

Indirect Giving to Nonprofit Organizations: An Emerging Model of Student Philanthropy

Julie Cencula Olberding
Northern Kentucky University

ABSTRACT

Student philanthropy is an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make decisions about investing funds in them. The limited literature on student philanthropy has focused on the original model, called “direct giving,” which provides students with funds to make small grants to nonprofit organizations. But the literature has not addressed an emerging model, called “indirect giving,” which partners a class with a corporation or foundation, and has students evaluate “real” grant proposals and make funding recommendations. This article examines the impact of an indirect-giving program on MPA students at Northern Kentucky University (NKU). A majority of students indicated that the program helped them to become more aware of social problems (64.8%) and nonprofit organizations (77.8%), learn the curriculum (75.7%), apply the course principles (75.7%), and gain academic skills or knowledge (62.1%). The article also discusses some “lessons learned” about the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy.

INTRODUCTION

Student philanthropy has been defined as an experiential learning approach that provides students with the opportunity to study social problems and nonprofit organizations, and then make collective decisions about investing funds in one or more nonprofits (Ahmed & Olberding, 2007/2008). To date, student philanthropy has been the subject of a very limited number of scholarly articles in public administration and nonprofit management outlets. The existing literature has focused on one approach to student philanthropy, which provides students in a class with funds in the range of \$1,000 to \$5,000. Participating students are responsible for researching community problems and nonprofit organizations, conducting a request for proposals (RFP) process, and deciding which proposals to fund or not to fund (Ahmed & Olberding, 2007/2008; Irvin, 2005). This could be seen as the original model, because it seems to be the earliest means of directly engaging students in philanthropy and

it is still the means most commonly used. This model also has been called “direct giving,” because students have the responsibility of making decisions that *directly* impact the funding of nonprofit organizations (Northern Kentucky University [NKU], 2007).

In addition to direct giving, there is at least one other model of student philanthropy that has emerged in the past two years or so. With this new approach, students evaluate grant proposals submitted by nonprofit organizations to a corporation or foundation in the “real world.” The students make *recommendations* to the corporation or foundation about which proposals to fund and which proposals not to fund, and the corporation or foundation makes the final funding decisions. Because students are not making the funding decisions themselves, this new model has been called “indirect giving” (NKU, 2007).

While scholarly articles on student philanthropy in public administration and nonprofit management are few and far between, articles focusing on the new indirect-giving model are apparently nonexistent. So, this article begins to fill the gap in the literature by describing the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy, discussing its use in MPA classes at NKU, and examining its impact on students who have participated in it.

Further, the limited literature on student philanthropy courses in public administration and nonprofit management primarily have looked at the impact of this pedagogy on students’ awareness, attitudes, interests, and intentions related to the nonprofit sector (i.e., their awareness of nonprofit organizations, their interest in a career in the nonprofit sector, their intentions to volunteer and donate money to charity, etc.). This study gives attention to another important goal of student philanthropy — enhancing students’ interest in the course and their learning of the course content.

This article begins with a literature review that focuses on student philanthropy and its impacts, as well as the two models of student philanthropy — the original, direct-giving model, and the new, indirect-giving model. It then describes the research methodology that was used to analyze the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy at NKU, presents the results of these analyses, and discusses key findings and lessons learned.

STUDENT PHILANTHROPY AND ITS IMPACTS

Student philanthropy is a relatively new teaching strategy and thus the literature focusing on it is sparse, relative to other teaching strategies. Student philanthropy is an experiential education strategy that has similarities to service learning, which is much more established in literature as well as in practice. Service learning has been defined as “a teaching and learning approach that integrates community service with academic study to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities” (National Service Learning Clearinghouse, 2005, home page menu). So, student philanthropy could be

defined as a teaching and learning approach that integrates *charitable giving* with academic study, in order to enrich learning, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities. Scholars and observers of service learning have identified a number of goals that are relevant to student philanthropy. Based on the existent literature on student philanthropy and service learning, as well as descriptions of student philanthropy programs, the goals are to

- Enhance students’ awareness of social problems and nonprofit organizations in the community (Ahmed & Olberding, 2007/2008; Midland College, 2007);
- Influence students’ attitudes, interests, intentions, and behaviors related to social responsibility and civic engagement (Markus, Howard & King, 1993; Ahmed & Olberding, 2007/2008);
- Increase students’ knowledge of philanthropic processes, particularly grant-seeking and grant-making (NKU, 2007; Palka, 2007; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill [UNC-Chapel Hill], 2007);
- Enhance their understanding of the academic content of the course by integrating theory and practice (Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyster & Giles, 1999; Rockquemore & Schaffer, 2000; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Reinke, 2003; Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004); and
- Improve their critical thinking, communication, leadership, and other work-life skills (Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004; Midland College, 2007).

Irvin (2005) was one of the first professors to incorporate student philanthropy or “grant-making” into a public administration course. She taught a freshman seminar at the University of Oregon that was an introduction to the nonprofit sector. Irvin secured \$5,000 from Wells Fargo for the students to invest in a nonprofit organization. She had the students work in groups to research nonprofit organizations, select organizations, and persuade their classmates to invest the \$5,000 in “their” organization. Irvin provided some qualitative evidence of the student philanthropy project. “When I asked the founding year’s students if their experience in the course affected their intention to volunteer, 16 of the 18 students responded positively; some in glowing but general terms, about their hope to become involved in the nonprofit sector” (Irvin, 2005, p. 320). Irvin also incorporated a similar student philanthropy project into a graduate seminar in philanthropy at University of Oregon, but she did not provide any measures of outcomes of this effort.

Ahmed and Olberding (2007/2008) conducted the most extensive evaluation of student philanthropy to date. The authors cumulated and analyzed quantitative, end-of-the-semester data from about 1,000 students who participated in the Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project at NKU from 2000 to 2005. According to survey results, 89.6 percent of students agreed that the

philanthropy project increased their awareness of social problems, and 94.9 percent agreed that it increased their awareness of nonprofit organizations. In addition, a majority indicated that their participation in a philanthropy project increased (a) their sense of responsibility to help others in need (88.6%), (b) their intention to give money to charity (83.7%), and (c) their intention to do volunteer work (82.6%).

Interestingly, Ahmed and Olberding (2007/2008) found that the impact of the philanthropy project — in terms of awareness, interests, and intentions related to the nonprofit sector — was much less for MPA students than undergraduate students. The authors suggested that a potential reason for the lesser impact of NKU's student philanthropy project on MPA students — of which more than 90 percent are in-career — is that they enter courses with relatively high levels of awareness in terms of social problems and nonprofits, and relatively strong attitudes and interests in terms of their sense of responsibility to help others and their intentions to volunteer and donate money. Therefore, these in-career graduate students have a very limited capacity to improve in these areas. Ahmed and Olberding pointed to studies of service learning that have made similar conclusions — that is, service learning tends to have a relatively limited impact on MPA students because they enter the service-learning experience with strong feelings of civic responsibility and public service, as well as high levels of civic engagement (Reinke, 2003; Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004).

