altruism, advocacy, social capital, and volunteerism. Many philanthropic individuals and their institutions also claim as a core value the desire to fund innovation ideas to improve the conditions of society, for example “doing good for the common good,” for the best possible outcomes and the greatest impact for people and their communities (Mendel and Brudney, 2014).

The outcomes of social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship are achieved in all parts of the U.S. economy. Among the mutual benefits to society of these theories and practices are the trails they blaze toward amplified or leveraged financial and nonfinancial resources drawn from all the sectors. Other benefits include the ways nonprofit, private and public actors borrow concepts from one another to advance the common good (Sullivan, Weerawardena, and

Carnegie, 2003). It is no coincidence that the Nonprofit Academic Centers Council Curricular Undergraduate Guidelines subsections 7.5 and 7.6 and the Graduate Guidelines subsections 12.7 and 12.8 include these topics as essential for students of nonprofit management and philanthropic studies.

B. Theory

The conceptual roots of social innovation, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship across the sectors in the United States are traceable to the responsibility of individuals and institutions to the “commons” (McCambridge, 2004). The “commons” in perspective to nonprofit sector institutions are associated with principled actions that generate trust and reciprocity among individuals, and contribute to direct and indirect benefits to the larger society and environment (Frumkin, 2009; Lohmann, 1992). While responsibility by individuals to “the commons” is central to the function of American democracy (Berger and Nuehaus, 1977), the notion of an obligation to care about and contribute to the common good is also woven into the ethos of leadership and management in nonprofit organizations, whose legitimacy arises from volunteers who govern them (Powell and Steinberg, 2006).

Nonprofits and the commons

The methodology toward achieving social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship is increasing dynamic. An individual social entrepreneur may choose the mechanism of a nonprofit organization to reach social mission outcomes (Reis, 1999). One reason, for example, would involve the start-up subsidy from public and private donor sources or from volunteers (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2002). In contrast to for-profit business, a nonprofit is likely to place mission fulfillment ahead of generating profits as a priority, seeing fiscal success in the outcome of not losing money (Alvord, Brown & Letts, 2004). Thoughtful nonprofit organization entrepreneur-ists value social-mission outcomes that align with the fulfillment of their organizational mission. Nonprofit leaders would also view competent performance and ways to measure performance and mission achievement as a way to attract support from third party funders or other stakeholders.

Nonprofit leaders and managers in the United States are guided by the mission of their organization that may involve explicit or implied responsibility to contribute outcomes for the common good (Sheehan, 2010; Clemens, 1998). Some have argued that these principles are readily observable through the social innovation outcomes that strive to effect social change and perform advocacy on behalf of their stakeholders (Dees, Emerson, and Economy, 2002). For example a principle-agent contract-for-hire between public and nonprofit organizations which off-load local government management of a publicly-funded shelter for homeless single women to the local YWCA (Cain, 2018).

Others point out that social enterprise utilizes the market place to improve quality-of-life advancement for difficult to employ individuals. One example includes a cascade of negative social problems borne by food stamp recipients who are required to do some work to receive benefits. Greater good outcomes that contribute to the commons in this example are the desire by policy makers to get people jobs and increased wages particularly with “community re-entry” populations (McGraw, 2013). Employers such as the regional nonprofit food bank, a local restaurant business and public and private health care institutions create the conditions for

employment and offer skills-appropriate technical and non-technical services for these populations in their business planning (Farkas, 2017).

Still others may offer that social entrepreneurialism occurs when a business serves as a civic leader, contributes profits to sustain a nonprofit partner organization, or adopts a deliberate business practice such as minimizing its carbon footprint in the manufacture of its goods and services (Jones and Donmoyer, 2015; Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006). This may require forgoing maximum profits due to higher costs of doing business for the greater good of the community (Snook, 2012; Bryson and Crosby, 2006).

