3-2009

Higher Education and the New Capitalism: Social Enterprise Partnerships and the Opportunity for Community Colleges

Rosanna S. Diaz
National-Louis University

NATIONAL LOUIS UNIVERSITY

HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE NEW CAPITALISM: SOCIAL ENTERPRISE
PARTNERSHIPS AND THE OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
In

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

BY
ROSANNA STOLL DIAZ

Chicago, Illinois

Copyright

Community College Leadership Doctoral Program

Dissertation Notification of Completion

Doctoral Candidate: <u>Rosanna Stoll Diaz</u>

Title of Dissertation: <u>Higher Education and the New Capitalism: Social Enterprise</u>

<u>Partnerships and the Opportunity for Community Colleges</u>

Dissertation Chair: <u>Dr. Diane E. Oliver</u>

Dissertation Committee: <u>Dr. Rebecca S. Lake</u>

<u>Dr. Stephen D. Spangehl</u>

Date of Final Approval Meeting: <u>March 26, 2009</u>

The above named candidate has satisfactorily completed a dissertation as required for attaining the Doctor of Education degree in the Community College Leadership Doctoral Program.

Signature   Date

D. E. Oliver   _MARCH 26, 2009_

Rebecca S. Lake   _March 26, 2009_

Stephen Spangehl   _March 26, 2009_

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible for me to thank all the people who have influenced my journey in completion of this dissertation. I am forever grateful to all the family, friends, teachers and mentors that have supported me throughout this adventure.

This journey would not be possible without the support of the CCL faculty and my dissertation committee to who I am most appreciative. Dr. Heaney, thank you for pointing me in the direction of the CCL program. Dr. Lake, thank you for reminding me that we always keep learning. I would like to especially thank my chair, Dr. Diane Oliver, for her selfless guidance, grace, wisdom, encouragement and enthusiasm. Dr. Oliver, thank you so much! I was blessed to have the benefit of your experience and knowledge - I would not be here without you.

Many thanks to the all of the people at Broward (Community) College, along with the Marine Engineering Management Program partners, for their help in completing this study. Special thanks to Jorge Guerra for his generous and unwavering support and cooperation throughout this process. *Muchas gracias* to my buddy Oscar for the serendipitous introduction.

Dr. Stephen Spangehl - your quick wit and kindred spirit has helped sustain me throughout this process. Many thanks for sharing your unique insight and experience with continuous improvement and community colleges - it is much appreciated.

Thank you to all the members of CCL DOC 1 for challenging me and helping me to grow during this voyage over the last three years. Lois and

Jeannette – our Saturday lunches and your friendship made this journey so much more enjoyable.

Lastly, nothing happens in a vacuum – I could not have reached this goal without the love and support of my family:

Mama, thanks for instilling in me the importance of education and the drive to always do my best, no matter what.

John, thank you for picking up the slack during my educational odyssey- for making family dinners, running errands and driving our son to endless classes while I toiled away in my office. *Te quiero mucho.*

Rafael, thank you for understanding that Mommy was not available for you while she was working on her dissertation and that some things are worth sacrificing for – I promise that we will be swimming with the dolphins after I graduate this summer. *Te adoro.*

ABSTRACT

In the current economic climate, driven by their mission of open access, affordability, and a desire to help all of their constituent communities, community colleges are under increasing pressure to service a rapidly expanding and increasingly diverse group of students with fewer and fewer resources. Declining budgets and a burgeoning enrollment spurred by the recent economic downturn have forced community colleges to become more entrepreneurial in the ways that they develop new programs and find alternative revenue streams (Wiers, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007).

A critical concern for community colleges is that the business paradigm that fuels the increasing pressure to produce skilled workers and alternative revenue streams will diminish the mission that emphasizes open access and teaching at community colleges (Levin, 2001). The purpose of this study is to explore social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts, which are operational strategies originally designed for nonprofit organizations, as a framework for developing alternative revenue streams and innovative, demand driven programming for community colleges through the use of collaborative partnerships. The nonprofit social purpose framework that governs social enterprise is consistent with the mission of community colleges and provides a congruent paradigm for exploring entrepreneurial concepts with public institutions of higher learning (Dees, 2001).

A qualitative case study was conducted at Broward College (Broward Community College) and focused on the genesis, development and maintenance of the Marine Engineering Management Program. The program is characterized by a collaborative, integrated partnership which includes representatives from the college, the college's foundation, a program advisory board and the considerable contributions of the local marine trade association and its' members who own and operate businesses in the area.

Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship concepts, as conceived in this study, provide a framework for developing program partnerships that are comprehensive and relevant to the market driven environment in which many community colleges must now operate. The key organizing concepts of collaboration, accountability, sustainability, innovation and impact that were derived from this research and the literature were found to exemplify the Broward College program partnership and characterize a framework other community colleges can use to develop social enterprise partnerships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION..   1

      Background of the Study...   1

      Statement of the Problem   2

      Purpose of the Study...   3

      Significance of the Study..   3

      Conceptual Framework   5

      Definition of Terms   6

2. LITERATURE REVIEW.. 10

      Introduction 10

      Early History of the Community College............................ 13

      Contemporary Context of the Community College 15

            Technology and Globalization 16

            Funding and the Political Environment.................... 17

            Demands for Community College Innovation 18

      Shifting Patterns in Resource Dependency and the Rise of

      Academic Capitalism... 20

      Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise................. 22

            Defining Social Entrepreneurship............................ 24

LIST OF APPENDIXES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The United States and much of the developed world is, at this writing, in the midst of an economic crisis precipitated by inflationary housing prices, spiraling unemployment, widespread foreclosures, record breaking stock market losses, bank failures and corporate bailouts. It is in the context of this entrenched, worldwide recession that the newly elected President, Barack Obama, assumes his first year of office. As the financial crisis worsens and unemployment rises, the federal deficit has reached an all time high and state budget appropriations are being drastically cut (Samuelson, 2008; Zakaria, 2008). Thus, states are desperately seeking ways to fill budget deficits caused by increasing costs and decreasing revenue sources.

Moreover, state funding for public education has been declining steadily for the past 10 years and community colleges, which receive a significant portion of their budgets from state appropriations and local tax dollars, are in a particularly precarious position given the current state of the economy (Kelderman, 2008). Declining budgets and a burgeoning enrollment spurred by the economic downturn have forced community colleges to become more entrepreneurial in the ways that they develop new programs and find alternative revenue streams (Wiers, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

In the current economic climate, driven by their mission of open access, affordability, and service to all of their constituent communities, community colleges are under increasing pressure to service a rapidly expanding and increasingly diverse group of students with fewer and fewer resources. Since 1960, community colleges have increasingly moved toward career and community education and further from their original institutional purpose of serving as a conduit to transfer programs at senior institutions (Cohen, 2003). With this shift away from general education and greater emphasis on vocational and developmental instruction, both internal and external tensions continue to mount as the volume and variety of demand increases and funding dollars and sources decrease.

The community college's tradition of open access, along with the current economic and demographic trends of rising unemployment and an impending recession has presented even greater challenges for community colleges. The increasing necessity to retrain displaced workers or provide updated skills for baby boomers in search of encore careers has expanded the need for innovation and collaboration with the surrounding community to ensure that students are receiving the most relevant and sustainable skills needed to survive through the current crisis (Moltz, 2008; "Pathways to Encore Careers", 2008).

Given these trying times, there is a growing need for fresh innovative ideas and bold new leadership in community colleges; this study explores

community college innovation in the arena of engaged entrepreneurial leadership, emerging opportunities in public/private partnerships and market-driven program development.

Purpose of the Study

A critical concern for community colleges is that the increasing pressures to produce skilled workers and alternative revenue streams will diminish the mission that emphasizes open access and teaching at community colleges (Levin, 2001). How will the opportunity for community colleges change in the decades to come? Will they maintain the integrity of their mission while operating in an increasingly volatile competitive environment? This study will provide a conceptual framework for examining these questions.

The purpose of this study is to explore social enterprise as a conceptual framework for developing alternative revenue streams and innovative, demand driven programming for community colleges.

Significance of the Study

The preceding background information and statement of the problem lay the foundation for this study's contention that community colleges need to find new and better funding sources. The colleges also must find ways to reach out to a growing and diverse constituent community through the operation and development of demand driven program initiatives. The viability of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts as a tool for developing program partnerships is presented as a more compatible paradigm for applying business

practices to the operation and development of a public institution of higher education. The current model of the "entrepreneurial community college" (Roueche & Jones, 2005) is more about the operational practices of the institution and the orientation of the college's executive leadership; it applies what is largely a business paradigm to the community college mission. Utilizing the social entrepreneurship and social enterprise paradigm in exploring development of alternative revenue streams for community colleges is far more compatible with the nature of these institutions. The social entrepreneurship and social enterprise paradigm was originally conceived for use with nonprofit social purpose organizations as a framework for applying business practices to their operations and program development.

The nonprofit social purpose framework is consistent with the mission of community colleges and provides a more congruent paradigm for exploring entrepreneurial concepts with public institutions' of higher learning. The framework specifically allows community colleges to address many of their impending issues such as increased proprietary school competition and a growing demand for technical and industry specific training in the context of declining funding, rising costs, and burgeoning enrollments. The social enterprise paradigm can help community colleges engage their constituent business communities and create external stakeholders by forging collaborative program partnerships that are innovative, sustainable, and accountable and make an impact on the constituent community that is mission focused.

Research Questions

The study will be guided by two research questions:

1. How can social enterprise concepts be applied to the community college mission?

2. How can community colleges enhance revenue streams and develop innovative, market driven programming by employing social enterprise concepts?

Conceptual Framework

The notion of entrepreneurship as a generally accepted business paradigm is believed to originate from the 13th century French verb *entreprendre* meaning to undertake. In the early 1800's, the term *entrepreneur* was coined by John Baptiste Say to refer to "individuals who create value in an economy by moving resources out of areas of low productivity and into areas of higher productivity and greater yield" (Dees, 2001, p. 1). Joseph Schumpeter, an Austrian born Harvard economist, first introduced the concept of entrepreneurial innovation and the notion of the creative destruction of old or existing ideas, methods, skills or technologies, to create new and better ways of achieving entrepreneurial results. It is Schumpeter's view of the entrepreneur as an innovator rather than an inventor that grounds Dees (2003) notion of social entrepreneurship and the importance of impact over income. Dees' (2003) concept of impact over income and his (2001) vision of the meaning of social entrepreneurship are at the core of this research study's conceptual framework.

Definition of Terms

Accountability. This refers to the heightened level of answerability and transparency to all partners and the constituents served. This is where the application of business practices and a socially focused mission intersects. Accountability and responsibility must be transparent for and to all parties involved in the program partnership (Dees, Emerson, & Economy, 2001).

Constituent community. This community comprises the concomitant population of students, residents, business owners, and industry representatives that individual community colleges serve, as shaped by the social, political, and economic characteristics of their geographic area.

Collaboration. Collaboration is a key component of social entrepreneurship and a critical element for successful social enterprise partnerships. Here the intersection of college and community is clearly illustrated in a mutually beneficial alliance that should demonstrate maximum benefit to all constituents, particularly the student. It is critical that all partners have a considerable stake in the outcome and sustainability of the program, as well as clearly defined roles and responsibilities for delivering those outcomes (Kisker & Carducci, 2003).

Mission and impact. Dees (2001, 2003) posited the notion that for social entrepreneurs, the social mission is central to their business related activity, and mission-related impact becomes the central criterion, not wealth creation. For community colleges, this is particularly true as the best interest of the student

and the community served is always paramount when social enterprise partnerships are formed.

Innovation. The definition of innovation as it applies to entrepreneurial activity for this study is grounded in the work of Joseph Alois Schumpeter who envisioned the concept as a process of "creative destruction" whereby the entrepreneur is not an inventor but instead someone who continuously creates change from an existing pool of resources(Dees, 2001, p.1).

Partnership. A partnership is a relationship between individuals or groups that is characterized by mutual cooperation and responsibility; it works toward the achievement of a specified goal.

Program partnership. A program partnership is between a community college and representatives from the college's constituent community. It is formed with the mutual goal of developing and maintaining a career focused academic program, often technology driven.

Proprietary college. This type of institution is a privately or publically owned college and is operated as a for profit entity.

Social entrepreneurship. This term represents the act of a social entrepreneur who typically garners resources to solve social problems by enlisting the community in which they operate for a collaborative effort that is self-determined and mission driven.

Social enterprise. These enterprises are mission driven organizations (typically non-profits) that apply business practices to their social purpose

mission. In this study, the term is used interchangeably with social entrepreneurship.

    Sustainability. Sustainability, a critical concept for all social enterprise ventures, means the capacity to create lasting improvements, sustain operations, and service provision independent of charitable support (Dees, 2001; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2001). In the case of community college programming, it also refers to the longevity of the program and the program's relevance to the community and market that it serves.

<p align="center">Organization of the Study</p>

    This study of social enterprise partnerships and community colleges is organized in five chapters. Chapter 1, the Introduction, provides background information regarding the context of the study's problem and purpose. The chapter also describes the significance of the study, lists the research questions, introduces the conceptual framework, and provides definitions for terms unique to the study. Chapter 2, the Literature Review, examines the historical and contemporary context of community colleges with emphasis on funding and program development, and explains social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts. In addition, research on entrepreneurship and community colleges and the concept of social enterprise and community colleges is explored.

    Chapter 3, Methodology, reviews the study's design and rationale, describes the sampling and case study selection process along with data

collection methods and data analysis procedures. Chapter 4, Data Analysis, presents the context for the study, profiles the case study institution, and reviews the research data from the interviews, observations, and document analysis. The findings are organized around emergent themes from the data and a priori themes from the review of literature. Chapter 5, Conclusions and Recommendations, answers the research questions that drive the study and concludes that the social enterprise paradigm provides a viable opportunity for community colleges to develop program partnerships and enhance revenue streams. Finally, the chapter discusses recommendations for practice that are a result of the findings of the study and suggests opportunities for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this election year of 2008, the United States is in the midst of a real economic crisis. Prolonged record oil prices, a failed subprime mortgage market and widespread foreclosures leading to a national housing slump have triggered a domino effect on the U.S. economy. Unemployment is up, the stock market has plummeted and for the first time since the S&L crisis of the 80's and the great Depression, the federal government has been forced to bailout banks, financial institutions, and major corporations to keep the economy from crumbling under the weight of years of record corporate profits. The Federal deficit has reached an all-time high and state budget appropriations are being slashed to the bone as a result. Demands for goods and services produced off-shore have weakened overseas market economies as well and foreign investors have reacted to the weakened U.S. economy by causing a panic in Asian and European financial markets (Samuelson, 2008; Zakaria, 2008).