As stated earlier, there are multiple goals of student philanthropy. One is to enhance awareness, interests, and intentions related to the nonprofit sector, while another is to provide students with a richer understanding of the academic content of the course. There has not been a published article that looks at the impact of a student philanthropy project on learning by MPA students; however, scholarly research on service learning offers some insight. Overall, a number of studies have found that service learning has a positive impact on student learning (Cohen & Kinsey, 1994; Astin & Sax, 1998; Eyer & Giles, 1999; Rockquemore & Schaffer, 2000; Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000; Reinke, 2003; Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004). Specific to the field of public administration, students in three MPA courses at Augusta State University were “unanimous in concluding that the service-learning project enhanced their understanding and mastery of course material” (Reinke, 2003, p. 134). On the evaluations of an MPA course on public-private partnerships at Texas Tech University, “67 percent of students reported that the service learning project had helped them gain a better understanding of the course material” (Dicke, Dowden, & Torres, 2004, p. 204).

TWO MODELS OF STUDENT PHILANTHROPY

Student philanthropy programs have been springing up across the country in recent years, and there seem to be two distinct approaches or models. As stated

earlier, direct giving is the original model and the more commonly used approach. The indirect-giving model is a new or emerging approach. Each of these models is discussed in greater detail in this section.

1. Direct Giving: The Original Approach to Student Philanthropy

The direct-giving model of student philanthropy allots a certain amount of funds to a class or another group of students for the grant-making process. Then students invite nonprofit organizations to apply for grants through a request for proposal (RFP) process. Students evaluate proposals and make collective decisions about which ones to fund. In the “early years” of direct-giving student philanthropy — the early 2000s — individual professors initiated and administered a philanthropy project for their classes. As discussed in the literature review, a professor at the University of Oregon started direct-giving student philanthropy projects at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In addition to individual professors initiating student philanthropy projects, a growing number of universities have begun to create programs that serve students from various classes, disciplines, and departments. Usually, student philanthropy projects are funded by a corporation or foundation, although one or two individual professors have been known to put up their own money.

The Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement at NKU has a direct-giving program that is one of the most well-established — and most inclusive for the range of academic disciplines involved — in the United States, and it also is the largest, based on the number of courses, students, nonprofit organizations, and funding. NKU's student philanthropy effort began in 1999 with a grant from the Manuel D. and Rhoda Mayerson Foundation. About five classes per semester were designated as Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project courses, and each class was provided with \$4,000 to invest in nonprofit organizations in the region. Since 1999, more than 2,000 students participated in the Mayerson project in 40 different courses, including MPA and MBA courses, as well as undergraduate courses in communication, literature and language, marketing, philosophy, sociology, and theatre. These classes have invested about \$420,000 in 300 nonprofit agencies in the Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky metropolitan area.

Within the past couple of years, a number of universities have created courses or student organizations that generally incorporate student philanthropy, specifically using the direct-giving model. For example, at Arizona State University, a new graduate degree program in nonprofit studies began offering a course in Spring 2007 called Theory and Practice of Philanthropy. The students made site visits, prepared cases for support, and ultimately awarded \$10,000 to a nonprofit organization in Phoenix (Palka, D., 2007).

The Carolina Center for Public Service in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-Chapel Hill) developed a one-credit class for undergraduate

students called Promoting Change Through the Nonprofit Sector. A Web site description of the class says, “This one credit hour course is designed to offer undergraduate students an opportunity to learn about the nonprofit sector and to promote change in local communities by working together to fundraise, design grant award criteria, solicit grant proposals and decide on recipient nonprofit agencies” (UNC-Chapel Hill, 2007, Public Service Scholars section). Each semester, about eight to 15 students are selected, based on their applications, with preference for enrollment given to students in the university’s Public Service Scholars program.

At other universities, student philanthropy has been established in an extracurricular council or club. Generally, these clubs involve a mix of students representing a variety of academic disciplines and levels (i.e., freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors). Interested students compete for a limited number of positions on the student philanthropy council or club through an application and interview process. For example, Midland College in Texas has developed the Students In Philanthropy (SIP) club to teach “the importance of philanthropy and the role of nonprofit organizations in the community” (Midland College, 2007, student life/clubs/SIP). Students in the club raise funds, award grants to nonprofits, and “gain leadership and stewardship training through a structured program designed to educate, support and promote philanthropic leadership in the community” (Midland College, 2007, student life/clubs/SIP). Each year, up to 25 students are selected through an application and interview process. The selected students participate in the club’s activities for a full academic year, and attend weekly meetings designed to enhance their knowledge of the nonprofit and philanthropic communities.

The Upstate Institute at Colgate University in Hamilton, New York, initiated the Student Philanthropy Council (SPC). “During the fall semester, experts in these fields lead seminars to guide the SPC in its efforts. In the winter, the SPC designs, solicits and evaluates Requests for Proposals (RFPs) from regional nonprofits, and reaches group consensus on which will receive funding. In the spring, the SPC disburses a total of \$10,000 in grants to support regional nonprofit organizations” (Upstate Institute, 2007, home page + philanthropy council). Sophomores and juniors can apply for the council and, through a competitive process, 10 to 12 are selected to serve. The Student Philanthropy Council was funded with \$50,000 from the Brennan Family Foundation, which is enough to hold five seminars through 2011 (Jenkins, 2006).

2. Indirect Giving: A New Approach to Student Philanthropy

In Spring 2007, the Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement at NKU developed a new model of student philanthropy, while maintaining the original direct-giving model. With the new model — called “indirect giving” — students

evaluate grant proposals submitted by nonprofit organizations to a corporation or foundation in the “real” world. Students complete the following tasks:

- Familiarize themselves with the philanthropic mission of the corporation or foundation;
- Review proposals submitted to the corporation or foundation;
- Develop written evaluations of all proposals, regardless of whether or not they are being recommended for funding;
- Discuss the proposals with other students in the class — particularly their strengths and weaknesses — and prioritize the proposals for funding; and
- Present the class’s funding recommendations to the corporation or foundation board (limited to a few students). The board considers these recommendations, but it is ultimately responsible for making final decisions about which proposals to fund and not to fund.

In addition, the professor may decide to require or encourage that students take on other activities, such as

- Researching the nonprofit organizations — beyond their grant proposals — by using Guidestar, the BBB Wise Giving Alliance, and other sources; and
- Conducting site visits or interviews with one or more representatives of nonprofit organizations that have submitted proposals.

NKU seems to be the only university with a formalized indirect-giving program, based on a search of student philanthropy programs on the Internet. But, this is not conclusive at this point because there may be universities — or even individual professors — that have an indirect-giving program that does not appear on the Internet.

Relative to the original direct-giving model of student philanthropy, the indirect-giving model has some notable advantages and disadvantages. One advantage is that the university or professor does not have to raise funds for the student philanthropy program or project, because a corporation or foundation provides the dollars to fund proposals. In contrast, the direct-giving model requires the university or professor to raise funds, usually from a foundation or corporation. As discussed in the literature review, direct-giving student philanthropy programs at other universities involve \$10,000, \$30,000, or \$50,000 per year. A disadvantage from the university and/or faculty perspective is that it requires communication and coordination with another community partner — a corporation or foundation — that has its own priorities, schedules, personalities, etc.