Unlike social enterprise housed within a for-profit business, nonprofit organizations create mission-driven programs as an approach led by professionals or volunteers devoted to that purpose (Young, 2018). In a nonprofit organization setting, social mission related outcomes are proposed and tested as a contract-for-hire to public managers or as an experimental service funded by others such as philanthropic institutions (Moulton & Eckerd, 2012; Smith & Lipsky, 1993). As part of this transaction, nonprofit social entrepreneurs are encouraged to form partnerships with others. In the best of circumstances, positive performance provides persuasive evidence to policy and grant makers that their investment produced a desired social outcome (Plantz, Greenway & Hendricks, 1997, p. 23).

Business and the commons - the triple bottom-line

For-profit businesses leaders can claim a role in social enterprise along a wide range of actions and outcomes contributing social benefit. (Roper & Cheney 2005). The underlying ethos is that successful business endeavors include responsibility by executives and private leaders to share their wealth for the greater good of a community. This concept arose in the earliest times of the North American experience as the civic responsibility of the businesses and elite stakeholders in local communities. Consequently much of the early scholarly thinking on social enterprise and entrepreneurialism was based on for-profit business operations, profit models, institutional forms, civic citizenship and ethical case settings. For example, business may serve as employers of protected and nontraditional populations; through contributions to the tax base of a community; through environmentally sensitive practices provide land-use reclamation, clean energy, reduced carbon footprint or other amelioration of other negative environmental impact pathologies. Businesses can point to social enterprise for purposes of enhanced market share and civic responsibility for a community (Shane, 2008).

The “triple bottom-line,” is a concept that came into use in the mid-1990s to describe businesses that are profitable, support community and are environmentally friendly (Savits & Weber, 2006). This is particularly evident where for-profit business and entrepreneurialism intertwine (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006).

Government and the commons – social innovation, enterprise and public private partnership

Government actors in the United States are also engaged in social innovation, enterprise and change through legislative process and through the principle agency of their contractors, and nonprofit and business partners (Moulton and Eckerd, 2012). Public managers use these tools to affect changed behavior in society through the businesses and institutions with who they engage. In many ways, the advocacy role many nonprofits practice with government as conveyors of

Table I One-stop shop: social innovation, social enterprise and social entrepreneur across the sectors

	Social Innovation	Social Enterprise	Social Entrepreneur
Nonprofit	New and better ways to address social problems and ways to measure outcomes to judge impact within the context of mission fulfillment of the organization.	Generation of earned income to achieve a social purpose that shift the resources for social change from application leading to low productivity funding and break-even budgets to higher productivity budget surplus.	Individuals or nonprofit and philanthropic institutions who engage in the risk of creating a new venture or collaboration that support new models for funding sustainability, including willingness to embrace unrelated business income into their operations model. Organizing premise may also include a desire to effectively mobilize the resources needed to address a problem across all the sector institutions of the economy.
Business	A wide range of societal problem solving outcomes using for-profit business models that lessen the carbon footprint of operations, have a value-added social benefit, contribute the common good using new but also recycled assets.	Profit activity with an embedded social and other greater goods purpose. Outcomes may include an articulated degree of direct profit set in a balance accepted by the business stakeholders to indirect profits.	A person or institution that engages in the process of designing, launching and running a business to create social value outcomes and willing to accept a modified profit attainment that is measured in a bottom line profitability and social impact outcomes which they select as evidence of community and value efficacy.
Government	Policy and management practices that produce public value and the common good outcomes.	Collaborations. Partnerships and PPPS that leverage investment by government, reduce costs to government and remove the risks to government in the performance of work products outside their primary purposes.	Public management and policy making legislators who create the conditions for hybrid business entities such as low profit limited liability companies, or social impact bonds and investments as tools that encourage entrepreneurs to engage in social enterprise.

Sources: Dees and Anderson (2006); Austin, Stevenson and Wei-Skillern (2006); Light, (2006); Salamon, (1989).

information back to policy-makers and public managers offers a reciprocal pathway for public sector engagement in social change, social capital, social innovation, the creation of public value, and the public good.