States are scrambling to find ways to fill budget deficits caused by increasing costs and decreasing federal appropriations. Federal and state funding for public education have been declining steadily for the past 10 years and given the current status of the U.S. economy, the future forecast for public education funding is grim (Kelderman, 2008). Community colleges, which rely on receiving a significant portion of their total operational budgets from state appropriations and local tax dollars, are in a precarious position. As state and

federal funds for public education continue to decline, community colleges are being forced to become more entrepreneurial in the ways they develop programs and revenue streams while servicing a burgeoning enrollment and an increasingly diverse group of student and community constituents (Wiers, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007).

Although much has been written about revenue strategies focusing on increased grantsmanship, as well as foundation and private fund raising, there is a paucity of research on the ways and means of developing "alternative" revenue streams in the form of partnerships that are mutually beneficial, demand driven, and sustainable. This study will explore three areas of particular importance to community colleges: (a) current trends in higher education funding and program development that have affected higher education operations, policy, and programming; (b) the critical internal and external forces fueling those trends; and (c) traditional and "alternative" ways in which community colleges develop and fund new programs and how this may change in the future given the current trends.

This chapter explores and analyzes the literature in two main areas: (a) the historical and contemporary context of community colleges with emphasis on funding and program development and (b) social entrepreneurship theory and social enterprise concepts. In the first area, the mission of the community college will be briefly reviewed in the context of its' socioeconomic history and mission focus. The external environment relative to the forces contributing to diminishing

funding in public education in general and community colleges in particular is then explored. Finally, the changing occupational outlook and the community college's response to those changes are both reviewed.

In the second area, the review of literature provides a contemporary exploration of social entrepreneurship theory and social enterprise concepts, contextualized by the external forces of ubiquitous technology, globalization, and economic changes that are part of the higher education landscape. This section first discusses the genesis of entrepreneurship, including its relationship to social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts, and how these concepts have been applied in the nonprofit sector as a tool for developing supplemental revenue streams for mission based organizations. The organizational definitions of social entrepreneurship are examined, followed by a scholar-practitioner characterization of the social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts. In summary, the selected a priori themes of social enterprise are described. Next, an exploration of the literature surrounding entrepreneurship in community colleges is presented followed by an examination of the potential opportunity for community colleges to form social enterprise partnerships. Lastly, the application of social enterprise models in the non-profit sector and specifically in community colleges is explored and a working definition of social enterprise as it relates to this study is described.

The summary demonstrates how social entrepreneurship theory and social enterprise concepts fit together in the context of global, political and

socioeconomic forces to inform and guide this study. Social entrepreneurship theory and social enterprise concepts provided the lenses for analysis that facilitated production of findings, conclusions and recommendations which will hopefully aid community colleges in developing innovative, sustainable programming and in promoting entrepreneurial change within the institution.

Early History of the Community College

In the years since the inception of our nation's first community college more than a century ago, much has changed in the social, political, and economic landscape that defined conditions leading to the genesis of the institution. Conceived by William Rainey Harper and his colleagues in 1901 with the establishment of Joliet Junior College as a high school extension program to help matriculate students to four year institutions, the original intent was expanded to include a broader range of students and services. Changes in demographic and socioeconomic conditions over the first half of the twentieth century converged to reshape the institution's original purpose and focus on providing a greater breadth of services to surrounding constituent communities. Widespread unemployment resulting from The Great Depression of the 1930's created a significant need for job training programs to put people back to work. After WWII, community colleges retrained returning soldiers and their families for the post war consumer manufacturing boom in the United States that was financed by the GI Bill. Finally, in the late 1940's, the Truman Commission created the catalyst for community colleges to provide a more extensive array of

services and a more diversified menu of educational opportunities for minorities,

women and working adults (AACC, n.d.a; AACC, n.d.b.)

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, n.d.c.) reports

that during the 1960's, more than 450 new community colleges were created in

the United States, doubling the total number of colleges in the nation to over 900.

In an excerpt from the book *America's Community Colleges: A Century of*

Innovation published in the *Community College Journal (2001),* the economic

and demographic influences fueling that growth are discussed:

> Between 1950 and 1980, major demographic trends brought
> change to community colleges, deepening their commitment to
> access through low cost, a comprehensive curriculum, and
> innovation. By 1960, states could no longer ignore the pending
> demand of baby boomers for access to college. Many state
> leaders were influenced by the 1947 Truman Commission report
> *Higher Education for American Democracy*, which encouraged
> the growth of community colleges. Some states, including
> Virginia and Massachusetts, created entire systems of state
> community colleges. Others, including California and Texas,
> used state resources to expand local institutions and to add new
> ones. (p. 11)

Cohen and Brawer (2003) examine how demographic trends affected

community colleges in the middle of the twentieth century, a phenomenon that

continues to influence who community colleges serve and how they deliver

education and training services even today. Up until the 1950's, higher education

was a privilege few young people realized, but that changed dramatically after

World War II. The number of people that went to college as a result of the GI Bill

increased significantly due to the "first large-scale financial aid packages that

made it possible for people to be reimbursed not only for their tuition but for their living expenses while attending college"(Cohen & Brawer, 2003, p.26). These drastic increases in the total number of enrollments were accompanied by significant changes in the composition of traditional college students to include women, minorities, and others who might not have considered college as a viable option.

No longer a place where young people went out of high school to fulfill their general education requirements before transferring to a four-year institution, community colleges became synonymous with the "new vocationalism" of the 80's and 90's along with the developmental and remedial education that their diverse student base required. In keeping with their mission of open access and service to the community, the community college was redefined as an institution that was many things to many different people (Phillipe & Sullivan, 2005; Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Contemporary Context of Community Colleges

Since 1960, community colleges have increasingly moved toward career and community education and further from their original institutional purpose of serving as a conduit to transfer programs at senior institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Brint and Karabel (1989) highlight the period between 1970 and 1980 as being particularly significant given the increase in occupational program enrollments and the proportion of degrees awarded in occupational fields. Legislation, particularly The Higher Education Acts of 1965 and 1972, along with

increased support from business and government officials, rapidly expanded the community colleges role as the primary purveyor of education and training for the masses (Dougherty, 1994).

With this shift away from general education and greater emphasis on vocational and developmental instruction, both internal and external tensions continue to mount as the volume and variety of demand increases and funding dollars and sources decrease. The community college's tradition of open access, along with current economic and demographic trends of rising unemployment, an impending recession, and the increasing necessity to retrain displaced workers or provide updated skills for baby boomers in search of encore careers has expanded the need for innovation and collaboration with the surrounding community to ensure that students are receiving the most relevant and sustainable skills needed to survive through the current crisis (Moltz, 2008; "Pathways to Encore Careers", 2008).

Technology and Globalization

The triple threat of ubiquitous technology, globalization, and concomitant forces on the United States local political and economic milieu has created a precarious climate for higher education, particularly where the areas of funding and program development are concerned. As Friedman (2006) points out, the flattening of the world has created a global market for education and knowledge services, bringing both an opportunity for amplified reach and a significant threat from increased competition to many higher education institutions with a

previously narrow world view of their constituent communities (Suarez-Orozco &

Qin-Hilliard, 2004). This is particularly true in large, research driven public

institutions of higher learning where lack of funding for pure research and the

interests of private business and technology have merged. It has created the

atmosphere of "academic capitalism" with projects and commercial ventures that

have paid for capital improvements, and made millionaires of research scientists

and business moguls of professors (Stromquist, 2002; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997;

Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Internationalization is a growing trend among community colleges which

enroll nearly 40% of all college students in the United States (AACC, n.d.). Many

community colleges house international student services offices, and enrollments

for international students are on the rise at community colleges across the

country, particularly in California, Florida, New York and Texas (Koh, n.d.; Chow,

2007; Phillipe and Sullivan, 2005;).

Funding and the Political Environment

Times are tough in public education. Shrinking budgets from state and

federal sources, globalizing job markets, increased competition from private

colleges and proprietary schools, and a student base that appears to be

exhibiting an increasing need for remediation and basic skills training are

converging to exert unrelenting pressure on public higher educational institutions

to produce more with less. Community colleges are no exception. Data clearly

show that costs and funding patterns have changed in recent years (Kenton,

Schuh, & Huba, 2004). As community colleges are consumers of goods and

services as well as providers of education, they are subject to the same

inflationary pain that individuals and institutions have suffered during the recent

economic crisis. Costs have steadily increased while tuition has remained

relatively flat and state reimbursements have been steadily declining (Kenton, et

al, 2004; Cohen & Brawer, 2003).

Demands for Community College Innovation

Given these trying times, there is growing need for fresh innovative ideas

and bold new leadership in community colleges; this study explores community

college innovation in the arena of engaged entrepreneurial leadership, emerging

opportunities in public/private partnerships, and market-driven program

development.

Reviewing the literature on community college leadership, innovation, and

entrepreneurship produces a common thread: community colleges (and their

leaders) must be nimble, flexible, embrace change, reward risk-takers, inspire

collaboration and out-of–the-box thinking, recognize excellence, and constantly

look with an eye toward opportunity (Jones, 2005; Wiers, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007;

Roueche & Jones, 2005). According to Shults (2001), nearly 80% of community

college leaders are expected to retire in the next five years. Community colleges

need leaders with vision and the courage to explore new opportunities, wherever

these opportunities may be found. A critical concern for community colleges is

that the increasing pressures to produce skilled workers and alternative revenue

streams will diminish the mission that emphasizes open access and teaching at community colleges (Levin, 2001). So what and where will the opportunity be for community colleges in the decades to come? How will they maintain the integrity of their mission while operating in an increasingly volatile competitive environment? This study will provide a conceptual framework for examining these questions.

Donham (2003) refers to a keynote speech presented at the American Association of Community College's 2003 Workforce Development Institute by William Sanders, U. S. Department of Labor, addressing the need for high-tech workers and his prediction that "America is likely to face a severe shortage of high-tech workers by the year 2020" (p. 28). How will these workers be trained and who will lead the way in developing these high-tech programs? This presents a significant opportunity for community colleges to innovate and develop a more entrepreneurial approach to career education.

Traditionally, the development of community college programs has been driven largely by internal forces (Donham, 2003). The unencumbered availability of institutional resources led primarily by faculty interest and personal relationships resulted in the development of many programs that had no viability in the marketplace for students seeking sustainable employment. Budget constraints and lack of external resources placed even greater pressure on community colleges. As Donham (2003) states, the "cost of lab equipment needed to support technical programs can be prohibitive" (p. 29). Although many

schools rely on industry and private donations to fill their labs with expensive

equipment, true partnerships based on mutually beneficial goals with full

accountability are rarely established (Kisker & Carducci, 2003).

Collaboration and partnering with community organizations, social service

providers, and other pseudo-governmental agencies have a long history in the

evolution of programs at community colleges. In a nationwide survey conducted

by the American Association of Community Colleges, more than 82% of the

participating colleges reported that community programs and services are an

integral part of their mission statement (Community College Engagement, n.d.).

These alliances, often born from their common mission and funding base, have

proved to be cumbersome and difficult to sustain. They developed not from the

need for innovation but rather the desire to share in a portion of the public funds

that accompany their allegiance. Public appropriations for community colleges

are shrinking at an increasing rate and private donors are becoming more

outcomes focused, further increasing the need for community colleges to be

more entrepreneurial and accountable for their outcomes (Selingo, 2008).

Shifting Patterns in Resource Dependency and the Rise of Academic Capitalism

The reality of public education in today's tenuous funding environment is

that the paradigm for institutions of higher education has been shifting to become

more aligned with a traditional business model as can be seen by the number of

endowed chairs, named schools and research partnerships that four year

institutions of higher learning have increasingly established (Levin, 2001; King

2005; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades 2004). Shrinking state funding and mounting budget demands have put more pressure on institutions to find revenue streams and alternative funding sources. There is a growing interest in assessing state level performance as is documented in a study conducted by the National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education entitled *Measuring Up 2000.*

The Community College Research Center (2002) reports that, in the future, there will be more emphasis on empirical evidence of student success and measurable outcomes will be required of all public institutions as evidence of that success. These are the very metrics that private, proprietary schools provide regularly to sustain the right to operate on an annual basis. Business and industry thrive on their ability to substantiate their effectiveness – performance indicators as a measure of effectiveness are critical to their ability to survive in a competitive, investor-driven marketplace. Community colleges, in order to compete against and/ or partner with private business and industry training professionals must adapt to this empirical model of effectiveness, particularly in technology driven disciplines and in career training and vocational education.

In an effort to cut costs, and stay competitive in an increasingly globalized economy, many new community college faculty are being required to teach a heavier load than their tenured, retiring colleagues and there is a greater reliance on the use of adjunct faculty as well (Avakian, 1995; Levin, Kater & Wagoner, 2006). Moreover, there is significant competitive pressure for community colleges

from the for-profits, particularly in career and vocational education programs. The business acumen of proprietary schools and their acknowledgement of education as a "product" for which students have a choice of providers, particularly those non-traditional and minority populations that comprise the vast majority of community college students, has created a competitive environment that is very different than the traditional academic purview of many of the administrators that are still directing policy and budget decisions (Farnsworth, 2006).

<div align="center">Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise</div>

The concept of entrepreneurship in American business can be traced to the early 1930's and Joseph Schumpeter, a Harvard economist born in Austria and educated in elite schools in Vienna (Dees, 2001; Light, 2008; Nicholls, 2006). Schumpeter first introduced the idea while at Harvard where he was a professor until his death in 1950. His conception of "creative destruction" and the idea of the entrepreneur as an innovator rather than an inventor are widely deconstructed and debated in business schools throughout the globe even today (Light, 2008). Schumpeter's 1934 seminal work, *The Theory of Economic Development,* is generally credited as providing the genesis for entrepreneurship theory. The critical tenets of innovation and creative destruction found in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* form the basis for Schumpeter's vision for capitalism and laid the foundation for contemporary notions of entrepreneurship (Schumpeter, 1934, 1942).