From the student perspective, an advantage is that the indirect-giving model provides an opportunity to participate firsthand in the grant-making process of a corporation or foundation and, thus, observe “what works and what doesn’t” in grant proposals. A disadvantage is that, relative to the direct-giving model,

students have less say in the decision-making process for funding proposals, because they make recommendations to a corporation or foundation board that itself makes the final decisions. The board's final decisions can align with the students' recommendations, they can completely go against the students' recommendations, or they can be somewhere in-between. With direct giving, the students make the final decisions related to funding of proposals.

From the corporation or foundation perspective, one advantage is that students review the grant proposals, research the nonprofit organizations, conduct site visits, and write evaluations. This input may provide the board members and staff with valuable information and insight, and it may save them some time and energy in their own review of the proposals. Another advantage is that, by working with students, a corporation or foundation may get some satisfaction from helping to nurture a stronger sense of philanthropy and stewardship among young adults in their region. A disadvantage from the corporation or foundation perspective is that representatives should meet with the faculty and students at least twice — first, to introduce their organization and its philanthropic approach and, second, to hear students' evaluations of grant proposals and funding recommendations.

In Spring 2007, the indirect-giving model was incorporated into four classes at NKU, including a course that I teach, called Resource Acquisition and Management (PAD 621). This course is an elective for the MPA program and a requirement for the Nonprofit Management certificate. It is designed to help students gain a more comprehensive understanding of how nonprofit organizations acquire funds — including the sources of funds, fundamental principles of fundraising, and different types of fundraising programs and methods. It also looks at how nonprofits manage financial resources — including the basics of budgeting, accounting, and financial reporting. A student-learning outcome that is most relevant to the student philanthropy project is to “learn more about the grant-seeking and grant-making processes.”

During the “pilot” semester, there were a few challenges. One challenge was that the number of proposals was much lower than originally planned, and this was not learned until after the semester started. For my Resource Acquisition class, the corporation originally was supposed to forward about 30 proposals the week before classes started, but it provided only eight proposals during the second week of class. This change impacted a number of factors related to the class, including the descriptions and guidelines of certain assignments, and the organization of students into “boards” or small groups. A second challenge was related to the fact that four classes at NKU were involved in the indirect-giving model, yet the involved corporation had a limited amount of funds for its philanthropy program. The board followed the funding recommendations of a couple of classes — particularly a compressed class that only met during the first eight weeks of the semester class and presented its funding recommendations to

the board much earlier than other classes. The board did not fund any of the proposals that were recommended by students in my Resource Acquisition class, which made some of them feel as if their work had little impact on the final decision-making process. A third challenge was that the grant proposals were very inconsistent in their length and quality. For instance, some proposals were 10- to 12 pages in length and used a common grant application form required by some funders in the region, while other “proposals” consisted of a one-page letter with an organizational brochure attached. These differences made it difficult for students to evaluate and make recommendations, as in the “comparing apples and oranges” metaphor.

After the pilot semester, the Scripps Howard Center hired an outside evaluator to look at the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy. Based on this evaluation, some major changes were made to the indirect-giving model, such as having only one class work with the corporation. In Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, the one class selected was my Resource Acquisition course. In addition to the changes made at the program level, I made changes at the course level — most important was the addition of site visits to the nonprofit organizations by the students who were evaluating their proposals. In Spring 2007 — the pilot semester — students were not required to conduct site visits because there was an expectation that the corporation was going to forward about 30 proposals to the class, and the prospect of 30 site visits in two weeks seemed potentially problematic. In Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, the expectation — and the reality — was that the corporation would forward six to eight proposals to the class. Each “board,” or group, of students was required to conduct a site visit for each of the two proposals that it was assigned to evaluate, although not every student took part in the site visits due to work schedules or for other reasons.

This evaluation of the indirect-giving model helped eliminate or diminish a few challenges. For example, the change from multiple classes to one class resulted in improved communication and coordination. It also led to the one class having more influence — or at least a perception of more influence — on the corporation's funding decisions. But at least one challenge remained through the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters — inconsistency in the quality and length of the grant proposals submitted by nonprofit organizations.

METHODOLOGY

This study has four research questions. Questions #1 and #2 are based on the study of student philanthropy by Ahmed and Olberding (2007/2008). These questions address the goals of student philanthropy that are based on enhancing students' awareness, interests, and intentions as related to the nonprofit sector. Question #3 is based on another set of goals that has been identified for student philanthropy — i.e., enhancing learning. Question #4 is designed to identify underlying factors that relate to the outcomes of the student philanthropy

project. The following lists the four research questions:

1. To what degree does participation in student philanthropy — particularly the indirect-giving model — increase students' awareness of social problems and nonprofit organizations?
2. To what degree does participation in the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy enhance the development of certain interests and intentions related to the nonprofit sector?
3. To what degree does student philanthropy generally enhance learning, and to what degree does the indirect-giving model specifically enhance learning? Does it increase students' interest in the course, their learning of the course content, their ability to apply the knowledge and skills in the real world, and their acquisition of knowledge and skills?
4. Do certain characteristics of the course and the philanthropy project influence or impact students in terms of their awareness, interests, intentions, and learning?

The Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement at NKU systematically collects data on the Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project. The data for this study came from an end-of-semester survey of students in the Resource Acquisition course who participated in the indirect-giving, student philanthropy project (Spring 2007, Fall 2007, and Spring 2008). Seventeen students completed the evaluation in Spring 2007, eight students completed it in Fall 2007, and 12 students completed it in Spring 2008, for a total of 37 respondents. This study includes variables that have been used in earlier research on student philanthropy, particularly Ahmed and Olberding (2007/2008), because both articles analyze data from the Mayerson project survey by NKU's Scripps Howard Center. Specifically, both studies include the following variables: Students' awareness of social problems, awareness of nonprofit organizations, interest in community service, consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector, intention to do volunteer work, intention to give money to charity, interest in the course, interest in taking another course with a philanthropic or service component, learning of the course material, gaining of knowledge and skills, and application of course principles.

This study analyzes data from the Mayerson project survey in the following ways:

- **Percentages of responses.** In terms of the variables listed above, this study looks at the percentage of MPA students who indicated that the student philanthropy experience had a positive effect, and the percentage who indicated that it had a negative effect. The items asked respondents to assess the various effects of the student philanthropy experience on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being "very negative" and 5 being "very positive." In order to simplify and clarify the findings, responses to the 5-point Likert-scale items are collapsed into three categories, which get labeled as:

1. "Very negative or negative" effect.
2. "No effect."
3. "Very positive or positive" effect.

- **Means and standard deviations.** Another way that this study analyzes the effects of student philanthropy is to look at the mean response to each of the survey items listed. It also looks at the standard deviations, in order to assess the amount of variation across the 37 students who responded to the survey.
- **Regression analyses.** The regression analyses attempt to explain variation in the effects that the indirect-giving project has on students. There are two types of dependent variables here:

1. Students' awareness, interests and intentions related to the nonprofit sector, and
2. Students' interest in and learning of the course content.

There also are two sets of independent variables that may have moderated the effect of the philanthropy project on students. The first set consists of student activities related to the philanthropy project:

1. Whether the student participated in site visits, and
2. Whether the student presented to the corporation's philanthropic board.