Government has also contributed to the generation of social enterprise through the creation of public value. Public value for example is a concept that has been cast as an end product of the deliberate actions of public managers to create greater good outcomes by implementing public policies and using the economic resources of government to change behaviors of people and institutions that interact with the public sector (Moore, 2013; Bozeman, 2007; Bennington & Moore, 2011). Public policy making can reflect the desire of public actors to create public value supportive of the commons. The Obama Administration urged policy makers to develop a “Social Innovation Fund” for example, to nurture social enterprise (Nash, 2010, page 263). Another innovation of public sector support are social impact bonds, an invention of the bond marketplace that offers the promise to use private investment dollars for traditionally publically funded social innovation endeavors (Liebman, 2011). Government actors also strive to craft public private partnerships that produce both direct and indirect outcomes that contribute to public value.

Three cases illustrate the nuances and complexity of the concepts we have been discussing.

C. Case Study I – Social Innovation

A century old regional nonprofit community hospital was purchased by a global for-profit health care corporation during a spate of buyouts of private health care institutions in the 1990s (Duke, 1996). The sale proceeds resulted in a sizable after-expenses surplus beyond long term pension and other obligations of the institution. Rather than commit to a spend down institution closure business model, the hospital board of directors elected to shift the long term obligations and surplus from the sale of the hospital and its affiliate operations to the private fund development Foundation of the System. The board of directors revised the mission of the Foundation from that of exclusively fund development and institutional advancement of the legacy hospital, to that of an operating, community grant-making institution. Under the stewardship of the former hospital CEO, the Foundation sought to create a comprehensive community initiative (CCI) whose goal was to promote positive improvements in the health and well-being of the urban neighborhood previously served by the hospital. The CCI was complex, operating across all economic sectors of society for the purpose of achieving significant and observable social changes at the individual, family, organizational, community and service system of the target community (Danna & Portia, 2006).

Discussion and questions

Arguably, the Foundation and its work touch upon all three legs of the social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneur stool. The CCI outcomes for example required innovative outcome measures of the initiative’s impact on community institutions, practices, and systems such as employment, health, and education for the neighborhood residents. Evaluating the CCI over the long-term led to an evolving cause-and-effect chain of Foundation grant making projects in which, depending on the point at which evaluation occurred, activities which at one moment in time were most appropriately thought of as outcomes later on were seen as inputs or means to a

subsequent objective (Bagnoli & Megali, 2011; Rogers, Petrosino & Huebner, 2004; Innes & Booher, 1999).

- Q1. In what ways is the hospital conversion reflective of social innovation? Social enterprise? Social entrepreneurship?
- Q2. What weight might we assign to contributions a CCI might make to the commons, the creation of public value, the agency of public private partnership to social change?

Table II Tracking social change and public good outcomes by social innovation, Enterprise and Entrepreneurism

Social Change Outcome Methods	Innovation	Enterprise	Entrepreneur-ism
	How will the engagement of public, private or nonprofit actors lead to..	How will the engagement of public, private or nonprofit actors lead to..	How will the engagement of public, private or nonprofit actors lead to..
Contributions to the Commons	Mutual benefits for all stakeholders?	Mutual benefits for all stakeholders?	Mutual benefits for all stakeholders?
Creation of Public Value	Conditions for change generating societal change?	Conditions for change generating societal change?	Conditions for change generating societal change?
Use of Public Private Partnerships	Efficient use of cross sector resources?	Efficient use of cross sector resources?	Efficient use of cross sector resources?

Sources: Bryson & Crosby, 2006; Dees & Anderson, 2003; Clemens, 1998; Lohmann, 1992.

Case Study II - Social Enterprise

As early adopters of the social enterprise business concept two entrepreneurial brothers started a micro-brewery business in their restaurant in an historic neighborhood (Conway, 2013). The business was conceived to fill a niche left by the shifting market economies of the global brewing industry that led to the consolidation of large scale brewing companies and the demise of smaller, local and regional brewers in the United States.

The mission statement of the Brewing Company is that it is a principle-centered, environmentally respectful and socially conscious company committed to crafting fresh, flavorful, high-quality beer and food for the enjoyment of its customers. In pursuit of profitability, the owners assert that they strive to turn waste materials from their production processes and business operations into viable products.