We are in what has long been referred to as a "knowledge economy" where knowledge is both a product and a tool for making a living in an informational society (Drucker, 1992 p. 263). Over time, Drucker held that as society becomes increasingly focused on productivity at the expense of workers, new industries would increasingly employ professional, managerial, and technical people as defined by the U.S. Census and eventually replace manual workers entirely. Knowledge and training as commodities would become increasingly necessary and much more valuable in order to remain competitive in our globalizing, digitized world to both American business and its' workers. Drucker's (1985) seminal work, *Innovation and Entrepreneurship,* introduces the seven sources of innovative opportunity and the principles of innovation. Subsequent to this publication, Drucker spent a great deal of his time consulting with non-profit organizations on a pro bono basis in an effort to help them become more effective service providers (Drucker, 1990).

Bill Drayton, founder of Ashoka: Innovators for the Public, describes the current era as a "fundamental pattern change" for the non-profit sector throughout the world (Drayton, 2006, Winter). According to Drayton, this fundamental change will require more innovative approaches to solving an ever-increasing array of social problems, both domestically and overseas. It is the non-profit or "citizen sector", of which public education and community colleges are a part, which operate the mission-based ventures associated with social entrepreneurship (Drayton, 2006).

Defining Social Entrepreneurship

The definition of social entrepreneurship and its' application to the solution of a wide array of social problems is currently being debated in business schools across the country (Dees, 2007; Dees & Anderson, 2006; Martin & Osberg, 2007; Light, 2006, 2008). Many of the organizations that fund projects forged by social entrepreneurs have been instrumental in helping to shape and add meaning to discussions of what characterizes social entrepreneurship in terms of substance and behavior. Some of these discussions involve the exemplar activities of the individual entrepreneur (e.g., Skoll Foundation) while others focus on the actions of these individuals and the scope and substance of what they are accomplishing such as Civic Ventures Purpose Prize for social innovators over 60 (www.skollfoundation.com).

The formalized study of social entrepreneurship as an academic discipline is relatively new and as an emerging field, it is still in the nascent period of discovery and debate (Nicholls & Cho, 2006; Anderson & Dees; 2006). Given the intensity of the current debate, identifying a definition in absolute terms is nearly impossible. The classification of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise thought, which drive the conceptual framework of this research, vary principally by their emphasis on earned income strategies and their geographic application. This ranges from activity focused on large non-profits operating in domestic markets or globally focused NGO's operating principally in developing countries where lack of infrastructure and limited access to resources have

sparked increasingly innovative approaches to providing basic human services (Nicholls, 2006).

It should be noted that given the embryonic stage of social entrepreneurship as an academic discipline and the applied, pragmatic focus of this emerging field, there is a scarcity of rigorous academic research and the application of the social enterprise concept in public higher education is virtually non-existent. While the need for a comprehensive theory of social entrepreneurship is currently being debated, it remains, at this writing, largely a field dominated by organizations that fund social entrepreneurs and a dedicated group of scholar-practitioners intent on expanding the literature beyond a pragmatic set of case studies (Anderson & Dees, 2006; Dees & Anderson, 2006; Nicholls, 2006; Light, 2008).

Leading Organizational Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship

In operational terms, social entrepreneurship can be viewed as the work of a social entrepreneur. According to the Skoll Foundation (n.d.), a social entrepreneur is someone who identifies a social problem and applies entrepreneurial business practices to organize, create, and manage a project or venture whose goal is social change. While success for a business entrepreneur may be measured primarily in terms of profit, a social entrepreneur measures success in terms of the impact that their efforts make on the environment or group that is the beneficiary of the effort. One of the most noted social entrepreneurs is Muhammad Yunus, founder and manager of Grameen Bank

who was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 (Ashoka, n.d.; Light 2006, 2008).

Social enterprises, which perform the work of social entrepreneurs, can be

organized as both non-profit and for-profit ventures, further complicating the task

of defining social entrepreneurship in absolute terms. For example, Vikram

Akula, the founder and CEO of SKS Microfinance, is a former McKinsey

management consultant who started a micro lending venture in several villages

of the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh. While the 10-year old venture is for profit,

it has had a tremendous impact on the lives of poor women in the 15 Indian

states where it currently operates, serving as a catalyst for social change

(www.sksindia.com). Bill Drayton, the founder and CEO of Ashoka: Innovators for

the Public, is widely recognized as a thought leader in the emerging field of social

entrepreneurship (Dees, 2001; Nicholls, 2006; Crutchfield & McLeod Grant,

2008; Light, 2008). Drayton has been largely credited with early contemporary

use of "social entrepreneurship" as a concept for non-profit management.

According to the organization's website, since 1981, Ashoka has "elected over

2,000 leading social entrepreneurs as Ashoka Fellows, providing them with living

stipends, professional support, and access to a global network of peers in more

than 60 countries" (www.ashoka.org). Drayton (2006) defines social

entrepreneurship in terms of the creation of a "citizen sector" and fundamental

pattern change, reminiscent of Schumpeter's creative destruction that this new

citizen sector has influenced throughout the world. Ashoka defines social

entrepreneurs as individuals "with innovative solutions to society's most pressing

social problems" (http://www.ashoka.org/ social_entrepreneur). Ashoka emphasizes the citizen sector as the critical catalyst for change and emphasizes change as the critical factor in determining the end result for social entrepreneurship activities and operations (Drayton, 2006).

Jeff Skoll, the founder and President of eBay, created the Skoll Foundation in 1999; its mission is "to advance systemic change to benefit communities around the world by investing in, connecting and celebrating social entrepreneurs" (www.skollfoundation.org/skollawards). The Skoll Foundation, which supports the work of social entrepreneurs through the Skoll Awards for Social Entrepreneurship (SASE), defines social entrepreneurs as "the change agents for society, seizing opportunities others miss, and improving systems, inventing new approaches, and creating sustainable solutions to change society for the better" (http://www.skollfoundation.org/aboutsocialentrepreneurship/index.asp).

Through the Skoll World Forum and through Social Edge, a Skoll-sponsored website at www.socialedge.org, the community of social entrepreneurs, practitioners and scholars from around the globe share resources and discuss the latest developments in the field.

The Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship, founded in 1998, was created "to advance social entrepreneurship and to foster social entrepreneurs as an important catalyst for societal innovation and progress" (http://www.schwabfoundseoy.org/en/static/about). In the Schwab Foundation's

Five Year Evaluation Report, 2000-2005, social entrepreneurship is defined as

follows:

> A social entrepreneur has created and leads an organization
> whether for-profit or not, that is aimed at catalyzing systemic social
> change through new ideas, products, services, methodologies and
> changes in attitude. Social entrepreneurs create hybrid
> organizations that employ businesses methods– but their bottom
> line is social value creation. The ability to turn new ideas into
> concrete transformational solutions is the hallmark of an
> entrepreneur. (p. 3)

Echoing Green is a 20 year-old global nonprofit organization dedicated to

early-stage social sector investing. Through a two-year fellowship program,

Echoing Green identifies individuals with ideas for social change and provides

them with seed money and strategic support to help them launch new

organizations. According to the Echoing Green website,

http://www.echoinggreen.org, the organization answers the question, "What is

social entrepreneurship?" in the following way:

> We believe that social entrepreneurs are those exceptional
> individuals who dream up and take responsibility for an innovative
> and untested idea for positive social change, and usher that idea
> from dream to reality. What enables social entrepreneurs to make a
> lasting impact on the most difficult problems is a special
> combination of groundbreaking creativity and steadfast execution.
> Echoing Green's portfolio of social entrepreneurs attack the root
> causes of critical social problems with unparalleled rigor.

The critical factors of systemic social change, the creation of opportunities,

along with the application of new approaches and sustainable solutions to social

problems led principally by individuals with vision and dedication to their mission

can be aggregated to summarize the organizational definitions of what

constitutes social entrepreneurship.

Scholar-Practitioner Definitions of Social Entrepreneurship and Social Enterprise

While much of the early literature on social entrepreneurship sponsored by

organizations focused on case studies and operational examples of the work of

social entrepreneurs in developing countries, early scholar-practitioners in the

United States took a pragmatic approach and focused their efforts on providing

non-profits with entrepreneurial approaches to operating social sector

organizations (Brinckerhoff, 2000; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2001). Leading

business schools across the United States, including Harvard, Duke, Stanford,

Columbia, and New York University, have developed affiliations and academic

research institutes to study social entrepreneurship, and are leading the current

debate regarding the creation of a universal definition of social entrepreneurship

and social enterprise (Dees, 2007; Dees & Anderson, 2006; Light 2008).

Emphasis on the use of business practices to create innovative operational

approaches for mission based organizations is a recurring theme; however,

exactly what is considered a social enterprise and whose work can be

considered social entrepreneurship is still widely debated (Nicholls, 2006; Light,

2008).

Definitions vary including those where social entrepreneurial leaders are

characterized in terms of their ability to take risk and garner creative use of

existing resources and those whose mission based organizations are viewed as

entrepreneurial where their delivery of services is augmented by an earned income strategy in addition to their conventional fundraising efforts (Dees, 2001; Nicholls, 2006; Light, 2008).

As the founding Faculty Director of the Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE) at Duke University's Fuqua School of Business, and one of the founding co-directors of the Center for Social Innovation at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business, J. Gregory Dees has written extensively and is widely recognized as an academic pioneer in the field of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise (Nicholls, 2006; Light, 2008). In 1998, Dees published a seminal paper funded by the Kauffman Foundation entitled "The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship". In a final 2001 revision of this paper, Dees refers to social entrepreneurship as a phenomenon that includes "innovative non-profit ventures, social purpose business ventures such as for-profit development banks and hybrid organizations that mix non-profit and for-profit organizations" (p. 1).

The genesis of Dees classification can be traced to Schumpeter's creative destruction concept combined with the work of French economist Jean Baptiste Say who viewed entrepreneurs as creating value by shifting resources to creating greater utility; innovation not invention (Dees, 2001). Dees incorporates Drucker's notion of entrepreneurship into his definition as well. According to Dees, Drucker did not see all small business as entrepreneurial nor did he believe that entrepreneurship *required* a profit motive, hence the extension to

socially focused ventures. For social entrepreneurs, impact related to the organization's social mission is the primary goal, not wealth creation. Dees (2007) credits the concept of social entrepreneurship to the work of Bill Drayton at Ashoka, who funds social innovators around the globe, and Ed Skloot of New Ventures who helps non-profits explore sources of income.

Earned income strategies alone are not enough to classify an organization as socially entrepreneurial (Dees, 2003, 2007). Social service agencies, such as the Salvation Army, the Girl Scouts and other mission based organizations, have operated thrift stores, sold cookies, held silent auctions, and organized bingo parlors since their inception as a consistent means of generating revenue for day-to-day operations. While it does require a certain amount of business acumen to operate these activities successfully, it does not require much innovation, risk taking or collaboration to sustain the practice.

Brinckerhoff's (2000) pragmatic definition of social entrepreneurism involves good stewardship at the core. The central thesis of his definition of social entrepreneurship is to empower non-profits to do more mission (Brinckerhoff, 1994, 2000). Brinckerhoff (2000) delineates a list of six characteristics that social entrepreneurs exhibit:

1. They are constantly looking for new ways to serve their constituencies and to add value to existing services.

2. They are willing to take reasonable risk on behalf of the people that their organization serves.

3. They understand the difference between needs and wants.

4. They understand that all resource allocations are really stewardship investments.

5. They weigh the social and financial return of each of these investments.

6. They always keep mission first, but know that without money, there is no mission output. (p. 12).

Dees, Martin and Osberg (2007) narrow the social entrepreneurship definition by delineating the setting in which social entrepreneurship occurs. Their discussion of first identifying a social problem or unjust equilibrium and then bringing to bear the resources to stabilize that unjust equilibrium leans heavily toward the work of social entrepreneurs operating in developing countries.

In Reshaping Social Entrepreneurship, Paul Light (2006) attempts to broaden what he views as a skewed definition toward the individual social entrepreneur by expanding the number of exemplars:

1. Social entrepreneurship does not have to start with individual commitment.

2. Social entrepreneurship is more about the idea than the process.

3. Social entrepreneurship can involve pattern breaking ideas about not only what gets done, but also how it happens.

4. The level of social entrepreneurial activity can vary greatly.

5. The intensity of social entrepreneurship can and does ebb and flow over time.

6. Social entrepreneurs sometimes fail. (p. 50)

In his recent book, *The Search for Social Entrepreneurship*, Light (2008) revisits his 2006 definition and introduces his concept for a new typology of social enterprise organizations. Light reexamines some of the generally recognized definitions of social entrepreneurship and presents an extensive discussion of the pragmatic literature and scholarly studies over the past decade. Following a three- phase process, senior executives at 131 "high performing social benefit organizations" completed an Internet survey administered by Light's team in an effort to identify a commonly acceptable definition of social entrepreneurship (Light, 2008, p. 197).

Light and his research team at Princeton Survey Research Associates coded these 131 organizations as "highly, moderately and not-too entrepreneurial" (Light, 2008, p. 159) in an effort to identify a diverse, representative sample of organizations of all sizes that were "pursuing pattern-breaking change"(Light, p. 153). While Light states that his study "hardly resolves the debate over definitions and assumptions which are central to the development of the field" of social entrepreneurship, he concludes that "social entrepreneurs and their investors must confront the long-standing belief that socially entrepreneurial activity simply cannot take place in existing organizations" (p. 214). This finding certainly supports this study's premise that

community colleges can develop socially entrepreneurial activity and partnerships in their constituent communities.

Over a four-year period, Critchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) evaluated 12 high impact non-profits and discuss the concomitant corporate partnerships that have moved these organizations beyond "checkbook philanthropy" into more strategic relationships (p. 65). By working together the non-profits and their corporate partners increase their collective social impact, expand their individual reach and resource bases, and learn from each other.

In summarizing the pragmatic social entrepreneurship literature (Brinckerhoff, 1996; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2001), Helm (2004) suggests that non-profits can diversify revenue streams and "buffer themselves from economic decline and be more prepared to take advantage of economic opportunities" (p. 9). Thus it seems reasonable for community colleges to consider social enterprise partnerships to help develop alternative revenue streams and demand driven programming; however, academic research, such as that pursued in this study, is clearly needed to further explore this nascent field of application.

<div align="center">Social Enterprise A Priori Themes</div>

The review of literature on social entrepreneurship and social enterprise revealed several a priori themes that have been applied to the analysis of data and findings in this research study on social enterprise partnerships at

community colleges. These critical organizing concepts are innovation, sustainability, collaboration and accountability.