In regards to site visits, the project did not have site visits in Spring 2007. It did have site visits in Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, but a few students were not able to participate in them. In regards to board presentations, the number of student-presenters was limited to three each semester, due to the size of the board room.

The second set of independent variables consists of student assessments of key elements of the philanthropy project in two areas:

1. Satisfaction with the quality of proposals submitted by nonprofits, and
2. Satisfaction with the final monetary awards or grants by the corporation's philanthropic board.

In addition, all of the regression models included control variables related to demographic characteristics of individual students, for which data were collected on the end-of-semester surveys. (See Appendix B for a condensed version of the survey instrument.) These demographic control variables included age (1 = <18, 2 = 18-25, 3 = 26-35, etc.), race (0 = white, 1 = non-white) and gender (0 = male, 1 = female). Initially, the models also included one other control variable that accounted for whether or not the course took place during the pilot semester (0 = non-pilot, 1 = pilot). As discussed earlier, the pilot semester had some challenges that had the potential to moderate the philanthropy project's effects on students. All of these models were estimated using ordinary linear regression analysis in SPSS.

Table 1. The Effects of the Indirect Giving Model of Student Philanthropy on Participants

What effect did this [student philanthropy] experience have on the following:

Survey Item	Percentage of Student Participants Number of Student Participants				
	Very Neg. & Negative	No Effect	Very Pos. & Positive	Total	
Awareness, Interests & Intentions Related to the Nonprofit Sector	Awareness of Social Problems	2.70% (1)	32.40% (12)	64.80% (24)	100.00% (37)
	Awareness of Nonprofit Organizations	13.90% (5)	8.30% (3)	77.80% (29)	100.00% (37)
	Interest in Community Service Organizations	2.80% (1)	41.70% (15)	55.60% (21)	100.00% (37)
	Consideration of a Career in the Nonprofit Sector	16.20% (6)	37.80% (14)	45.90% (17)	100.00% (37)
	Intention to Do Volunteer Work	2.70% (1)	51.40% (19)	45.90% (17)	100.00% (37)
	Intention to Give Money to Charity	5.40% (2)	45.90% (17)	48.60% (18)	100.00% (37)
Interest in the Course and Learning of the Course Content	Interest in This Course	5.40% (2)	32.40% (12)	62.10% (23)	100.00% (37)
	Interest in Taking Another Course with a Philanthropic or Service-learning Component	10.80% (4)	35.10% (13)	54.00% (20)	100.00% (37)
	Learning the Course Material	10.80% (4)	13.50% (5)	75.70% (28)	100.00% (37)
	Application of Course Principles to Address a Community Need	2.70% (1)	21.60% (8)	75.70% (28)	100.00% (37)
	Gaining of Academic Skills or Knowledge	2.70% (1)	35.10% (13)	62.10% (23)	100.00% (37)

RESULTS

Percentages of Responses

Table 1 shows the percentages of responses to various measures of effects generated by the indirect-giving student philanthropy project. Looking at the “very positive and positive” column, 77.8 percent of respondents indicated that the student philanthropy experience had a positive effect on their “awareness of nonprofit organizations,” 64.8 percent said that it had a positive effect on their “awareness of social problems,” 75.7 percent of respondents indicated that the student philanthropy experience had a positive effect on their “learning of the course material,” and 75.7 percent also said that it had a positive effect on their “application of course principles to address a community need.” About 62 percent of respondents indicated that the student philanthropy project had a positive impact on their “gaining of academic skills or knowledge.” It is worth noting that there were some negative responses on these measures, too. Looking at the “very negative or negative” column, 16.2 percent indicated that the student philanthropy experience had a negative impact on their “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector,” and 13.9 percent said it had a negative impact on their “awareness of nonprofit organizations.” (See Table 1.)

Overall, Table 1 shows that the indirect-giving student philanthropy project had a lesser impact on students’ interests and intentions, as related to the nonprofit sector, than the other areas. Less than half of the students said that the student philanthropy project had a positive effect on their “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector” (45.9 percent), their “intention to do volunteer work” (45.9 percent), and their “intention to give money to a charity” (48.6 percent). These results are similar to those in Ahmed and Olberding (2007/2008), which state that the original model of student philanthropy — the direct-giving model — had a relatively small impact on MPA students’ attitudes and intentions. As discussed in the literature review, Ahmed and Olberding suggest that a potential reason is because more than 90 percent of MPA students at NKU are in-career — usually in the nonprofit sector or government sector — so they enter courses with relatively established patterns of behavior in terms of giving their time and money to charities. Therefore, these in-career graduate students have a very limited opportunity for an increase on these measures.

Means and Standard Deviations

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the various effects from the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being “very negative” and 5 being “very positive,” the highest mean response was 3.9 for an item about the effect of the student philanthropy project on the “application of course principles to address a community need.” Two other items related to learning had relatively high means at 3.8; these were “learning of course material” and “gaining of academic skills or knowledge.” In addition, the other set of outcomes with relatively high means looks at awareness related

Table 2.
The Effects of the Indirect Giving Model of Student Philanthropy on Participants

What effect did this [student philanthropy] experience have on the following:

	Survey Item	Mean	SD
Awareness, Interests & Intentions Related to the Nonprofit Sector	Awareness of Social Problems	3.8	0.83
	Awareness of Nonprofit Organizations	3.8	1.08
	Interest in Community Service Organizations	3.6	0.83
	Consideration of a Career in the Nonprofit Sector	3.3	1.31
	Intention to Do Volunteer Work	3.5	0.73
	Intention to Give Money to Charity	3.5	0.77
Interest in the Course and Learning of the Course Content	Interest in This Course	3.7	0.88
	Interest in Taking Another Course with a Philanthropic or Service-learning Component	3.5	0.90
	Learning the Course Material	3.8	0.92
	Application of Course Principles to Address a Community Need	3.9	0.81
	Gaining of Academic Skills or Knowledge	3.8	0.86

Note. $N = 37$. Survey items were based on a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being Very Negative Effect and 5 being Very Positive Effect. For each item, the minimum response was 1.0, and the maximum response was 5.0.

to the nonprofit sector. The mean was 3.8 for both “awareness of social problems” and “awareness of nonprofit organizations.” (See Table 2.)

Table 2 also displays standard deviations for the responses to each survey item that measured outcomes. Some of these standard deviations are high, relative to the means. For example, a couple of standard deviations are greater than 1, with means of less than 4; the S.D. is 1.31 for “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector,” and 1.08 for “awareness of nonprofit organizations.” This indicates that there is great variation in the effects of the student philanthropy project across the 37 students in this study. The next couple of sections discuss efforts to explain some of this variation, including two sets of regression analyses and an overview of narrative responses by participants in the indirect-giving student philanthropy project at NKU.

Regression Analyses

Table 3 shows results of the regression analyses that attempt to explain variation in the effects of the philanthropy project on students’ awareness, interests, and intentions, as related to the nonprofit sector. There are six regression models in this set of analyses, each with a unique dependent variable that measures an effect of the student philanthropy project. The independent variables in these models include each student’s activities that were related to the philanthropy project (whether he/she conducted site visits to the nonprofits and whether he/she made a presentation to the corporation’s philanthropic board), as well as each student’s assessment of certain key elements of the philanthropy project (the degree to which he/she was satisfied with the quality of the nonprofits’ proposals, and the degree to which he/she was satisfied with the final grants by the corporation’s philanthropic board). The control variables are each student’s age, race, and gender.