In their vision for sustainability, the entrepreneurs assert engagement in economic, social, and environmental practices that achieve a sustainable yet profitable business. This “Triple Bottom Line” (Elkington, 2013) philosophy is present in almost every aspect of the business. From in-kind and monetary donations to community organizations, to green building and energy efficiency, to utilizing house-made biofuels, they are deeply invested in the sustainability of their business and community.

Discussion and Questions

One mechanism an entrepreneur may choose to utilize to work toward their social change goals is through the development or adaptation of a business. Because creating a business that does not achieve profits is unsustainable over time and is counter to business theory, using the business entity as a way to achieve a social-mission outcome means that market forces and a for-profit return on investment are the primary driving forces advancing social mission outcomes (Paredo & McLean, 2006; Pomeranz, 2003). In the business setting, social mission related outcomes would be framed within their contributions toward competitive advantage, lower operating costs of production, and the attraction of a labor force with distinctive (Bagnoli & Megali, 2013, p. 156).

Q1. How does the business model for the Brewing Company square with the concepts of cross sector social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurialism?

“Triple Bottom Line” is a concept that came into use in the mid-1990s to describe businesses that are profitable, support community and are environmentally friendly (Savits & Weber, 2006). The triple bottom line occurs during and after profit making operations. The Brewing Company social mission-related priority outcomes of the triple bottom line include in-kind and monetary donations to community organizations, green building and energy efficiency, and utilizing house-made biofuels. In their sales and marketing literature, the Company owners describe their business as “a principle-centered, environmentally respectful and socially conscious company committed to crafting fresh, flavorful, high-quality beer and food for the enjoyment of our customers.

Q2. In what ways is the triple bottom line theoretical concept aligned or runs counters to the principles of the market, shareholders and business function? In other words, what barriers exist to this concept as a standard of practice for the field of business operations?

The financial risk the entrepreneur assumes in social enterprise will also drive their sense of social mission fulfillment and the creation of outcome measures. Because social mission outcomes are likely to be “in the eyes of the beholder,” the original intention of the business or nonprofit based entrepreneur is an important reference point in the work of assessing progress toward social mission goals. This point is repeatedly made in the scholarly literature on social entrepreneurs.

Table III Social Innovation, Enterprise and Entrepreneurism Business Plan Scorecard

Indicator	Innovation	Enterprise	Entrepreneurism
	Fulfillment measures	Fulfillment measures	Fulfillment measures
The triple bottom line	Advancement toward improved conditions of society using the market, but also philanthropy and	Operations of a successful profit generating program that validates the social mission endeavor as a viable	At conception of the endeavor, the intent of the business owner, nonprofit or philanthropic board executive leadership,

	government practices and resources	profit-making concept	elected legislator or other public manager establishes the goals as driving greater good outcomes.
Customer or client satisfaction.	Societal need is met through a new method or re-ordering existing resources.	Customer or stakeholders validate the endeavor through operational profits and some social benefits.	Profit, operations surplus or leveraged/amplified public funds and the endeavor moves from concept to practice.
Human capital	Plan and design makes use of existing or new work force to achieve greater benefits or reduces societal negatives	Partnership and collaboration actors come together to achieve mutual benefits and fulfill the missions of all partners while achieving a positive social outcome.	Planned outcomes that address a social or common good such as employment for the otherwise unemployable

Sources: Savitz & Weber, 2006; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2002.

Table III offers a way to score social mission outcomes in terms of an effective business plan and the value system of organizers. The first measure is that a successful profit generating business validates the social mission endeavor as a viable profit-making concept. Or put more simply, a profitable enterprise indicates that the business idea is a good one and is meeting a market need and claiming market share. Second, is that the business social-mission achievement is valued by customer or client satisfaction. Third, is that the human capital capabilities contributed by the entrepreneur are a good match for the endeavor and that the outcomes meet the intent of the business owner.

Case Study III - Social Entrepreneurism

The Alliance has been organized to create the conditions for an airport city or “aerotropolis” business district to take shape using its ability to convene and coordinate local, regional and national stakeholders. The Alliance is comprised of five municipalities; county, state and federal stakeholders; the publically owned airport; private developers, small aerospace businesses and others. The Alliance operates in a large office building located adjacent to the airport. The building may provide physical space for federally supported small business innovation research projects at incubation and early stage development.