The definition of innovation as it applies to entrepreneurial activity for this study is grounded in the work of Joseph Alois Schumpeter who envisioned the concept as a process of creative destruction whereby the entrepreneur is not an inventor but instead someone who continuously creates change from an existing pool of resources.(Schumpeter, 1934, 1942; Dees, 2001).

Sustainability, a critical concept for all social enterprise ventures, refers to the capacity to create lasting improvements, sustain operations, and provide services independent of charitable support (Dees, 2001; Dees, Emerson & Economy, 2001). In the case of community college programming, it also refers to the longevity of the program and its' relevance to the community and market that it serves.

Collaboration is a key component of social entrepreneurship and an essential element for successful social enterprise partnerships. Here the intersection of college and community is clearly illustrated in a mutually beneficial alliance that should demonstrate maximum benefit to all constituents, particularly the student. It is critical that all partners have a considerable stake in the outcome and sustainability of the program as well as clearly defined roles and responsibilities for delivering those outcomes (Kisker & Carducci, 2003).

Accountability to all partners and the constituents served is where the application of business practices and a socially focused mission intersect.

Accountability and responsibility must be transparent for and to all parties

involved in the program partnership (Dees, Emerson, & Economy, 2001).

Entrepreneurship and Community Colleges

The idea of applying entrepreneurial concepts to community colleges is

not entirely new--John R. Kotula and Henry J. Decker (1989) published a paper

nearly 20 years ago on Delaware Technical and Community College in

Wilmington, Delaware. The paper described the innovative practices that were

employed by the college to establish a self-sustaining program which, in 1987,

received more than $2.8 million in revenues by providing flexible, customized

services to business and industry. In the heyday of technology transfer, this

community college was able to establish a niche and serve a need in the

community. But one must ask what about today's economy? In 2008,

manufacturing and assembly production are ever shrinking parts of the U.S.

economy as profit maximizing multinational corporations continue to automate

and digitize local production or relocate manual processes overseas where labor

is less organized and more malleable to profit seeking entities ("Cheer Fades",

2008) .

Over the past 20 years, the primary emphasis in the entrepreneurship

literature as applied to community colleges commonly centers on leadership and

the operational aspects of the institution as is exemplified in *The Entrepreneurial

Community College* by John E. Roueche and Barbara R. Jones (2005). A review

of the research on "entrepreneurial" behavior at the community college level

provided examples of the various types of leaders, management styles and operational settings that are necessary for entrepreneurial activity to occur (Jones, 2005; Esters, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007; Langrell, 1990; Sygielski,1998; Williams,1997).

Jones (2005) examines the entrepreneurial role of a community college's senior leadership, the perceptions of faculty and administrators, and the opportunities and challenges associated with infusing entrepreneurship throughout the community college as an organization. Jones study of "East Coast Community College," a fictitious name, utilized a modified case study methodology. The case study institution was selected because it was "recognized as a leading college in the areas of entrepreneurial programming, activities and leadership" (Jones, p.79). The college's designation as entrepreneurial was long standing and self-determined, precipitating the "culture shift which encouraged risk taking and out-of-the-box thinking needed to reduce dependency on shrinking state resources" (Jones, p. 80). Jones interviewed six senior leaders, conducted focus groups with faculty and administered a survey that "focused solely on the specific activities and characteristics of the entrepreneurial leader" (p.80).

Jones' (2005) findings presuppose that an entrepreneurial culture driven by senior leadership must be present before activity can emerge. However, according to her interviews with senior leaders, strategic alliances, in the form of partnerships, associations and collaborations are critical to "create synergy and

promote outcomes greater than what each entity could achieve independently. Alliances lead to new ideas, and new ideas lead to the possibility of increased revenue" (Jones, p. 157). Further, the data found that

> The alliances that we form help to shape our innovations and help guide us in fulfilling our mission. . . . I would say that our partnerships drive revenue and resources . . . we very seriously take the recommendations of external entities, such as advisory boards, when we plan revenue and resource allocations" (Jones, p. 158).

While Jones' (2005) findings delineate a list of characteristics relevant to community college leaders and the organization itself, her conclusions imply that an entrepreneurial, innovative culture led by the president presupposes entrepreneurial activity. According to Jones, "any college which pursues entrepreneurship faces a certain level of risk "and "leaders must recognize that negative perceptions exist among some employees related to the pursuit of entrepreneurial activities within higher education" (p. 185). This further presupposes that it is the president who is solely responsible for seeking opportunities and building the strategic alliances that drive entrepreneurial partnerships. While culture is certainly a factor in encouraging entrepreneurial partnerships, clearly there is an opportunity to explore those activities that originate outside of the president's office and seek ways to encourage administrators, faculty and staff to identify opportunities for entrepreneurial alliance and collaboration.

Wiers' (2007) qualitative case study of an entrepreneurial partnership at Guilford Community College examined the Larry Gatlin School of Entertainment

Technology (LGSET). In an effort to develop a framework for the execution of sustainable community college partnerships, Wiers (2007) interviewed a total of 23 individuals that were involved in the creation, maintenance, or participation in the LGSET's entrepreneurial program partnership and observed students and advisory board activity over a 4-month period. In explaining the significance for the study, Wiers discusses the need for colleges to forge partnerships as a tool to accommodate greater enrollment demands and decreasing funding.

While identifying the characteristics of successful community college partnerships, Wiers (2007) discusses the importance of congruity with the mission and goals of the college and the external alliances that are forged. All parties involved in collaborative community college partnerships must share a common mission with equitable authority and accountability to be effective. In addition, the alliance must be mutually beneficial to ensure commitment from all parties to the program's goals. Wiers' stated goal was to study the impact of community college partnerships on the external community and the college itself and examine the establishment and delivery of innovative programs generated by the formation of such partnerships. Although her findings point to the critical importance, once again, of the college president in initiating, establishing, and maintaining the partnership that made the program a reality, Wiers does conclude that "innumerable partnerships have been formed during all stages of development. . . . new relationships and new ideas have been generated and acted upon by various individuals at the college"(p. 155). Wiers credits the

"tacticians," meaning the school and program administrators under the president, for developing the program's core and creating the form that sustains it. Much like Jones (2005), Wiers points to the president's strategic vision for the program and sees his transformational leadership as the key to its success along with the help of "carefully selected team members" (p.154).

Wiers (2007) concludes that The Larry Gatlin School of Entertainment Technology is "meeting the fundamental mission of the community college . . . . with open access as a core value, students of all backgrounds and capabilities can pursue their desires of employment in the entertainment industry (p. 155). Further, the program is serving the college's mission by "meeting community and industry needs through the education of students and partnerships that bring together individuals from academia and industry" (Wiers, p.156). Yet, how the program's success is measured or sustained is unclear and presents an opportunity for further research.

In her study entitled *Exploring the Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Community Colleges*, Dingfelder (2007) looks at entrepreneurship and innovation at three Upper Midwest community colleges and examines the characteristics of an entrepreneurial community college and its' culture. Using a qualitative "mixed methodology" of 34 semi-structured interviews, informal conversations, document analysis, and campus and community observations, Dingfelder explored perceptions of community college personnel, board members and community partners regarding the development and sustainability of an entrepreneurial

community college culture. Perhaps most pertinent to this study is her exploration

of the impact that entrepreneurship has on the mission of community colleges.

Dingfelder (2007) generally defines the community college mission as

twofold: first, to "provide opportunities through open access. . . . regardless of

academic record or ability" and second "to serve their communities through

outreach and service that fosters economic development and vitality" (p. 6). Her

definitions of entrepreneurship and innovation relative to community colleges are

equally relevant. Entrepreneurship is defined as "attitudes and activities within

the college community that are intended to increase resources and generate

revenue to the institution and its departmental units" (Dingfelder, p.6). Innovation,

a critical concept in Dingfelder's work, is described as "change, invention,

creative behavior and adaptation in an organizational setting influenced by

individuals and environmental factors" (p. 6). While this researcher takes

exception to the characterization of innovation as necessitating invention which is

contrary to the Say/Schumpeter concept, Dingfelder's definitions have utility in a

community college context and for the purposes of this study.

Several key findings in Dingfelder's (2007) study reveal a common thread

among successful entrepreneurial community colleges in the areas of program

development and alternative revenue streams. First, at all three case study

institutions, the college maintained higher education partnerships, and the

leadership team, along with many faculty and staff, had experience outside of

education which contributed to their ability to innovate and think outside-of-the-

box. In addition, all three colleges maintain strong collaborative relationships with key industry partners to provide funds, equipment, instructor training, student internships, and student jobs. The colleges rely significantly on their institutional foundations for support including student scholarships and capital contributions. Finally, a culture of responsible risk taking, innovation and continuous improvement is instilled at each college where the faculty maintains strong external connections with business and industry.

It should be noted that another significant emphasis in the literature focuses on entrepreneurship as a field of study for community college students and the development of entrepreneurial skills training and entrepreneurship education as a program in business for community colleges (Smith, 2007; Fox, 2005; Hagan, 2004; James, 2002; Drury, 1999.). While this is important to community college program development and service provision for an increasing number of small business owners and students seeking self-employment, it is not the focus of this research and therefore was not explored in depth.

<div align="center">Social Enterprise and Community Colleges</div>

Dees (2001, 2003) developed the seed for the expanded concept of social entrepreneurship that serves as the impetus for this study. Specifically, Dees' (2001) notion of what constitutes legitimate social entrepreneurship or social enterprise served as the context for addressing the study's driving questions. The adapted view that guides the analysis in this study includes the following key concepts that Dees (2001) considered in his "idealized" definition:

Social entrepreneurs act as change agents in the social sector by:

1. Adopting a mission to create and sustain social value (not just private value),

2. Recognizing and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission,

3. Engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning,

4. Acting boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand,

5. Exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created. (p. 4)

Although many scholar-practitioners believe that Brinckerhoff's (2000) idea of serving the social good while sustaining operations through business practices and earned income strategies is at the crux of conventional social entrepreneurship models for mission-based organizations, Dees (2003) has stressed the concept of impact, not income, as a primary tenet of the social enterprise model. Across the country and around the globe, social entrepreneurship ventures and social enterprise programs are increasingly used to address critical social issues including homelessness, hunger, and lack of affordable healthcare and housing, particularly in developing countries where traditional institutional structure does not exist or is poorly developed (Nicholls, 2006). In nonprofit higher educational institutions, the model could be further expanded to address many critical social issues that directly impact the

populations that community colleges serve including the elimination of academic enrichment programs in public schools, globalization of jobs, aging workforces, a steady influx of non-English speaking immigrant workers and the concomitant need for skills based job training and economic development in constituent communities.

Collaborative knowledge development and applied learning presuppose the cooperative work of a wide variety of experts with differing points of view. Based on the literature, it seem reasonable to conclude that a critical component of this social enterprise paradigm is the active, deliberate engagement of community college administrators, along with faculty and staff, in reaching out to representatives from student groups, local government, community organizations, small businesses, social service providers, economic development offices, professional associations, public school systems, religious organizations and the corporate sector to assist in the identification of relevant issues and in the development of applied, demand driven solutions in the form of mutually beneficial partnerships.

The development of cutting edge, high tech programs that provide sustainable employment in cooperation with business and industry will be critical in helping community colleges remain relevant and necessary in the growing arena of non-profit and for-profit career education providers (Kisker & Carducci, 2003).

Concurring with Drury (2001), it is clear that in order to succeed in the higher education arena of the future, community colleges will have to adopt the market-driven mindset of many privately held educational providers. Farnsworth, (2006), a former president of Crowder College, a community college in Missouri, writes about the four lessons that community colleges can learn from for-profit institutions. Amazed and frustrated with the unbridled enrollment success of proprietary school's technical programs, Farnsworth was puzzled by the willingness of students to pay 10 times the cost of an equivalent program at a community college. What he realized after leaving his presidency came following a China conference highlighting the best proprietary colleges around the globe. Farnsworth notes that outstanding proprietary colleges view employers, not students, as their primary "clients" (para. 5). Exemplary colleges "design programs, develop curricula and shape student thinking" with the employer in mind (Farnsworth, para. 5). According to Farnsworth, students are the beneficiaries of the relationships that these proprietary colleges build with employers who often reward the symbiosis with guaranteed jobs for graduates. Students are encouraged to exhibit greater professionalism in their dress and behavior and must adhere to established competency standards. In short, these exemplary colleges apply best business practices to the mission of higher education.

All community college leaders, not only the president, will need to think and act more like entrepreneurs than educational administrators, adopting a

mindset that includes being innovative, creative, taking calculated risks, and providing visionary guidance that embraces collaboration and partnership. The success of community colleges in workforce and economic development will depend on the extent to which these institutions adopt the demand-driven, entrepreneurial approach in order to compete with other private and public institutions of higher education. By forging mutually beneficial partnerships with economic development offices, social service organizations, professional associations, and private business, community colleges can leverage their public resources and provide more relevant, cost-effective training and educational services to their resident communities. This is, as Brinckerhoff (2000) states, simply good stewardship of public resources which in turn will provide an education that is truly in the best interest of the student and the constituent community that is being served.

Summary

This study fills a void in the literature by addressing, from the perspective of the scholar-practitioner, the utilization of business practices developed for large nonprofit social purpose entities to create earned income strategies and increase sustainable revenue streams. This research extends the original concept of social entrepreneurship to its application within an entirely new sector, public higher education and specifically community colleges, by expanding the definition under the social enterprise paradigm posited by J. Gregory Dees. The a priori themes of innovation, sustainability, collaboration and accountability

drawn from the social entrepreneurship and social enterprise literature provide

the framework through which this research will be analyzed.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Federal and state funding for public education has been declining steadily, particularly in the past decade, and the future forecast for public education funding is grim (Kelderman, 2008; Zumeta, 2003). In order to avoid raising tuition and fees which is an increasingly common practice but one which is prohibited in some states, community colleges are being forced to become more entrepreneurial in the ways they develop programs and revenue streams while servicing an increasingly diverse group of student and community constituents. Although the need is clear, there is a paucity of research on the ways and means of developing "alternative" revenue streams, particularly in the form of partnerships that are mutually beneficial, demand driven, and sustainable.

The purpose of this study is to explore social enterprise as a conceptual framework for developing alternative revenue streams and innovative, demand driven programming for community colleges.

The study was guided by two questions:

1. How can social enterprise concepts be applied to the community college mission?

2. How can community colleges enhance revenue streams and develop innovative, market driven programming by employing social enterprise concepts?