Please note that the “pilot semester” control variable was dropped from all of the regression models due to multicollinearity. Most noteworthy was a correlation of -0.95 between the “pilot semester” and the independent variable “site visit.” Recall that the pilot semester of the philanthropy project in the MPA class did not involve site visits, because there was an expectation of a large number of proposals from nonprofits, which would have made site visits unfeasible.

The amount of variation explained by each model ranges from very little to quite a lot. R^2 is only 0.214 in the model with “awareness of social problems” as the dependent variable, but it jumps up to 0.608 in the model with “awareness of nonprofits” as the dependent variable. The demographic control variables included age (1 = <18, 2 = 18-25, 3 = 26-35, etc.), race (0 = white, 1 = non-white), and gender (0 = male, 1 = female). Initially, one additional control variable accounted for whether or not the course was in the pilot semester (0 = non-pilot semester, 1 = pilot semester). As discussed earlier, there were some challenges during the pilot semester that potentially could have moderated the indirect-giving project’s effects on students. (See Table 3.)

Two independent variables in all of the regression models represent student activities that varied across students — whether the student conducted site visits of the nonprofit organizations that submitted grant proposals to the corporation, and whether the student made a presentation of the class’s funding recommendations to the corporation’s philanthropic board. Recall that none of the students in the pilot semester of the indirect-giving project (Spring 2007) conducted site visits. In the following two semesters (Fall 2007 and Spring 2008), most students conducted site visits, but a few did not take part due to schedule conflicts. Table 3 shows that the independent variable “site visits” is positively and significantly related to three dependent variables (“awareness of nonprofits,” “interest in community service,” and “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector”). Further, the coefficients on “site visits” are the largest

Table 3. First Set of Regression Analyses: How Student Activities and Assessments of the Philanthropy Project Moderate Its Impact On Their Awareness, Interest and Intentions Related to the Nonprofit Sector

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables Unstandardized Coefficients														
	Awareness of Social Problems		Awareness of Nonprofits		Interest In Community Service		Consideration of a Career in Nonprofit		Intention to Volunteer		Intention to Give Money to a Charity				
Constant	β	s.e.	β	s.e.	β	s.e.	β	s.e.	β	s.e.	β	s.e.			
2.028	1.282	1.215	-0.436	1.215	0.891	1.252	-1.322	1.573	0.702	1.128	0.986	1.155			
Student Activities															
Site Visits	0.617	0.419	1.848	0.398***	0.735	0.408*	1.311	0.515**	0.589	0.369	0.597	0.378			
Presentation to the Board	0.254	0.419	-0.377	0.398	-0.036	0.408	-0.503	0.515	-0.023	0.369	-0.032	0.378			
Student Assessments															
Satisfaction With Proposal Quality	0.262	0.243	0.975	0.230***	0.524	0.245**	0.760	0.298**	0.390	0.214*	0.131	0.219			
Satisfaction With the Final Grant Awards	0.036	0.153	-0.068	0.145	0.159	0.151	0.215	0.187	0.086	0.134	0.033	0.138			
Control Variables															
Age	0.041	0.193	0.191	0.183	0.176	0.189	0.144	0.237	0.186	0.170	0.277	0.174			
Gender	0.299	0.377	0.411	0.358	0.122	0.366	0.823	0.463*	0.482	0.332	0.496	0.340			
Race	0.270	0.490	0.298	0.465	0.323	0.517	-0.491	0.601	-0.154	0.431	-0.432	0.442			
R-Square	0.214											0.325	0.449	0.271	0.235

Note. N = 37
 * = Significant at p<0.10 level, 2-tailed
 ** = Significant at p<0.05 level, 2-tailed
 *** = Significant at p<0.01 level, 2-tailed

coefficients in terms of size or magnitude (1.848 in the “awareness of nonprofits” model and 1.311 in the “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector” model). This evidence indicates that the philanthropy project had a much more positive impact on those students who conducted site visits — relative to those students who did not — in terms of their awareness of and interest in the nonprofit sector. The other student activity — “presentation to the board” — is not significantly related to any of the dependent variables that measure the philanthropy project’s effects. So the impact of philanthropy project was not statistically different for students who presented to the board, when compared to those who did not, all else equal.

Two other independent variables are student assessments of particular elements of the philanthropy project — satisfaction with the quality of proposals submitted by nonprofit organizations, and satisfaction with the funding decisions. Recall that some proposals were 10 to 12 pages in length and used a common grant application form, while other “proposals” consisted of a one-page letter with an organizational brochure attached. “Satisfaction with proposal quality” is positively and significantly related to four of the six dependent variables measuring the philanthropy project’s effects (“awareness of nonprofits,” “interest in community service,” “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector,” and “intention to volunteer”). The coefficients on “satisfaction with proposal quality” are the second-largest coefficients, next to those on “site visits.” Thus, the philanthropy project had a more positive impact on students who assessed the proposals that they reviewed as being of high quality. Interestingly, “satisfaction with the final grant awards” is not significantly related to any of the dependent variables.

Only one of the control variables is significant in only one of the six models. “Gender” is positively and significantly related to “consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector.” In other words, holding constant the other factors in the philanthropy project, female students were more likely to consider a nonprofit career than males.

Table 4 shows results of the regression analyses that attempt to explain variation in the philanthropy project’s effects on students for learning about and being interested in the course content. There are five models in this set of analyses, each with a unique dependent variable that measures an effect of the philanthropy project. In this set of analyses, R² ranges from a low of 0.255 in the model showing “interest in taking another course with a philanthropic or service learning component” as the dependent variable, to a high of 0.377 in the model with “learning of the course material” as the dependent variable. (See Table 4.)

As with the previous set of regressions, this set included two student activities that varied across students — whether the student conducted site visits of the nonprofit organizations that submitted grant proposals to the corporation, and whether the student made a presentation of the class’s funding recommendations

Table 4. Second Set of Regression Analyses: How Student Activities and Assessments of the Philanthropy Project Moderate Its Impact On Interest In the Course and Learning

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables Unstandardized Coefficients				Application of Course Principals	Learning of the Course Material	Interest in Another Philanthropic Course	Interest in This Course	Gaining of Academic Skills or Knowledge	
	β	s.e.	β	s.e.						β
Constant	1.777	1.321	1.993	1.381	0.968	1.243	1.002	1.243	1.594	1.268
Student Activities										
Site Visits	1.140	0.432**	0.975	0.452**	0.968	0.407**	0.879	0.407**	1.012	0.415**
Presentation to the Board	0.183	0.432	0.235	0.452	-0.056	0.407	0.464	0.407	-0.740	0.415
Student Assessments										
Satisfaction With Proposal Quality	0.277	0.251	0.166	0.262	0.498	0.236**	0.549	0.236**	0.334	0.240
Satisfaction With the Final Grant Awards	-0.081	0.157	-0.074	0.165	-0.062	0.148	-0.119	0.148	-0.062	0.151
Control Variables										
Age	0.094	0.199	0.043	0.208	0.193	0.178	0.151	0.188	0.173	0.191
Gender	0.349	0.389	0.365	0.406	0.487	0.346	0.483	0.366	0.276	0.373
Race	0.055	0.505	0.101	0.528	0.158	0.450	0.101	0.475	0.362	0.485
R-Square	0.315				0.342		0.377		0.278	