The nonprofit Alliance casts itself as a public private partnership (Mendel & Brudney, 2012) because its governing board is heavily weighted toward public sector participants joined by business and nonprofit actors. The public sector actors credit their work as entrepreneurial because the outcomes are justifiable to the common good of all their stakeholders. For example, the outcome sought by the Alliance is to establish an employment center of 50,000 high paying technology jobs clustered in the region and communities surrounding a regional airport. These

jobs and the accompanying benefits of economic development and small business attraction activity originating with the outcomes of work the federal government is driving the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) vision for “the mission to Mars.”

Discussion and Questions

Public private partnerships (PPPs) and social outcomes are large scale endeavors that rely on focused financial resources and institutional forms across all economic sectors (Mendel & Brudney, 2012; Wettenhall, 2003). Among the desired outcomes for PPPs are unanticipated benefits which contribute to the common good and public value. The rationale for PPPs that may focused on economic development outcomes such as the creation of a business district and center for employment, for example, will also create social outcomes such as enhanced quality of life for families, education opportunities and healthy communities (Drayton, 2011).

- Q1. In what ways is the Alliance reflective of social innovation, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship?
- Q2. Does the institutional nature of a PPP detract from its role to set the conditions for social entrepreneurship?

Measuring impact and value

Three methodological framing concepts for evaluating social mission-related outcomes (social innovation, enterprise and entrepreneurship) inform the process of measuring social mission outcomes (Sawhill & Williamson, 2001a; 2001b).

- First is the importance of profit or break-even income/expense performance as a determinant of achieving successful outcomes.
- Second is how and in what ways transactional and transformational measures were utilized by the case organizations to evaluate goal or mission fulfillment.
- Third is the reliance on mixed methods of assessment that incorporated both numeracy measures and anecdotal qualitative measures to as a way to include societal context as a backdrop for outcomes.

These three concepts offer a lens through which decision-making logic models, tradeoffs and lacunas necessary for measuring social mission outcomes can be understood in a variety of settings.

In addition to understanding social enterprise conceptual underpinnings, the attention cast toward social enterprise since the mid to late 1990s by private, nonprofit and public sector stakeholders has driven interest in the best ways to measure social mission related outcomes. Social enterprise models drawn from each sector, one way to illustrate the institutional forms of social enterprise is through a depiction of organizations practicing the phenomenon (Wood & Leighton, 2010). Two examples are necessary for the nonprofit sector organizations to address organizations engaged in nonprofit services and philanthropy. The frame for these illustrations considers how they themselves judge their progress in achieving social enterprise,

Exercise:

Using one of the three illustrative cases or case presented through another source, complete the Social Innovation, Social Enterprise, and Social Entrepreneur dashboard below.

Indicator and measures	Innovation	Enterprise	Entrepreneur
Is the importance of profit or break-even income/expense performance as a determinant of achieving successful outcomes.			
Is how and in what ways transactional and transformational measures were utilized by the case organizations to evaluate goal or mission fulfillment.			
Is the reliance on mixed methods of assessment that incorporated both numeracy measures and anecdotal qualitative measures to as a way to include societal context as a backdrop for outcomes.			

Learning goals for this chapter.

Upon completing this chapter, you should be able to accomplish the following sophisticated tasks:

- a. Explain and differentiate the concepts of social innovation; social enterprise; and social entrepreneurialism.
- b. Explain and differentiate the concepts of social innovation; social enterprise; and social entrepreneurialism across the institutional forms of the three sectors of the economy in the United States.
- c. Identify and characterize socially entrepreneurial initiatives in terms of definitions, drivers, size and key challenges.