This chapter presents the design, methodology, data collection and data analysis components of the research and the criteria for rigor to which this study was held. The research methods originally developed by social science researchers to explore social and cultural phenomena, being highly exploratory in nature, were utilized in this study as it is as much an examination of social and cultural phenomena as it is a demonstration of applied concepts. The process of conducting research is highly inferential in nature and done systematically so as not to cause errors in omission or clarity. A delimitation process was employed in choosing the community college selected for this case study research. Applied research problems, such as those that affect contemporary community colleges, cannot be contextualized nor interpreted without the benefit of considerable interaction between the researcher and the research participants. Interaction and iteration were both critical components of this research design and vitally important to the development of the rich, thick data needed for the final analysis.

Study Design and Rationale

This study uses a qualitative case study research design to identify factors germane to the genesis and successful operation of innovative programs and partnerships that entrepreneurial community colleges forge. Social enterprise concepts, while typically applied to non-profit organizations as a means of expanding funding and service provision, have not been used in public higher education, although clearly these institutions are non-profit and certainly ripe for new and innovative ideas. Although the practice of social entrepreneurship in the

non-profit business arena is ubiquitous and mature, as a distinct field of

academic inquiry, it is still considered in its infancy (Anderson & Dees, 2006).

Because little is known about the application of social enterprise concepts

outside of the non-profit business context, a qualitative methodology provides an

excellent mechanism for this exploratory study. As explained by Merriam and

Simpson (2000), qualitative research is particularly useful where there is little

knowledge about a problem, or there is a lack of theory.

Qualitative research utilizes an interpretive paradigm as the lens through

which data, collected from and about human subjects, is evaluated (Willis, 2007).

In fact, Bogden and Biklen (2007) argue, "All qualitative research is interpretive"

(p. 273). Exploration requires interaction and cannot be accomplished without

significant engagement between the researcher and participants where

participants provide data and the researcher interprets meaning relevant to the

research question. Willis (2007) contends that "interpretivists favor qualitative

methods such as case studies, interviews and observation because those

methods are better ways of getting at how humans interpret the world around

them" (p. 6). The concepts of partnership and collaboration, key to this research,

are uniquely human activities that can be thoroughly investigated by using an

interpretive paradigm.

A case study is an intensive description and analysis of a particular

phenomenon or entity that seeks to identify significant factors that are

characteristic of that phenomenon (Merriam & Simpson, 2000). Given the paucity

of information that exists on the application of social enterprise concepts in academic settings, for this framework to be useful to community colleges, research must illustrate the applicability of social enterprise concepts. Stake (2005) describes two primary types of case studies, intrinsic and instrumental. Intrinsic case studies are conducted because the researcher is interested in learning something more specifically about the case itself; for example, a particular child, clinic, or classroom. The study is undertaken because the researcher has an intrinsic interest in the particular issue, individual or institution being investigated. On the other hand, an instrumental case study is a particular case that is examined to provide insight into an issue or facilitates a particular understanding of something other than the case itself. In other words, it illustrates a phenomenon that allows the researcher to demonstrate a generalization from its use.

Under the umbrella of the community college as a case study, this research investigates the college's program partnership as a vehicle for examining the phenomena of social enterprise concepts in a community college setting as an explicatory tool; therefore, this research uses an instrumental case study. As a bounded, integrated system, the goal of case study research is to develop a holistic portrayal of the phenomenon under investigation (Stake, 1995). The exploratory nature of case study allows the researcher to identify patterns as these emerge and pursue opportunities for in-depth examination of a phenomenon to occur as it unfolds.

Merriam (1988) describes a case study as "an examination of specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group" (p. 9). Case studies are particularistic and naturalistic and focus on specific contexts with data that is collected in representative environments with real people in real situations (Willis, 2007). In simple terms, they are particularly useful in studies that seek to uncover observable patterns in institutions and organizations. This study examines community college partnerships as a vehicle for demonstrating the application of social enterprise concepts in a public higher education setting.

Case studies rely on inductive reasoning that produces findings from an examination of the data itself, rather than the testing of a hypothesis. Patterns evolve from a thick descriptive data set that can be derived from a variety of sources. Finally, case studies are heuristic in that they "illuminate the reader's understanding of the phenomenon under study . . . they can bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader's experience, or confirm what is known" (Merriam, as cited in Willis, 2007, p.239). This research aimed to specifically illustrate how social enterprise concepts can be applied in a community college setting and to assist administrators, faculty, and potential program partners in the transfer of these concepts to their own colleges and organizations.

Data Collection

Sample Selection

The process of conducting a case study involves several steps, the first of which is the selection of the case(s) to be analyzed. The selection is done purposefully, not randomly so that an entity, such as a college, is selected "because it exhibits characteristics that are of interest to the researcher" (Merriam & Simpson, 2000, p. 110). Given the purpose of this research, the existence of innovative academic partnerships was a key determinant in the final selection of a case study community college. Moreover, it was critical that the partnerships exhibit a collective and cooperative sense of purpose, responsibility, and accountability in order to "qualify" as "social enterprise" partnerships.

Early in the research process, the researcher began identifying viable prospective participant institutions through personal contacts and professional referrals, informally searching for those institutions known to be innovative in their program development. The final case study community college was selected from a subset of community college member institutions of the American Association of Community Colleges. Innovation in academic programs and partnerships can vary widely so the sample was purposefully drawn from institutions that were known to have innovative programs and partnerships by either reputation or referral from the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) office of the Higher Learning Commission, North Central Association. Sustainability is a key component of social enterprise partnerships; therefore,

colleges in the sample also demonstrated partnership programs that included revenue sources outside of traditional "soft money" along with significant community commitment and resources.

Merriam (1998) states that to begin purposeful sampling, you must "first determine what selection criteria are essential in choosing the people or sites to be studied" (p. 61). The researcher conducted preliminary screenings by telephone to determine eligibility based on the criteria of innovation, sustainability, community collaboration, and accountability. Due to issues of researcher accessibility and time constraints, the final sample was limited to those institutions located in either the Midwest or Southeast regions of the United States. Every effort was made to include rural/suburban and urban institutions in the sample so as to avoid a geographic bias in the data and support transferability.

Prior to the final selection of the case study institution, the researcher spoke with several colleagues and associates from community colleges, along with association and accreditation personnel, to narrow the prospect list and identify potential candidates for consideration as the case study institution. These conversations, both formal and informal, began early in 2007 and culminated in the fall of 2007 during a chance meeting with a former colleague from the advertising business that was in Chicago visiting family. During this meeting, the researcher discussed current professional pursuits with the colleague over Thai food and discovered that he was employed at a progressive community college

in South Florida. The researcher was actively reviewing several community colleges in Florida but had not yet examined this institution. Following this meeting, the researcher investigated the college more thoroughly as a potential participant. Subsequent conversations with the former colleague yielded an introduction to the key informant/gatekeeper and the serendipitous discovery of several innovative partnership programs at the college that met all of the sampling criteria of innovation, sustainability, community collaboration and accountability. Collectively, the concomitant issues of accessibility and fit with the study sampling criteria assisted in the final selection of the community college as the case study institution.

Case Study Selection

In March 2008, the researcher arranged to meet with the Dean/ program developer at the college in South Florida in person to discuss the study details, determine the partnership's relevance for the study's purpose and assess interest in participating as a case study institution. During this trip the researcher also visited another community college in Central Florida that was under consideration for final case study selection to tour the facility and determine relevancy for the research.

After several hours of conversation and a tour of the facility in South Florida, it was clear that the college and the partnership met all of the study sampling criteria. Following a brief discussion about some logistical issues, the Dean agreed that the institution would participate in the research. Several weeks

of telephone conversations and emails followed and in May 2008, the researcher

received notification that the college's Vice President of Academic Affairs had

granted permission to proceed with the study.

<div align="center">Participant Selection and Interview Process</div>

The Dean identified several potential participants at the case study

community college who were critically involved in the development and

maintenance of the program under investigation. Moreover, a list of the full

Program Advisory Board was sent to the researcher to aid in the selection and

interview process.

The researcher began calling and emailing potential participants to set up

face-to-face interviews in June 2008. The Dean facilitated the process as a key

informant and was fully utilized as a gatekeeper whenever possible to ensure

access to the most critical and relevant potential study participants. Once

candidates were identified, the researcher made initial contact through email or

by telephone to assess the potential participant's interest in the study. When it

was determined that the participant was interested, interview dates and times

were scheduled and a description outlining the study along with the informed

consent forms were sent by email. Participants were sent a copy of the interview

questions (Appendix C) a week prior to the scheduled interview date.

 By mid June all interviews were scheduled and the researcher made the

trip to South Florida during the week of July 21, 2008 where a total of seven in-

person interviews were conducted over a two day period at the college and on-

site at partner organization offices. Subsequent interviews were conducted by telephone with key college and partner organization personnel that were identified as relevant during the interviews conducted in South Florida. The researcher interviewed three community college administrators and staff who are directly involved with the program. During this trip, two key members of the partner organization and two members of the South Florida marine industry who were involved in the program's development were also interviewed. Subsequent to this trip, additional interviews were conducted by telephone with key college administrative personnel that were involved in program approval or in generating "new" revenue streams for the college.

All individual interviews with staff and administrators at the community college, and associated partner/industry organizations were conducted solely by the researcher to ensure continuity and reliability in the data. Gender was not a selection criterion; all participants were adults over the age of 21. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed professionally. Subsequent to receiving the transcriptions of the recorded interviews from the professional transcriptionist, the researcher conducted a thorough quality check of all written transcriptions against the original tape recordings to ensure that salient details of the data were retained and correctly transcribed.

Data Collection Methods

Merriam (1998) states that "interviewing in qualitative investigations is more open-ended and less structured" (p. 74). This less structured format allows

information to flow naturally from the individual participant and enables the researcher to capture data embedded in the unique ways that each participant may respond by using flexible wording and a mix of structured questions and adaptable probes (Creswell, 2007). Semi-structured interviews were conducted with the use of an interview guide comprised of open ended questions that focused on the genesis and characteristics of the program partnership (Appendix C). Bogdan and Bilken (2007) concur that interviews are used "to gather descriptive data in the subjects' own words so that the researcher can develop insights relevant to the research purpose" (p. 103). When employed in conjunction with other techniques such as field notes and document analysis, interviews are considered the dominant strategy for qualitative data collection (Bogdan & Bilken, 2007). The on-site, face-to-face interviews lasted from 1 to 2 hours and were digitally recorded. Follow-up interviews lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes and were conducted by telephone as additional questions subsequently arose. Telephone interviews with key college administrative personnel lasted 45 minutes to an hour.

When employed along with the primary data collection technique of interviewing, field notes are considered an integral part of both data collection and preliminary data analysis (Creswell, 2007). The researcher kept a record of descriptive and reflective observations, thoughts and ideas encountered in the field throughout the study. During and subsequent to each interview conducted, and each visit to the community college, the researcher recorded observations

and ideas in a notebook carefully noting the date, time and setting of each occurrence. In addition, the researcher regularly used "memoing" to capture those "aha" moments that arose during the course of the research. These reflective ideas were incorporated into the field notes where appropriate to add clarity and depth to the thickness and richness of the data set and final analysis (Bogdan & Bilken, 2007)

Secondary data in the form of documents and websites from participating colleges and partner organizations also were incorporated into the data set. In addition, data from federal, state and private sources, such as South Florida's Workforce One, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP), the American Association of Community Colleges, and the American Boat and Yacht Council were evaluated to give direction and add depth to the data set, and insight to the analysis and interpretation of findings.

Data were triangulated with the researcher's field notes, interview notes and institutional documents to add credibility and dependability to the findings. Member checks were conducted by asking participants to review the transcriptions for accuracy and to provide additional comments.

<div align="center">The Researcher</div>

Merriam and Simpson (2000) state that 'in all forms of qualitative research, the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis" (p. 98). This role carries with it a responsibility to identify those biases

and shortcomings that may impact the study while pointing out that the researchers' interest and enthusiasm for the subject under study is critical to their examination and analysis of the problem.

Eclectic training and experience as an entrepreneur, a business consultant, a non-profit volunteer and board member, a community college and university faculty member, a for-profit college campus executive, and as an academic professional have shaped this researcher's interest and enthusiasm for finding ways to deliver innovative, collaborative community college programs that are both sustainable and student centered. This researcher is interested in discovering innovative approaches for helping faculty and administrators carry out their duties as responsible stewards of public (and private) resources. The study is directly tied to the researcher's desire for teaching and empowering non-profit higher education institutions and specifically community colleges to learn how to fish for themselves in an environment of larger and larger fish (for-profits) and smaller and smaller ponds (public/ grant funding).

<div align="center">Ethical Consideration</div>

Prior to the commencement of data collection, the researcher received approval for the study from the Institutional Research Review Board (IRRB) of National-Louis University. Once a participant agreed to take part in the research, a formal letter outlining the study and the informed consent form was sent by email. During the scheduled interview times, prior to beginning the formal

interview, participants were asked to sign an informed consent form (Appendix A) in person, and the researcher retained one copy.

There were no anticipated risks for the study participants greater than that encountered in daily life. Confidentiality of the individual study participants was maintained at all times. The professional transcriber was required to sign a confidentiality agreement (Appendix B) and destroyed all transcription files ninety days after they were delivered to the researcher. All data including documents, field observation notes, digital files, transcriptions, and discs will be securely stored.

<div align="center">Data Analysis Procedures</div>

As an academic professional, entrepreneur, and community volunteer, the researcher's unique experiences along with the conceptual framework of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, guided the analysis of data in this study. The social enterprise a priori themes of innovation, sustainability, and collaboration, in conjunction with the structures imposed by the interview questions, were used to first group data to address the study's driving questions. Seidel (1998) uses the analogy of solving a jigsaw puzzle in describing the process of qualitative data analysis. As the primary instrument for data collection and analysis, this researcher reviewed interview transcripts, field observation notes, along with institutional, policy and program documents, to piece together the puzzle and analyze the array of data that was collected.

The process of data analysis is highly iterative and actually begins while data is being gathered (Bogdan & Bilkin, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman,1994). Bogdan and Bilken (2007) define memos as "the reflective writing that qualitative researchers do while collecting data that become the starting point for analysis and interpretation" (p. 273). Memoing was employed on a continuous basis throughout data collection as concepts and ideas for organizing themes emerged. Thoughts and ideas were recorded in the researcher's field notes in the form of reflective remarks. Subsequent to data collection, transcripts were read and re-read line for line and as organizing concepts emerged, researcher notes were initially annotated in the margins of the transcriptions as a preliminary method of coding data into large themes. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that reflective remarks in raw field notes and marginal remarks used in the initial coding "add meaning and clarity to field notes" and the coding process (p. 67). Each participant was assigned a code and grouped by affiliation with the college, the professional association, or the employer/ community. Data returned from member checks was evaluated and coded accordingly. The researcher classified, grouped, and analyzed the data to identify patterns and themes utilizing an interpretive framework and the selected a priori concepts of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship.