Note. N = 37
 * = Significant at p<0.10 level, 2-tailed
 ** = Significant at p<0.05 level, 2-tailed
 *** = Significant at p<0.01 level, 2-tailed

to the corporation’s philanthropic board. Table 4 indicates that the independent variable for “site visits” is positively and significantly related to all five of the dependent variables (“interest in the course,” “interest in taking another course with a philanthropic or service learning component,” “learning the course material,” “application of course principles,” and “gaining of academic skills or knowledge”). As with the first set of regression analyses, the coefficients on “site visits” are the largest coefficients in terms of size or magnitude (e.g., 1.140 in the “interest in the course” model and 1.012 in the “gaining of academic skills or knowledge” model). This evidence indicates that the philanthropy project had a much more positive impact on students who conducted site visits — relative to those students who did not — in terms of their interest in and learning of the course content. Also similar to the first set of regression analyses, the “presentation to the board” is not significantly related to any of the dependent variables measuring the philanthropy project’s effects.

In terms of the independent variables measuring student assessments of particular elements of the philanthropy project, “satisfaction with proposal quality” is positively and significantly related to two of the dependent variables measuring the philanthropy project’s effects (“learning course material” and “application of course principles”). Again, the coefficients on “satisfaction with proposal quality” are the second-largest coefficients, next to those on “site visits,” and indicate that the philanthropy project had a more positive impact on students who saw the proposals they reviewed as being of high quality. Interestingly, “satisfaction with the final grant awards” is not significantly related to any of the dependent variables in these models. None of the control variables is significant in any of the five models.

Qualitative Data

Appendix A provides excerpts of narrative responses by students who participated in the indirect-giving student philanthropy project at NKU. These excerpts are organized by themes that are related to the key variables of this study (e.g., awareness of nonprofits, interests and intentions related to nonprofits, etc.). The following comments are some of the positive narrative responses:

- I was also considering the Public Administration/Government sector but now will be seeking a nonprofit career.
- I want to explore grant writing as a career.
- I will be volunteering for more things and trying to support local NPOs in multiple ways.
- It was experiential and reinforced the textbook material in a less mundane way.
- I have more skills to be able to enter the nonprofit sector as a professional.

- As someone who has written grants in the past, I was glad to have the opportunity to review the process from the point of view of the funder. (See Appendix A.)

The following comments represent some negative perceptions of and experiences by students who participated in the indirect giving student philanthropy project at NKU:

- Many nonprofits are striving to meet the needs of the community with little help and resources.
- Many grant proposals are weak, cut-and-paste documents with limited attention to detail and extremely limited assessment of outcomes.
- The proposals given were hit or miss. For each, excellent proposal, there was a substandard proposal.
- In our capacity of reviewing and making recommendations, we could objectively evaluate the proposals, but even though we kept [the corporation's] perceivable goals and funding strategies in mind, their board chose differently than our class.

The following comments provide some insight on why the indirect-giving student philanthropy project may have had a limited impact on MPA students:

- I already work in the nonprofit sector so it didn't enhance my desire to do so.
- Most students with the MPA program already volunteer ... *a lot!*

DISCUSSION

This article has attempted to fill a gap in the literature by describing the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy, and examining its effects on MPA students at NKU who have participated in it. Overall, this study found that the indirect-giving student philanthropy program had a number of benefits. A majority of MPA students indicated that the project helped them become more aware of social problems and nonprofit organizations, and it helped them to learn the course material, apply the course principles to address a community need, and gain academic skills or knowledge.

It is worth noting again that the indirect-giving student philanthropy program had some negative effects on a minority of participants. Specifically, 16.2 percent indicated that it negatively impacted their consideration of a career in the nonprofit sector. One reason may be that the indirect-giving program at NKU is in the early stages of development, and the data in this study are from the pilot semester and two semesters that followed. Therefore, the program has some "kinks" that need to be worked out (and that are, in fact, being worked out). For example, as stated earlier, there was inconsistency in the quality of grant proposals in all three of the semesters in this study. But NKU worked with the corporation to encourage the use of a common grant

application form used by other funders in the region. Another reason for the negative effects of the indirect-giving student philanthropy program on participants may be that it opened their eyes to some realities of the nonprofit sector and corporate philanthropy. Specifically, it may have changed some perceptions that all or most nonprofit organizations are very knowledgeable about grant-seeking, and very professional in grant-writing. These realizations seem apparent in the narrative responses by a few students regarding the qualitative data. For example, one student said that "[many] grant proposals are weak, cut-and-paste documents with limited attention to detail."

Based both on the analyses in this study and on my personal experience, this section highlights some "lessons learned" about using the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy:

- **Require or encourage site visits.** This study found that site visits had the most significant and largest positive influence on students during their participation in the indirect-giving philanthropy project. Therefore, the professor should encourage or require site visits, if possible, in order to "make the most" of the philanthropy program.
- **Work with the corporation or foundation to ensure consistency in the proposals.** This study found that student satisfaction with proposal quality had a number of positive and significant impacts. The challenge is that proposal quality is not a factor that the professor controls directly, but rather it is more in the hands of the funder and nonprofit organizations. With that said, the professor — or a center or department if the philanthropy program is university-wide — can work with funders to educate them about the importance of using a common grant application form, or some other standardized form, by emphasizing that it will help not only the students, but also their board members, in evaluating the proposals more fairly and wisely. (This lesson is probably more relevant to corporations, as most foundations have moved to standardized forms.)
- **Limit one class per funder, if possible.** As discussed earlier, NKU started its indirect-giving program with four classes working with one corporation. This turned out to be somewhat difficult in terms of communication and coordination between the corporation, the university, and multiple professors. After the pilot semester, a change was made such that only one class would work with the corporation. This lesson does not imply that the program should be limited in terms of funders or classes. It implies that they should grow together; as the number of funders increases, then the number of classes can increase.

- **Manage student expectations.** In particular, it is important that the professor periodically remind students that they are just making recommendations — not final decisions — and that the primary purpose of the philanthropy project is to help them to learn the course content and gain skills related to grant-seeking and grant-making. An interesting and somewhat surprising finding was that “satisfaction with the final grant awards” was not significantly related to the project’s impacts on students (all else equal), because one might assume that students who disagree with the corporation’s funding decisions may find the entire project less meaningful and impactful. This result may be partly due to the fact that I tried to remind students that the corporation had the final say in terms of funding decisions, and that the primary goal was to enhance their learning.
- **Keep nonprofit organizations in the loop.** During one semester, the nonprofit organizations that had submitted proposals to the corporation were not informed that NKU students were involved in the philanthropic process. So, some of them were caught off guard when an NKU student contacted them about doing a site visit. Ideally, the corporation or foundation should send a letter and/or email message to the nonprofits, briefly explaining the student philanthropy project, potential benefits, ways in which students will be engaged in the process, etc.
- **Look for ways to leverage the program.** The indirect-giving model of student philanthropy can be a “win-win-win” situation for the students, funders, and nonprofit organizations. And there should be ways to make these “wins” even bigger for the parties involved. As discussed above, one way is that the professor and students can provide information and insight to funders, which may help them with the grant-making process and grant application forms. Another way is that the professor and students can help nonprofit organizations with their grant writing. Specifically, student evaluations of grant proposals should be shared with the nonprofits in order to help them learn their strengths and weaknesses.
- **Maintain some flexibility in the course.** During the first semester that I incorporated the indirect-giving model of student philanthropy, I developed a syllabus with very specific descriptions of the assignments, etc. Again, I expected 30 proposals, but received only eight, so this led to various changes in the course structure, assignments, etc. After that experience, I learned to include more general descriptions in the syllabus, and add more details as the semester progressed.