References

- Alvord, S., Brown, L. & Letts, C. (2004). Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. Vol. 40, Number 3, pp. 260-282.
- Ashoka Innovators for the Public. (2000). Selecting Leading Innovative Social Entrepreneurs. Washington D.C.
- Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, Y. (2006). Social and Commercial Enterprise: Same, Different or Both? Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, Vol. 30, Issue 1, pp. 1-22, January.
- Bagnoli, L., & Megali, C. (2011). Measuring performance in social enterprises. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40(1), 149-165.
- Benington, J., & Moore, M. (2011). Public value in complex and changing times. Public value: Theory and practice, 1-30.
- Berger, P. L., & Neuhaus, R. J. (1977). To empower people: The role of mediating structures in public policy (Vol. 1). American Enterprise Institute.
- Bozeman, B. (2007). Public values and public interest: Counterbalancing economic individualism. Georgetown University Press.
- Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (2006). Leadership for the common good. Creating a culture of collaboration, 367-396.
- Bryson, J. M., Anderson, S. R., & Alston, F. K. (2011). Implementing and Sustaining Your Strategic Plan: A Workbook for Public and Nonprofit Organizations (Vol. 4). John Wiley & Sons.
- Cain, B. (2018). Cuyahoga County strikes a deal with YWCA to manage homeless women's shelter. Cleveland.com, March 9.
- Clemens, E. S. (1998). Private action and the public good. Yale University Press.
- Conway, P. (2013). Sustainability rationale. www.greatlakesbrewing.com/sustainability/other-sustainability-projects
- Danna, D. & Portia, D. (2006). Establishing a Nonprofit Organization: A Venture of Social Entrepreneurship. Journal of Nurse Practitioners, Vol., 4, Issue 10, pp. 751-752.
- Dees, J., Emerson, J., & Economy, P., editors (2002). Strategic tools for social entrepreneurs: Enhancing the performance of your enterprising nonprofit. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York.

Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2003). Sector-bending: Blurring lines between nonprofit and for-profit. *Society*, 40(4), 16-27.

Dees, J. G., & Anderson, B. B. (2006). Framing a theory of social entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. *Research on social entrepreneurship: Understanding and contributing to an emerging field*, 1(3), 39-66.

DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organization fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.

Duke, K. S. (1996). Hospitals in a changing health care system. *Health Affairs*, 15(2), 49-61.

Drayton, W., (2011) Collaborative Entrepreneurship: How Social Entrepreneurs Can Tip the World by Working in Global Teams. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization* Vol. 6, No.2, Pages 35-38

Elkington, J. (2013). Enter the triple bottom line. In *The triple bottom line* (pp. 23-38). Routledge.

Farkas, K (2017) Cuyahoga County to subsidize internships for former inmates. *Cleveland.com*, April 24.

Frumkin, P. (2009). *On being nonprofit: A conceptual and policy primer*. Harvard University Press.

Hansmann, H. B. (1980). The role of nonprofit enterprise. *The Yale law journal*, 89(5), 835-901.

Harris, M. (2012). Nonprofits and Business: Toward a subfield of Nonprofit Studies. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No 5., pp. 892-902.

Innes, J., & Booher, D. (1999). Consensus building and complex adaptive systems: A framework for evaluating collaborative planning. *Journal of the American planning association*, 65(4), 412-423.

Jones, J. & Donmoyer, R. (2015). Multiple meanings of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise and their implications for the nonprofit field. *The Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership*, 5(1).

Liebman, J. B. (2011). *Social Impact Bonds: A promising new financing model to accelerate social innovation and improve government performance*. Center for American Progress, 9.

Light, P. C. (2006). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 4(3), 47-51.

Lohmann, R. A. (1992). *The commons: New perspectives on nonprofit organizations and voluntary action*. Jossey-Bass Inc Pub.