All final transcripts were reprinted with wide margins to accommodate remarks and coding in the margins. Data were then organized and coded into a priori themes in a code book utilizing content analysis to identify those words and

phrases that were repeated and cross referenced by multiple respondents interviewed. All data were captured whether classified by a priori or found to be an emerging theme. Constant comparison was employed in the data set to identify consistent themes and arrive at supported findings and conclusions. Coded data were further reduced and categorized into substantive subcategories to be used for displaying the final analysis and conclusions (Merriam, 1998).

<div align="center">Credibility, Dependability, and Transferability</div>

Merriam and Simpson (2000) note that because the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis "interpretations are accessed directly through observations and interviews" (p. 101). Merriam and Simpson (2000) suggest that to add credibility and dependability to the findings and get as close to simulating reality as possible, qualitative researchers can use a variety of strategies, three of which were employed in this study: (a) triangulation of multiple sources of data, (b) member checks with study participants to determine if data and tentative findings "ring true," and (c) engagement and submersion in the research situation over a period of time to ensure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon (p. 102). Memoing, as a tool for strengthening dependability of the research, was employed throughout data collection and data analysis to help record those "aha" moments that relate salient details to the findings and conclusions elicited from careful analysis (Bogdan & Bilken, 2007).

As this study is intended to be applied research, it is critical that the findings are trustworthy and that the reader feels confident that the data and the

conclusions derived are transferable. Transferability, referred to as "reader or user generalizability" by Merriam (1998), involves leaving the extent to which research findings apply to other settings or situations to the individuals in those situations (p. 211). In this study, providing rich, thick descriptions of the case and phenomenon of inquiry facilitates transferability. Qualitative research seeks to determine "whether the results are consistent with the data collected" as there can be numerous interpretations of the data (Merriam & Simpson, 2000, p. 102). While the researchers' lens cannot be obscured from the data collection and analysis, the intent is to form logical conclusions through careful analysis and transparent reporting of the process.

Limitations

While qualitative case study research is a reliable method of data collection for exploratory research, some limitations may remain with the natural variability that emerges when the researcher is the instrument and human subjects are participants. Data collection is limited to a single case and cannot be generalized; however, the reader may determine what is transferable to their particular circumstances.

Summary

Qualitative research is particularly useful where there is little knowledge about a problem or a lack of theory (Merriam & Simpson, 2000). Given the exploratory nature of qualitative case study research and the highly exploratory nature of this study in particular, it is clear from the findings that the phenomenon

of the inquiry, social enterprise concepts and their relevance to community

college programming and alternative revenue streams, was well served by this

methodological approach.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter describes the setting for the case study institution, Broward Community College, and presents the findings that were derived from analysis of data gathered through interviews, observations, and review of documents. Broward Community College, now known as Broward College, serves approximately 60,000 students at three campuses located in southeastern Florida. The college houses the Marine Engineering Management Program that is the focus of this research. The program was designed to address a particular community need for a skilled, literate workforce in the tri-county area's (Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach) significant recreational boating industry.

The Marine Engineering Management Program embodies the concepts that are the phenomena of interest in this research study, as the program was developed thoughtfully and organically through the diligent and dedicated work of a social enterprise partnership. The partnership was led by the Broward College Dean and the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF), the leading marine industry trade association. It also included representatives from the Broward College Foundation, WorkForce One- Broward, and other marine related media, businesses and employers from the area. The research examined the genesis of the partnership along with the development and ongoing maintenance of the program which became operational in 2008 and is scheduled to graduate its' first class in 2010.

The chapter begins with a synopsis of the socioeconomic environment of the state and region in which the community college is situated. This is followed by a general description of the case study institution along with a narrative account of the program and the marine industry partnership that is the heart of this study. Also included in this section is an overview of the external environment germane to the marine industry in Southeast Florida. The remainder of the chapter presents findings that emerged as themes from the analysis of the data, in the context of a priori concepts derived from the literature review. These emergent themes include collaboration, accountability, sustainability, innovation and impact.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

Current Florida Economic Profile

In the state of Florida and across many regions of the United States, the growing inventory of unsold houses, combined with the burgeoning credit crisis and declining consumer confidence are projected to extend the current recession well into 2009. Like many of the regions that have been hit hardest by the foreclosure crisis, the state of Florida has seen some economic hardship over the past 18 months. The Florida Research and Economic Database (FRED) website reports that the unemployment rate in the state of Florida hit 7% in October 2008. In addition, FRED reports that personal income growth, anticipated to be 5.6% for Fiscal Year 2008-09 was reported at only 3.9%. The state has lost 157,200 jobs (1.9%) since October 2007. The housing crisis and its' concomitant erosion

of the tax base has precipitated significant decreases in state revenues which have in turn affected state appropriations for many critical services throughout the state; community college appropriations have been cut by more than 8%.

Economic Profile for the Community Area

In a report published by the Broward County Planning Services Division entitled, *The State of the Broward Economy Fall 2008,* data from the Florida Association of Realtors® and University of Florida Real Estate Research Center, shows that for August 2008 the number of existing single-family homes sold rose more than 12% from August 2007. However, this data also illustrates that for the first eight months of 2008, the number of single-family homes sold was 4,002, which was down from 4,482 for the first eight months of 2007. Moreover, these numbers are significantly down from the 10,150 single-family homes sold during the first eight months of 2004. The August 2008 median price for a single-family house in Broward County is $269,800, which is down nearly 27% from the August 2007 median price of $368,800 (*The State of the Broward Economy*, 2008).

The foreclosure crisis that has hit the nation is not unique to the Broward County housing market; however, foreclosures in Broward County outpace the national and state figures. According to RealtyTrac®, in August 2008, 1 in 416 U.S. households received foreclosure filings as compared to 1 in 194 households in Florida, and 1 in 112 households in Broward County.

Consistent with the record unemployment numbers for the state, new unemployment claims in the County for the first eight months of 2008 totaled 52,161. *The State of the Broward Economy* (2008) states that

> the 2008 pace [of unemployment claims filed for the state] suggests that claims for the full year 2008 may exceed the 67,484 recorded in 1991, a recession year, and the 66,847 recorded in 2005 when November claims surged temporarily to 19,363 in the aftermath of Hurricane Wilma. (p. 4)

Moreover, the unemployment rate in Broward County increased significantly from 3.9% in August 2007 to 6.1% in August 2008. According to *The State of the Broward Economy* (2008), the August 2008 figure is the highest in more than six years and compares to the 6.3% recorded in January 2002. Further exacerbating the situation, very few new jobs were created, inflation rose due to increases in food and energy costs, and erosion in consumer confidence was evident. This confluence of factors precipitated by the economic downturn caused a decrease of 4.3% in taxable sales in Broward County, which, in turn, had a negative effect on projected State revenue.

The State of the Broward Economy (2008) report found that although the weak economy and high fuel costs are affecting tourism, "international tourism has increased due in part to a weak dollar and new air service into the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport from Latin America "(p.8). However, challenges to tourism for the region will continue to be expanded by the economic slowdown in the U.S. and abroad, erratic fuel costs, and rising unemployment.

Funding Implications for Public Higher Education in Florida

The state budget signed by Governor Charlie Crist in 2008 was nearly $6 billion less than the budget signed in 2007. One reason was a steep decline in tax receipts from Florida's boom-to-bust real estate market. In addition, shortfalls in revenue from the state's 6% sales tax precipitated by the high unemployment and erosion of consumer confidence contributed to the budget crisis. Nearly $150 million was cut from the state's budget for universities and community colleges, representing a 6% decrease in funding. Governor Crist has warned that another 4% may be cut from this year's budget for higher education (Kelderman, 2009). Unlike most community colleges, Florida community colleges are funded entirely by the state and receive no local appropriations. In response to the anticipated state budget cuts and in order to meet current operating needs, Broward College is scheduled to increase tuition for 2008-2009 by 6% and fees by 2.5% with more fee increases anticipated in the future (Broward College Dean, personal communication, January 8, 2009) .

Broward College Profile

Broward College (BC) is a large, urban multi-campus institution located in southeastern Florida serving approximately 60,000 credit and non-credit students annually. Formerly called Broward Community College, the College was founded in 1959 as the first public higher education institution in Broward County. In May 2008, Governor Charlie Crist signed a bill changing the Broward Community College name to Broward College reflecting the college's role, beginning in

January 2009, as a site specific, baccalaureate degree granting institution in

Education. This offering is part of a larger statewide initiative to provide specific

bachelor's degrees through selected community colleges. As the principal

provider of undergraduate higher education for Broward County residents, the

College is committed to responding to the community's cultural diversity. Broward

College offers extensive international and intercultural educational experiences to

help students develop multicultural and global perspectives.

With a wide variety of degree, as well as certificate programs and

continuing education courses, the College attracts a diversity of students each

semester, including 8000 students born in other countries around the world. With

the exception of the new Bachelor's degree in Education, the College primarily

serves individuals seeking associate's degrees, contemporary job skills, and

education for personal enrichment. Broward College is also a nucleus for

community development, business and industry, and an avenue for continued

skill upgrading and retraining. (This description is a synthesis of data from the BC

Web site and a profile on the Insidehighered.com Web site.) The mission of

Broward College (BC) is:

> To provide high quality educational programs and services that are
> affordable and accessible to a diverse community of learners.
> Supported by the Board of Trustees and the community, a
> dedicated faculty and staff fulfill this mission through their
> commitment to student achievement, lifelong learning, academic
> excellence and the use of current technology.
> (http://www.broward.edu/view/mission.jsp)

The Marine Engineering Management Program at Broward College

The Marine Engineering Management Program was built on the successful framework of Broward College's Automotive Technology Program that is housed at the South campus. According to the program description on Broward College's website, the mission of the BC Marine Engineering Management Associate in Science degree is to:

- Transform you (the student) into a highly trained Marine Technician
- Prepare you for a lifelong career in the Marine Industry
- Teach you the diagnostic, technical and computerized skills it takes to service the latest high-tech Yacht systems
- Provide you with the superior academic background required for pursuing highly paid management positions. (http://www.broward.edu/marine/mission-statement.html)

The course listings, sequencing and hours for the two year program, extracted from the Program Sheet in the Broward College catalog, can be found in Appendix D.

The program only offers an associate's degree (no certificates) and operates with the assistance of an active program Advisory Board which meets regularly. The Board contributes to a variety of resources including technical and fundraising assistance, industry contacts, equipment donations, internship sites and curriculum development. Each of the primary program partners are represented on the Advisory Board and actively participate in the program's ongoing development and maintenance.

The Program Partnership

The partnership that now supports the Marine Engineering Management Program at Broward College is the culmination of a process that was developed over about a two year period. The Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) and Broward College (BC) have worked together in developing and maintaining the program. This collaboration is a continuous process cultivated through monthly Advisory Board meetings and attendance by Advisory Board members at marine industry and college-sponsored events. Along with the BC Foundation, MIASF and Broward College have collectively and collaboratively written the Community Block Job Training Grant (CBJTG) and the program curriculum, developed the Advisory Board, identified and hired qualified faculty, promoted the program to the industry and the media, raised private donations of equipment, supplies and cash, and created additional opportunities through the American Boat and Yacht Council (ABYC) and other concomitant marine organizations.

At their core, partnerships are comprised of people, not organizations. The commitment and vision of the people who are involved in the partnership that is analyzed in this study have clearly focused on a common mission driven goal for all the constituent organizations represented.

Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF)

The Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) is a not-for-profit trade association and one of the nation's largest marine organizations with

over 800 members primarily from Broward, Miami-Dade, and Palm Beach

counties. The organization was created in 1967, and works today to represent,

promote, and protect the sound growth of the recreational marine industry in

South Florida for the benefit and education of its members, the community and

the environment (http://www.miasf.org/index.htm).

Broward College Foundation

The college's foundation acted as both a catalyst and contributor to the

program partnership. The foundation is a separately incorporated 501 (c) (3)

organization and the officially designated means of making private contributions

to the college. According to the Foundation's website, The Broward College

Foundation awards more than $2 million in scholarships annually to BC students,

and supports academic programs and awards for outstanding faculty. The

BC Foundation provides educational support to more than 50% of the student

population who would not otherwise have been able to attend college.

While the State of Florida provides 62% of Broward College's funding, the

balance must be made up through other sources. The mission of the Broward

College Foundation is:

> To support the college by providing advocacy, community
> awareness, and financial support to the college, its students,
> faculty, and staff. Led by its Board of Directors, the Foundation
> raises funds, conducts programs and practices stewardship that
> increases the effectiveness of the college in meeting community,
> student, faculty, and staff needs.
> (http://www.broward.edu/foundation/foundation/about/mission/page
> 10450.html).

The BC Foundation further states that like most missions, success is not achieved in a single moment, but with a sustained effort, careful planning and passionate commitment. In making that effort, the foundation focuses on several objectives, two of which are particularly pertinent to the Marine Engineering Management Program:

- Raise funds for scholarships that increase access to a college education for full and part-time, deserving and qualified students.
- Raise funds to fortify a range of academic programs that improve the educational experience of students and provide cultural opportunities for the community.
  (http://www.broward.edu/foundation/foundation/about/mission/page10450.html)

South Florida Marine Industry

Recreational boating is a major industry for the state of Florida and for South Florida in particular. Florida has the highest number of registered recreational watercraft in the United States (988,652); one registered recreational boat per every 20 Floridians. Florida is also a major recreational boating destination for non-state residents, with an estimated 350,000 non-registered boats actively using Florida's waters in 2006 (OPPAGA, 2007). Recreational boating and its associated marine industry sectors, such as manufacturing, sales, dockage facilities and marinas, and repair businesses generate a significant amount of economic activity in the state and in the Tri-county South Florida region including Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties. For fiscal year

2005, gross retail sales of boat and motor products totaled $5.9 billion statewide; the Tri-county area represented 46%, or $2.71 billion (*Economic Impact of the Recreational Marine Industry*, 2005).