CONCLUSION

Student philanthropy is a relatively new pedagogy in public administration and nonprofit management, so its literature is quite limited. Most of the literature focuses on the original direct-giving model for which a class is allotted funds — usually a few thousand dollars — and the students research social problems, identify nonprofit organizations, request funding proposals, evaluate them, and decide which ones to fund. This article focuses on the emerging indirect-giving model, where students work with a corporation or foundation, evaluate real proposals submitted by nonprofit organizations, and make funding recommendations to the corporation or foundation. This article takes a few steps toward filling the gap in the literature by describing the indirect-giving model, discussing its use in MPA classes at Northern Kentucky University, and providing some evidence of its impact on students.

The advantages of an indirect-giving program include the following:

1. The university or professor does not need to raise money, as the funds for grants are supplied by a corporation or foundation;
2. Students work with a corporation or foundation on grant-making in the real world, which gives them insight on both grant-making and grant-seeking;
3. The corporation receives evaluations of grant proposals by students — possibly a “first cut” at the review process — and perhaps some satisfaction in knowing that they may be nurturing future philanthropists.

The disadvantages include the following:

1. The university or professor needs to communicate and coordinate with another community partner — the corporation or foundation — which takes time and energy;
2. Students have less say or influence on the funding decisions — relative to direct giving — because they are making recommendations and not final decisions;
3. The corporation or foundation needs to make plans to work with the class, which takes time and energy.

The few published studies on student philanthropy primarily have examined the degree to which it impacts participants’ awareness of social problems and nonprofit organizations, interest in community service and the nonprofit sector, and intentions to donate time and money to charity. This article examines these potential impacts, as well as the participants’ interest in the course, learning of the curriculum, and acquisition of academic skills or knowledge. It may be the first study that attempts to measure this broad range of potential effects. Data from a survey of 37 students indicate that the philanthropy project helped most of them to become more aware of social problems and nonprofit organizations, more interested in the nonprofit sector, more engaged in the curriculum, and more knowledgeable and skilled.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S., & Olberding, J.C. (2007/2008). Can student philanthropy help to address the current nonprofit identity crisis? A case study of a multiyear, multidisciplinary project at Northern Kentucky University. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 13(3/4), 593-615.
- Astin, A.W., & Sax, L.J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251-263.
- Cohen, J., & Kinsey, D.F. (1994). Doing good and scholarship: A service-learning study. *Journalism Educator*, 48(4), 4-14.
- Dicke, L., Dowden, S. & Torres, J. (2004). Successful service learning: A matter of ideology. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 10(3), 199-208.
- Eyler, J., & Giles, D.E., Jr. (1999). Where's the learning in service-learning? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Irvin, R.A. (2005). The student philanthropists: Fostering civic engagement through grant making. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 11(4), 325-336.
- Markus, G.B., Howard, J.P.F., & King, D.C. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 410-419.
- Midland College. (2007). *Students In Philanthropy*. Retrieved August 11, 2007 from <http://www.midland.edu/sip/>
- National Service Learning Clearinghouse (2005). *What is service learning?* (home page menu item). Retrieved August 4, 2008, from Learn and Serve America's National Service Learning Clearinghouse Web site: <http://www.servicelearning.org/what-service-learning>
- Northern Kentucky University, Scripps Howard Center for Civic Engagement and Nonprofit Development. (2007). *The Mayerson student philanthropy project*. (Scripps home page + get involved). Retrieved March 11, 2008, from <http://civicengagement.nku.edu/involved/mayerson.php>
- Palka, Debra. *Graduate students experience philanthropy firsthand*. (2007). Retrieved August 4, 2008, from Arizona State University, ASUNews Web site: http://www.asu.edu/news/stories/200705/20070504_SLHI.htm
- Reinke, S.J. (2003). Making a difference: Does service-learning promote civic engagement in MPA students? *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 9(2), 129-138.
- Rockquomore, K.A., & Schaffer, R.H. (2000). Toward a theory of engagement: A cognitive mapping of service-learning experiences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, (7), 14-25.
- Upstate Institute. (2007). *Student Philanthropy Council*. Retrieved August 5, 2009, from Colgate University's Upstate Institute Web site: <http://upstate.colgate.edu/ui-philanthropy.htm>
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Center for Public Service. (2007). *Promoting change through the nonprofit sector*. (Public Service Scholars section), Retrieved August 13, 2009, from the Carolina Center for Public Service Web site: <http://www.unc.edu/cps/students-scholars-philanthropy.php>
- Vogelgesang, L.J., & Astin, A.W. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, (7), 25-34.

Julie Cencula Olberding is an assistant professor in the MPA program and Nonprofit Management certificate program at Northern Kentucky University. She teaches Foundations of Public Administration, Resource Acquisition and Management, Volunteer Management, and other courses. In addition to student

philanthropy, her research has focused on collaboration among government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector for economic development. Her research has been published in the *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, *Public Administration Review*, the *International Journal of Public Administration* and *Economic Development Quarterly*. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julie Cencula Olberding, MPA, Ph.D., Department of Political Science and Criminal Justice, Northern Kentucky University, 424E Founders Hall, Highland Heights, KY 41099.

Appendix A.

Qualitative Data: Excerpts of Narrative Responses by Participants in the Indirect-Giving Model of Student Philanthropy.

Awareness Of Nonprofits

Positive

- There are far more philanthropic organizations and community needs than I had imagined.
- The most significant thing is learning to understand the NP sector and learning of more NPOs.

Negative

- Many nonprofits are striving to meet the needs of the community with little help and resources.
- Many organizations do not know enough about the logistics of philanthropy. Additional information would allow them to be better seekers of funding.
- Many grant proposals are weak cut-and-paste documents with limited attention to detail and extremely limited assessment of outcomes.

Interests And Intentions Related To Nonprofits – Career

Positive

- I was also considering the Public Administration/Government sector but now will be seeking a nonprofit career.
- I want to explore grant writing as a career
- I already work for a nonprofit but it expanded my knowledge about what is out there.

Neutral/no effect

- I already work in the nonprofit sector so it didn't enhance my desire to do so.
- I already have a career in the nonprofit sector.
- I'm here because I have a career in the nonprofit sector.