- McCambridge, R. (2004). Underestimating the power of nonprofit governance. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(2), 346-354.
- McGraw, T. (2013). Transformations are remarkable for Cleveland Foundation's re-entry program. *Crains Cleveland* on line. April 25.
- Mendel, S. C. (2010). Are private government, the nonprofit sector, and civil society the same thing? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(4), 717-733.
- Mendel, S. C., & Brudney, J. L. (2012). Putting the NP in PPP: The role of nonprofit organizations in public-private partnerships. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 35(4), 617-642.
- Mendel, S. C., & Brudney, J. L. (2014). Doing good, public good, and public value. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 25(1), 23-40.
- Mirabella, R., & Young, D. R. (2012). The development of education for social entrepreneurship and nonprofit management: Diverging or converging paths?. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 23(1), 43-57.
- Moore, M. H. (2013). *Recognizing public value*. Harvard University Press.
- Moulton, S., & Eckerd, A. (2012). Preserving the publicness of the nonprofit sector: Resources, roles, and public values. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41(4), 656-685.
- Mulgan, G. (2006). The process of social innovation. *Innovations: technology, governance, globalization*, 1(2), 145-162.
- Nash, M. T. (2010). "Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise." Chapter 10 in *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*, 3rd edition. David O. Renz, and Associates, editor. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nonprofit Academic Centers Council (2015). *Curricular Guidelines*.
- Paredo, A. & McLean, M. (2006). A Critical Review of the Concept. *Journal of World Business*. Vol.41, Issue 1, February pp. 56-65.
- Plantz, M., Greenway, M., & Hendricks, M. (1997). Outcome Measurement: Showing Results in the Nonprofit Sector. *New Directions for Evaluation*. No. 75, Fall, pp. 15-30.
- Pomerantz, M. (2003). The business of social entrepreneurship in a "down economy." *Business*, Volume 25, Issue 3, pp. 25-30
- Powell, W., & Steinberg, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*. Yale University Press.

Reis, T. (1999). Unleashing the new resources and entrepreneurship for the common good: A scan, synthesis and scenario for action. Battle Creek, MI: W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Rogers, P., Petrosino, A., & Huebner, T., (2004). Program Theory Evaluation: Practice, Promise, and Problems. *New Directions for Evaluation*. Vol. 2000, Issue 87, November, pp. 5-13.

Rose-Ackerman, S. (1982). Unfair competition and corporate income taxation. *Stanford Law Review*, 1017-1039.

Roper, J., & Cheney, G. (2005). The meanings of social entrepreneurship today. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 5(3), 95-104.

Sahni, N., Lanzerotti, L., Bliss, A., & Pike, D. (2017). Is Your Nonprofit Built for Sustained Innovation? *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, online August 1.

Salamon LM. 1989. The changing tools of government action: an overview. In *Beyond Privatization: The Tools of Government Action*, Salamon LM (ed.). Urban Institute Press: Washington, DC; 3–22.

Savitz, A. & Weber, K. (2006), *The Triple Bottom Line: How Today's Best-Run Companies Are Achieving Economic, Social and Environmental Success—and How You Can Too*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sawhill, J., & Williamson, D. (2001). Measuring What Really Matters in Nonprofits. *McKinsey Quarterly*. May.

Sawhill, J. & Williamson, D. (2001) "Mission Impossible? Measuring Success in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Volume 11, Issue 3.

Shane, S. (2008). *The Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The Costly Myths that Entrepreneurs, Investors and PolicyMakers Live By*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sheehan, R. (2010). *Mission Impact: Breakthrough Strategies for Nonprofits*. John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, N.J.

Smith, S. and Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for Hire: The Welfare State in the Age of Contracting*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Snook, D. (2012). Urban farms are taking root in Cleveland, bringing home surprising harvests. *Cleveland.com*, September 21.

Steinberg, R. (1991). " Unfair" Competition by Nonprofits and Tax Policy. *National tax journal*, 44(3), 351-364.

Sullivan Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., & Carnegie, K. (2003). Social entrepreneurship: Towards conceptualisation. *International journal of nonprofit and voluntary sector marketing*, 8(1), 76-88.

Weisbrod, B. A. (1997). The future of the nonprofit sector: Its entwining with private enterprise and government. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 541-555.

Wettenhall, R. (2003). The Rhetoric and Reality of Public Private Partnerships. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*, Vol. 3, pp. 77-107.

Wood, C., & Leighton, D. (2010). *Measuring Social Value: The Gap Between Policy and Practice*. London: Demos.

Young, D. (2018). *Financing Nonprofits and Other Social Enterprises A Benefits Approach*. , London: Elgar Publishers.