In a study conducted by Thomas J. Murray and Associates for the Marine Industries Association of Florida (MIASF), it was estimated that the state's marine industry had a total economic impact of $18.4 billion in 2005. This study further estimated that more than 220,000 Floridians were employed in marine industry sectors. Moreover, in FY 2005, the Tri-county marine industry had a total estimated economic impact of $13.6 billion in output; generating $4.8 billion in wages and earnings, and providing 162,000 jobs (*Florida's Recreational Marine Industry,* 2006).

Tri-County Marine Workforce Study

WorkForce One Employment Solutions, also known as WorkForce One-Broward, is a federally-funded, locally controlled organization that operates as an administrative entity of the Broward Workforce Development Board (BWDB). The organization provides a variety of services to employers and job seekers in Broward County which are delivered primarily through three one-stop centers and 25 kiosk sites located at various community-based and faith-based organizations throughout the county. According to their website, WorkForce One's vision is " to be the premier workforce agency promoting better jobs and providing quality workers that enhance the quality of life and build a sustainable economy for Broward County". Further the website states that "WorkForce One's

mission is to provide innovative solutions through the professional delivery of

quality services which consistently and effectively meet workforce needs"

(http://www.wf1broward.com/AboutUs/CompanyOverview.htm).

In 2007, WorkForce One - Broward commissioned a study from the

Center for Urban and Environmental Solutions (CUES) at Florida Atlantic

University. CUES partnered with the leading professional trade associations in

the Tri-county area of Broward, Dade, and Palm Beach County to develop a

workforce needs assessment for the marine industry across all three counties.

The survey was conducted by mail and included responses from 816 marine

businesses in the Tri-County area. Key findings from the Executive Summary of

the study, which was completed in May 2008, revealed the following:

- The majority of respondents were small-medium companies (55%) compared to sole-proprietors (45%), although the sample population was comprised of 44% small-medium companies compared to 56% sole-proprietors.

- The largest proportion of businesses surveyed was involved in some aspect of repair or service, followed by sales.

- The majority of employees in the Tri-county marine industry work full time.

- About half (53%) of the current positions that marine businesses are currently recruiting are trade and technical positions, particularly electrical technicians, boating system technicians, carpenters/joiners, and boat yard laborers. Two thirds of positions that marine businesses are expected to hire in the future are trade and technical, followed by sales staff.

- The most important skills that the marine industry needs currently and in the future are technical skills, which consist of mechanics, welders, engineers, and electricians. Next highest needs are experienced employees, followed by workers with solid attributes, such as work ethic, honesty, and loyalty.

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of those companies with five or more employees have difficulty finding qualified personnel whereas only half (53%) of sole proprietors mentioned difficulty in recruiting personnel.

- While nearly three-fifths (59%) of respondents feel that there is a need for local training centers, 73% of respondents do not send employees for outside training. The biggest reason stated for not sending employees for further training is an excessive workload, followed by the expense.

- Nearly half (45%) of the total sample was interested in learning more about the Broward College Marine Technology Management Program which was still under development at the time of the survey. *(Marine Workforce Study for the Tri-County Region,* 2008, Executive Summary)

Given the structure and composition of the businesses in the CUES study, it is clear that the marine industry in South Florida is entrepreneurially driven, as it is comprised primarily of small independently owned businesses and employers. An Advisory Board member and marine service business owner in Broward County discusses how the Marine Engineering Management Program encourages small business development by creating a career ladder for workers who are promoted into management at their place of employment and then "pass the baton" to the next group as they get older and start their own businesses. In this way, the program helps strengthen entrepreneurial economic development of the marine business sector and provides a steady pipeline of skilled workers:

> Yes, more economic development. Now you're bringing in new people. People leave and have to be replaced. Creating small business is definitely the best way to go in this country. There's a lot to learn in doing. A couple years later many will come back because there is too much to learn. It is difficult to survive as a small entrepreneur. Unless they have that drive or plan to work more than 9 to 5, Monday through Friday, they won't make it owning their own business. You need to work 16 hour days and then some seven days a week and you have to have it as a passion

that you will be pushing for it. Anybody that has gone into the entrepreneurial ship has that drive and that passion. And yet we find a lot of people in the industry do have that passion and love the industry and love everything about it.

Genesis of the Program Partnership – Responding to a Community Based Need

Early in 2006, a serendipitous conversation between neighbors, the Executive Director of the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) and the President of the Broward College (BC) Foundation, regarding the newly opened automotive technical training facility that was housed at BC, began a process that resulted in the Marine Engineering Management Program partnership. In his interview, the Executive Director of MIASF explains how he became involved with the program at BC:

> The issue of workforce has been with us for a long time. How we matched up with BC is sort of a fluke. I have a neighbor who is President of their Foundation and basically, he and I were talking and he made me aware of the fact they had this facility available. He made me aware that they partnered with the Auto Dealers Association, a very similar type of association and the question, of course was, "why not us?" From there, it is pretty much history.

The current program partnership was the culmination of a series of meetings and conversations, over a 2 year period, with BC personnel, MIASF's Executive Director and Director of Membership Services, MIASF members representing marine businesses and employers, marine industry media, the college's Foundation, and other representatives from interested constituent groups including Broward County schools and the Broward County Workforce Board.

The Director of Association Services for MIASF succinctly describes the early stages of the genesis of the current program partnership:

> In 2006 that entire series of conversations that the Executive Director was having led to some preliminary meetings with Marine Association of South Florida and NMMA[National Marine Manufacturers Association] the [BC] Foundation and the Dean of the Automotive Program. . . . We started having a series of meetings to get a better understanding of what each entity was looking for and what each was bringing to the table. We started talking about what they were able to do with the automotive center they created, what that process was and what was required of them in terms of the facility, curriculum and what role the Automotive Dealer Association played in the process. We outlined our history in terms of our workforce, our interest in workforce and our need for a marine industry workforce. We talked about our current partnerships that existed for many years with the Broward County schools and the middle school, high school and local technical centers, and the success, or lack thereof in the programs we supported at that level. . . . what we would be looking for in a BC program. We tried to understand what would be required of everyone moving forward. Those were some initial meetings that moved into a committee, which continues to meet as we try to get towards the build-out of the facility that BC has for the program.

A key program Advisory Board member and general manager of a large yacht builder in South Florida recalls the early stages of the partnership's development:

> It goes back to 2006 . . . probably around August, maybe June of 2006. So what started there were just some general discussions of what we, as an industry, were looking for. I guess I was picked out of the hat because I was the one most vocal with [name], which was a local trade school. The turnout from [name] wasn't what we anticipated or expected. When we sat in this room I said as long as you guys are going to offer something more than a trade or training session, you'll probably be able to take the industry by storm.

Clearly, this employer was disappointed by the caliber of graduates that

he had previously encountered. He explained further when the researcher asked,

"What were you looking for specifically"?

> I was looking for an individual that not only possessed the trades
> and skills and basic mechanical we were looking for, but I wanted
> them to do basic math and writing skills. I wanted them to have
> somewhat of an education. . . . So I felt if the person got through
> the educational process at least completed his high school degree
> and did a college portion of it, they would probably be able the
> handle the general work environment. . . . They were passing and
> coming out of the technical schools expecting to make $50,000 a
> year based on a six-month technical program where they
> disassembled the same engine 50 times. So I was looking for an
> educated technician. We had educated a lot of our senior people.
> Our older workforce was educated and had their skill set that they
> learned over the years, which allowed them to fit in, but the new
> kids that were just coming out just couldn't. They were expecting to
> be paid a lot for doing very little. That was what we were having
> trouble with.

He elaborates more regarding the decision to offer an associate's degree

that resulted from the series of early meetings with BC, MIASF members and

other marine industry businesses:

> I said, it is unbelievable that you could offer that but a degree in
> science would be perfect. It would be a real plus. You have to go
> two years to get an associate's degree and I thought that was
> great. That sparked my interest. After that I followed the meetings
> and gave them my two cents but you have to write a training
> program that will benefit the industry. You can't write a training
> program that just benefits little outboard motors . . . you have to
> expand beyond that. It's funny. I just read the South Florida
> Workforce Survey [from Florida Atlantic University] today. It's the
> first time I've seen it. The first thing they asked for is for people to
> have the general skills on yachts. Well [before the BC program], we
> were missing the whole thing. Then I started getting more
> interested in the whole project when I heard a degree was offered.

The BC Dean of the Automotive Technology Program that supplied the framework for the Marine Engineering Management Program recalls the genesis of the marine program partnership and his involvement at a very early stage:

> [The MIASF Executive Director] comes and visits the automotive program and facility which was brand new and he was impressed by what we put together here, the folks that we employed, our strategy, our vision, everything. He turns to me and asks, "Why can't you do this for our marine industry." Now, remember my background. My background wasn't necessarily the best experience [coming from the technical centers]. So I said to him, if we're going to do this, then I'm going to do a lot of research because I wanted to make sure we really will get the support from industry and this is something that can work. It will have some sustainability to it. And I told him what my experience was and he told me what his experience was with the tech centers.

The leadership at MIASF was so impressed with the facility and the resources of the program partnership that the Dean and the BC Foundation had developed with the South Florida Auto Dealers Association that they were able to envision how a similar structure could be developed and applied to their industry. It was from this framework that the partnership between MIASF, BC and other marine industry constituents began the process of building their program. As stated by the MIASF Executive Director, "It was a process. Of course, one point I want to make is that it isn't often you see a template of what the end result could be. We were so fortunate, so fortunate to be able to see the auto dealers' program up and running."

Partner Contributions to the Program

Throughout the developmental period that ensued, the program partnership was built thoughtfully and organically. Key members of the nascent partnership, including the MIASF Executive Director and Director of Membership Services, the BC Automotive Dean, and the BC Foundation, formed a marine program Advisory Board that met consistently and continuously over a period of several months. They also invited other members of their South Florida community and constituent groups in the marine industry to participate in the process by voicing their needs, and by contributing time and resources to building the program. One participant said, "I think we met in total for about two years. The whole planning took about two years. What actually pushed us into overdrive was the opportunity to write a grant."

The opportunity that arose during the course of the early conversations between the program partners was a second round of grants offered by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and the Education Training Administration (ETA). During the first round, Broward College, led by the Dean, had received nearly $2 million from the DOL and ETA to develop the automotive technology program that the Marine Engineering Management Program was using as a framework. During the early conversations, as a first round recipient, the BC Dean received an early email alert of the second round grant opportunity. The Community-Based Job Training Grant (CBJTG) offered the partnership a unique opportunity

to develop a demand driven program that would address the needs of the South

Florida marine industry:

> Community-Based Job Training Grants seek to strengthen the role of community colleges in promoting the U.S. workforce's full potential. The grants are employer-focused and build on the President's High Growth Job Training Initiative, a national model for demand-driven workforce development implemented by strategic partnerships between the workforce investment system, employers, and community colleges and other training providers. The primary purpose of the CBJTG grants is to build the capacity of community colleges to train workers to develop the skills required to succeed in high growth/high demand industries. (http://www.doleta.gov/business/Community-BasedJobTraining Grants.cfm)

The CBJTG met a specific need for seed funding that, given the financial

crisis that many community colleges were facing, would have taken significant

time and effort to raise, thereby delaying the opportunity to address the needs of

the marine industry in a timely, effective manner. The grants were to be used by

community colleges to do the following:

- Increase the capacity of community colleges to provide training in a local high growth, high demand industry through activities such as the development of training curricula with local industry, hiring qualified faculty, arranging on-the-job experiences with industry, and using up-to-date equipment; and

- Train new and experienced workers in identified high growth, high demand industries, with the aim of employing and/or increasing the retention and earnings of trained workers, while meeting the skill needs of businesses within targeted industries. (http://www.doleta.gov/business/Community-BasedJobTrainingGrants.cfm)

The BC Dean presented the grant opportunity to the marine program

Advisory Board to assess their interest in submitting the grant and the group's

commitment to development of the program. Following a collaborative effort to

write the grant that helped the partnership cement their relationship and

accountability toward successful development of the program, the CBJTG grant

application was submitted in late August, 2006 by the BC Dean. The integrated

partnership incorporated a broad representation of interests including the college,

MIASF, WorkForce One- Broward Workforce Development Board, the School

Board of Broward County, the Boys & Girls Club- Admirals Club, Parkway

Academy and the BC Foundation. The college was awarded a grant of $1.9

million to accomplish the following objectives over a 3-year period starting in Fall

2007 and ending in 2010:

- To change the image and/or perception of careers in the industry

- To increase enrollment through promotion/awareness of careers in the

  industry

- To increase program completion rates

- To produce a continuous pipeline of employees

- To provide industry standard curriculum development and instruction

- To increase faculty appointments/ credentials in the marine industry

  (*Budget Narrative and Abstract*, n.d.).

Further, the outcomes specified in the grant were directed toward impacting the

following specific groups within the partnership service area over the 3-year

period: 100 new degree seeking students, 75 postsecondary adult vocational

students, 80 incumbent workers, and 1165 high school students.

Challenges Faced by the Partnership

Although the seed money from the grant certainly provided resources to

fund development of the Marine Engineering Management Program, there were

still a number of challenges that the partnership, led by the BC Dean, needed to

address. One of the structural challenges to be addressed by the program

partnership, and that emerged in this study, was the fact that the marine industry

in South Florida was extremely fragmented, comprised of many sole

proprietorships and small to medium sized businesses that employed fewer than

10 people. Nearly every study participant mentioned this problem. The employer

perspective is represented by the MIASF representative: "Most of the members

on our roster have no more than 10 employees . . . the person that works there

needs to be [a jack of all trades]. "

The college Dean saw this challenge from a slightly different perspective.

It represented an opportunity that merited caution, as developing the curriculum

and finding industry-supported resources could present a problem:

> The marine industry is quite evident in South Florida . . . it is a huge
> industry. I had experiences with the marine industry in the past
> when I was an assistant principal at a tech center in Miami-Dade.
> My experience during that time was that the industry was very
> fragmented. A lot of people, a lot of companies in the industry, but
> all of them fewer than 10 employees to the company, a majority of
> them in that category, all of them doing things their own way. Each
> one of them was looking towards education as a specific panacea
> for their own company. So it was very difficult to develop a

partnership, a curriculum with the marine industry. We did as well as we could but there was not a whole lot of connection.