Interests And Intentions Related To Nonprofits - Volunteer Work

Positive

- One guest speaker's story led me to apply as a volunteer at her organization.
- I will be volunteering for more things and trying to support local NPOs in multiple ways.
- Yes, I have already explored/joined organizations that match my interests.
- After I complete school, my volunteer time will increase.

Neutral/no effect

- Full time work and full time school leave little extra time. I currently volunteer for special events at my place of employment.
- Too busy with school, work and family.
- Most students with the MPA program already volunteer ... *a lot!*

Interests And Intentions Related To Nonprofits - Giving Money

Positive

- Philanthropy is extremely important; when I am financially in a position to contribute and make a significant impact, it will be good.

Course & Student Philanthropy

Positive

- It was experiential and reinforced the textbook material in a less mundane way.
- The hands-on approach was nice. Really helped to demonstrate what we also learned in class.
- Great way to apply the material and concepts

Negative

- The project wasn't really appropriate for this particular course.

Learning & Application

Positive

- I have more skills to be able to enter the nonprofit sector as a professional.
- I learned the grant process from the inside out. I thought that was interesting.
- I learned the process of grant evaluation and feel better able to help secure funding.

- I learned that grant seeking is not a scary process — that it might be enjoyable for someone who can follow directions/guidelines and can write. I also learned how NOT to write grant proposals.
- What a grant is comprised of and what makes a good grant effective and efficient.
- I know how hard it is to make a decision when an organization needs funding.

Negative

- I learned that the philanthropic process is often not professional. The choices are generally not educated ones.
- It did not increase knowledge or skill.

What Did You Most Appreciate About The Student Philanthropy Project?

- The opportunity to review and evaluate proposals for the first time.
- As someone who has written grants in the past, I was glad to have the opportunity to review the process from the point of view of the funder.
- The hands on interviews with the administrative staff of the nonprofit groups. The fact that my input and recommendation was honored and put into practice, my program evaluation received funding.
- I appreciated the experience of interviewing and recommending a local agency for funding and knowing that my opinion matters.
- The opportunity to learn and be involved in actual projects and not just case studies in a book.

Other Comments

Quality of Proposals

- The proposals given were hit or miss. For each, excellent proposal, there was a substandard proposal.

Final Award(s) to Nonprofits

- In our capacity of reviewing and making recommendations, we could objectively evaluate the proposals, but even though we kept [the corporation's] perceivable goals and funding strategies in mind, their board chose differently than our class.
- I did not feel that our recommendation was taken very seriously.
- I was disappointed that [the corporation] didn't fund any of our recommendations.

Appendix B.

The Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project – Student Reflection and Evaluation.

Name of Course: _____

Major: _____

Minor or Area of Concentration: _____

Gender: Male Female

Do you live on NKU's campus? Yes No

Age: < 18 18-25 26-35 36-45 > 45

Ethnicity: American Indian/Alaska Native Asian Black or African American Hispanic or Latino Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander White Other: _____

Year in School: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Other

of credits earned at NKU, not including this term: _____

of college credits earned at other colleges/universities, not including this term: _____

This Mayerson class has helped me to ...

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- Learn the course material.
 Develop a greater awareness of nonprofit organizations in the community.
 Apply principles from this course to addressing a need in the community.
 Consider a career in the nonprofit sector.

List three (3) activities and/or assignments that increased your involvement and participation in this class.

- 1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

List three (3) activities and/or assignments that increased your learning in the class.

- 1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

What effect did this Mayerson class experience have on the following?

1 = Very Negative 2 = Negative Effect 3 = No Effect at All 4 = Positive Effect 5 = Very Positive Effect

- Your intention to do volunteer work.
 Your intention to give money to a charity to help those in need.
 Your interest in community service.
 Your awareness of the societal problem/need(s) addressed in this class.
 Your sense of personal responsibility to the community in which you live.
 The belief that you can make a difference in the world.
 Your sense of purpose or direction in life.
 Your intention to work on behalf of social justice.
 Your belief that you have a responsibility to help others in need.
 Your interest in taking another course with a philanthropic or service-learning component.
 Your interest in this course.
 Your academic skills or knowledge.
 Your relationship with the professor.
 Your relationship with other students in the class.
 Your desire to stay in college or complete a degree.
 Your attitude toward "experiential" programs like this one.

- Your willingness to contact community and civic leaders to learn about an issue.
 The development of functional life skills (e.g., communication, assertiveness, problem-solving).
 Your attitude toward those in need of services.

Read the list of activities and indicate whether this is something you did (or will do) this semester in connection with the Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project.

Answer with Y = Yes, N = No, or NS = Not Sure

- ___ I made an initial call to a nonprofit to learn about the services they offer or to see if they were interested in submitting a proposal.
___ I made at least one onsite visit to a nonprofit agency being considered for an award.
___ I submitted the name of a nonprofit agency for funding consideration.
___ I submitted the name of a nonprofit agency that eventually received funding.
___ I submitted the name of a nonprofit agency that did not receive funding.
___ I This semester I volunteered at one of the nonprofits being considered by my class for funding.
___ I This semester, I made a donation (money, material items) to at least one of the nonprofits being considered.
___ I served as a group (board) leader/co-leader.
___ I coordinated the visit of a nonprofit agency to speak to the class.
___ I presented (or will present) an award to one of the chosen agencies at the award ceremony.
___ I wrote a letter to a nonprofit agency indicating that its RFP had been selected (or not selected) for funding.
___ I coordinated (or am coordinating) at least one agency's visit to the award ceremony.
___ I have made plans to volunteer at a nonprofit agency next semester.
___ I made a presentation to a corporate philanthropy board.
___ I played other roles in the selection process that are not listed.

Please respond to the following six philanthropy and volunteerism questions.

- In the 12 months prior to this course, I donated (money or material items) to a nonprofit agency.
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____
As a result of this course, I increased the amount that I donate (money, materials) to nonprofit agencies.
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____
As a result of this course, I increased the number of nonprofit agencies that I donate to.
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____
In the 12 months prior to this course, I volunteered my time to nonprofit agency(ies).
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____
As a result of this course, I increased my number of volunteer hours with nonprofit agencies.
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____
As a result of this course, I increased the number of nonprofit agencies that I volunteer with.
 Yes No If yes, please list the name of the agency(ies): _____

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with ...

1 = Not Satisfied at All 2 = Unsatisfied 3 = Neutral 4 = Satisfied 5 = Satisfied

- The overall quality of the proposals nonprofits submitted for your consideration.
 The monetary award(s) this class made.

*Indirect Giving to Nonprofit Organizations: An Emerging Model
of Student Philanthropy*

Name the most significant things you learned this semester about your community, the nonprofit sector or the philanthropic process. *(Please use a few sentences to elaborate on your answers.)*

As a result of this course do you plan to make any changes in your life that relate to your level of involvement in campus or community life?

What did you most appreciate about the Mayerson Project experience?

Is there anything you would like to bring to our attention about the Mayerson Project?

We would appreciate the opportunity to ask you a few additional questions about your experience via email before the end of the semester. Please provide your name and email address so we can contact you.

Name _____

Email address: _____

NKU may want to contact Mayerson students in the future for follow-up evaluations. Please give us an address where you will continue to live or where someone can forward correspondence to you in the event you move.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ **State** _____ **ZIP Code** _____