Developing a quality curriculum that was responsive to industry needs, yet addressed some of the systemic issues raised by marine industry businesses that were to employ program graduates, presented a significant challenge. An industry employer voices his concerns:

Some of the kids coming out of the technical schools didn't have that [basic math and writing skills] and had issues that, unfortunately, some of the higher-end boatyards couldn't hire. You're putting people on $7, $15, $18 million boats and you had people who had convicted felonies, criminal backgrounds, couldn't pass drug tests, and you had people who just didn't want to work.

In order to address these types of employer concerns, the program would have to incorporate a "soft skills" component and give students a well rounded skill set that small, entrepreneurial employers required. The MIASF representative succinctly reiterates the employer position: "If you want to work in a small company, you have to have a well rounded capability."

The program partners, as members of the Advisory Board working in the marine industry, utilized their considerable contacts and arranged for the college Dean to attend an industry event, IBEX, the International Boatbuilders' Exhibition & Conference held in South Florida. A key member of the program Advisory Board introduced the BC Dean to the American Boat and Yacht Council (ABYC) leadership and a series of conversations ensued. Several of the program partner representatives visited the ABYC in Annapolis, MD, and from this, a relationship with ABYC and the Marine Engineering Management Program at Broward

College was born. ABYC's curriculum, which included all of the standards that

the marine industry aspired to, was purchased with grant funds and adapted to

meet the specific needs of the program at BC.

Not only did this alliance with ABYC save a significant amount of time,

expense, and effort, but also it addressed directly some of the concerns that

were voiced by the MIASF representative on behalf of its members regarding the

quality of the training that would be offered:

> Currently, the ABYC courses are taught in the northeast and we
> have been sending not only students up there for certification
> courses but also the instructors. They'll go up to Annapolis and take
> a course. Some of the people will be from down here and others
> from elsewhere. These certifications are very important, for
> example, because if you work on a mega yacht, you want a
> certified electrician and certified service people. That is where
> ABYC comes in because their courses are the certification courses.
> That is why this is so important.

Over time, this affiliation has developed into a more direct connection

between ABYC and BC; it has expanded the program's reach beyond those

students enrolling in the 2-year associates' degree program through BC's

designation as an ABYC Center of Excellence. Here the Dean explains how BC

earned the designation:

> The vision we provided and brought to ABYC, it created and
> launched something cooler. . . . They decided then to identify
> different schools that were doing an excellent job that they would
> attach their name to. They decided that they were going to look at
> schools along the East Coast, Gulf Coast, Pacific Coast and even
> the Great Lakes to see which schools were doing some very
> innovative, progressive curriculum teaching for the marine industry
> and assign them as Centers of Excellence.

MIASF explains the advantage of having Broward College designated as an

ABYC Center of Excellence:

> They are establishing no more than seven Centers of Excellence around the country where they partner with various educational institutions making their curriculum available to those institutions and having the courses taught locally. When someone [an employee] leaves Broward to go to Annapolis for a course for a week or month, you still have to continue to pay them. You have to pay their salary but you also lose the income they derive. So having them [ABYC] locally helps a lot because it decreases the time they are traveling and away from the job.

Given the demand for high quality, skilled marine industry workers, and

that the Broward College advertising and recruiting personnel were part of the

existing program structure, finding and recruiting students who were interested

and committed to succeeding in the program was not reported as an issue.

However, finding faculty who had the technical experience to teach in the

program, a college degree, and a willingness to work for the salary that could be

offered presented quite a challenge. As stated by the Dean:

> Finding faculty that has (a) the credentials necessary to meet our SACS accreditation standards and (b) working for what community colleges pay. We don't have a separate pay structure for professional career/technical teachers versus the academic teachers. So it is difficult to find individuals that have the credentials we are looking for and only pay them $45,000 a year. That's a challenge. We call it around here, finding the needle in the haystack.

Once again, as explained by one of the Advisory Board members, the

resources of the partnership were utilized to help find a solution:

> Actually, I was [involved with faculty recruitment]. When they had their interviews, read all of the resumes and they picked their two or three candidates they wanted to consider hiring, they [BC Dean]

asked me if I would be part of the actual interview process. . . .
Oddly enough, I happened to know one of the persons that came in
. . . that was the person that was hired.

The founding instructor for the program came highly recommended; in fact, in addition to his recommendation from the above quoted Advisory Board member, he had a letter of recommendation from the ABYC, another of the program's partners. Yet, as that Advisory Board member elaborates, more faculty will be needed and recruiting qualified faculty will remain a challenge:

I think they will find them [new faculty] because people move up and get a little older. The difficulty will be whether somebody has the college education to also implement with the trade. I do believe they will find that. There will be challenges and it will take awhile, but I do believe they will find them. There are enough educated people in the marine industry out there even though others might not think so. A lot goes with the personality. You have to have the right personality, the right mix. You have to have a passion for it.

A marine industry business owner discusses how the recent economic downturn presents a challenge for the recreational marine industry that the partnership will need to address:

We were doing really well until the present economic hiccup occurred which, believe it or not, I think is the first time this industry has ever been affected by an economic situation that has happened. We noticed it and it's the first time we've noticed it. Most of the time we've had a lot of international clients and we have kept on going.

Advantages of the Partnership

Recognizing and appreciating the relative contributions of each of the partners that provided expertise when and where it is needed clearly were among the greatest advantages of the social enterprise partnership examined in

this study. As an example, the MIASF representative explains the importance of

the Broward College Foundation:

> I would say the process would not have been successful unless all
> of these entities were at the table. We all bring something else to
> the equation. The Foundation was instrumental in the facility and
> property. They are also instrumental in leading the capital
> campaign fundraising effort. They will be the ones providing
> scholarships, matching scholarships. We have education
> fundraising efforts as an organization throughout the year and we
> have given money to the Foundation to give scholarships to
> students at BC and a $500 scholarship becomes a $1,000
> scholarship for the student. The Foundation is very vital to the
> entire process and a great advisor because they have been
> fundraising champions before and they know what it takes. They
> know how to build it. They are the experts when it comes to that
> type of thing we are not and we defer to them. We bring our
> contacts and resources to the table so that they can do what they
> do.

There was an apparent attempt to include a diversity of skills, interests and
points of view in assembling the partnership and the program Advisory Board.
Clearly each of the people involved in the partnership made different
contributions to the program as they were needed. One of the Advisory Board
members, who is also a business owner and employer, expresses his opinion
regarding the relative advantages of the program partnership led by Broward
College:

> I think that's why they succeeded because they got a lot of different
> people together each with their own level of knowledge to come to
> the table and share in it and at one point everybody had their
> opportunity to make their contribution. I think they were very wise in
> who they chose.

The MIASF Executive Director confirms this point when sharing his

perspective:

> Biggest advantages? Clearly, I think the biggest advantages of the
> partnership are that we are both leaders in our field. You have a
> very strong association, you have a very, very highly regarded
> community college, and it's a match made in heaven. That's a big
> advantage. You can't take two weak sisters and make one strong

relationship. I think when you have two very strong partners, it is very helpful to the process.

The BC Associate Dean discusses the program partnership's advantage from the college's perspective:

> The marine partnership with industry, with the companies has many levels. One of the levels is the ability to get to know them and their needs. That goes with the big companies and the small companies. Knowing what their needs are truly helps our curriculum to teach our students what is needed. We were talking about some of the soft skills. Almost everyone complains that people don't know how to show up on time. Their 1-hour lunch becomes 2 hours. This fellow frequently calls in sick on a Friday or a Monday, so it's teaching those soft skills. Another advantage is getting to know these companies and knowing the possibilities for donations. A lot of our donations come through them such as [name], who is a large yacht retrofitter. We met with him last week and he is already working on setting us up with what he calls the big five in the marine industry. That's the type of connection that, without connections like we're making, we'd never get the big five around the table at the same time.

Disadvantages of the Partnership

In retrospect, participants reported no disadvantages that they could see to the process or the program partnership. The development process and the program produced were, for everyone interviewed, considered as a positive "win-win" experience. The MIASF Executive Director summed it up best:

> What [disadvantages] can there be? If we were to walk out the door and, take that building over there, say I want that to be a marine tech center. We would have to buy the building, have to find the students, and have to find the teachers, have to find the curriculum, all that has been taken care of. All we have to do is find a couple of bucks.

While there were no disadvantages expressed, there was some concern that, in attracting support from the business community in the form of "named"

sponsorship or manufacturer specific training, other competing businesses or

marine manufacturers might mistakenly interpret this as a mutually exclusive

relationship. Yet, the problem was seen as relatively minor and a solution was

already formulated and relatively easy to apply. The situation is described by the

Associate Dean:

> It can be a slippery slope because if people think we are affiliated with that individual company, especially if you get a name sponsorship. As big as it [the marine industry] is and as fragmented as it is, everybody still knows everybody through a few degrees of separation so indirectly everyone knows a little bit about everyone. It is the same in the automotive industry.
>
> I remember the BC automotive training center. When we first opened a little over 2 years ago, the common response in the automotive field, when I was running the store down the street was, "My god, [name] just bought their own training center." That was what we all thought. After a few meetings and sitting on a few panels, I saw they didn't buy it . . . they donated a substantial amount of money.

The Associate Dean spends his Fridays doing community outreach

for each of his programs; every other Friday he visits local marine

businesses to help develop support and establish positive relationships in

the community. The solution requires effort on his part, but is an integral

part of his job and from his perspective, a relatively easy solution:

> So [for me] that is part of going out there and letting people know the story. For example, let's say [name] just donated a substantial amount of money and that's why it's the [Name] Marine Center. It is letting them [the industry] know that we are here for you too. Yeah, we might have the Caterpillar diesel engine training class, but we are more than willing to teach the Mercruiser, or the AMR or the other brands out there. It is just trying to squelch the rumors to stop people from thinking that we affiliate with them [specific companies named] only.

The researcher asked, "Is this is part of your going out on Friday to marine businesses?" The Associate Dean responds by explaining his approach in greater detail:

> Yeah, rumor control if you might. Just to let them know we are there for them. I think by showing up and having these visits, some planned some not, it lets them know we're here for you. That's why I'm stopping at your store. I'm not asking you to come to my advisory committee meetings. We'll visit where our students are placed and talk to them and see how that's going and then go places where I want to place students, creating an awareness and letting them know I'm here for them. Once they hire my student, and if I don't visit them anymore, then the real perception is he just wanted to get the student a job. Yeah he's good, and we're happy with it, but what kind of relationship is that? It is a continuing relationship that needs to be grown. It has to be grown to truly work. It's like any relationship. It has to be grown and nurtured and worked on and communicated.

Next Steps in the Partnership

Thus far, the structural issues relative to the composition of the marine industry in South Florida and the significant challenges faced in developing the program have been presented. However, there remains one more substantial obstacle for the partnership to surmount; it must raise the funds needed to retrofit a facility to house the program. The BC Foundation's Executive Director:

> We wrote a successful application and subsequently, I was brought in to look at the capital funding needs. The foundation owned two buildings in Miramar, one that houses the automotive tech program and the second building was vacant but in need of renovation. The foundation donated the buildings to the college and we have since been cultivating donors to raise the funds necessary to build out the infrastructure of the second building as well as provide our students with scholarships.

The BC Foundation is actively working toward a $3 million fund raising goal that is needed to retrofit the building that was donated to the partnership for the marine program. As of this writing, more than $600,000 in cash and equipment had been donated. This includes a $50,000 cash gift from the MIASF and another $50,000 from a private donor thanks to the efforts of the ABYC, whose Foundation President has assumed the role of Chair of the Development Committee for the program's fundraising effort.

Given the current state of the U.S. economy, coupled with the myriad of crises plaguing the business, financial and philanthropic communities, raising the $3 million in funds needed to complete the marine program's facility may remain a challenge for some time. However, it is clear from the data presented that the partners will continue to work diligently and collaboratively to achieve that goal.

Findings

The previous section provides a rich, thick description of the case study institution, program, and entrepreneurial partnership that was derived from analysis of the interview questions along with document review. This section presents the findings that were derived from analyzing the data through the conceptual lenses of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise. These findings emerged as categories through the themes of collaboration, accountability, sustainability, innovation and impact that were derived from the review of the literature and were demonstrated through analysis of the case study institutional data.

Collaboration

Collaboration with community constituents is a key concept of social

entrepreneurship and social enterprise. In this study, the committed

contributions of each partner organization, along with their obvious willingness to

work together created a synergy that expanded the partnerships impact by

leveraging resources toward a common goal. This was clearly indicated by the

MIASF's Executive Director:

> The fact is our business is the marine business and BC's business
> is education. We would like to think we know our business pretty
> well and it is clear [BC Dean] knows his business pretty well. You
> talk to our partnerships. We look for partnerships. It's the only way
> we can leverage our resources.

The Marine Engineering Management Program curriculum, based on the

standards and framework purchased from the ABYC, was truly a collaborative

effort between all partners, with each having a stake in the outcome. The

Advisory Board members and the MIASF worked together to help the BC Dean

develop an industry standard driven curriculum that was relevant to local

workforce needs. Here a marine business owner and employer explains her

involvement in curriculum development:

> [We had] input into the curriculum and also knowing the different
> trades and what's all involved coming from the repair business of
> boats. Also we've built a couple of boats. So I'm looking at the
> different systems and the whole entity of a boat or yacht and what's
> put together there and seeing the different trades that are a part of
> it and the different types of technicians you need, the different types
> of systems and different types of training and how the training is
> very different. You have people that do fiberglass and composites
> and they're very different from the people doing engines and people
> doing electrical. They're all working in the same environment and

they all have a completely different role and the boat brings them all together, especially a large boat which is a complete entity in and of itself; its completely sustaining by itself.

The MIASF also lent their expertise to the curriculum development

process, as explained by the Executive Director.

We would look at a boat, a large boat, and looked at all the systems that were there. What did we need to teach someone so that they could walk on board and be able to handle all the systems? Boats are very complex. They may not look like it from the outside but like a car, there are a lot of things under the hood, under the engine hatch that I wouldn't even think to understand. Boats break down and salt water is a tough environment, so we need people who are well trained and can get it right the first time. I don't want anyone experimenting on my boat.

The Director of Member Services elaborates by saying:

It was our knowledge of the workforce needs, specific workforce needs, or the priority needs for industry that we brought to the table. They wanted to know what our needs were and, from our experience, from our focus on the issue, on the number of years we were able to say we needed folks who could work systems, who can handle electronics and electrical systems, riggings and the engine repair for this size engine versus that size engine, who can handle fiberglass repair and handle refinishing. Those types of skill sets are what we saw we needed and brought to the table when we first started looking at how to build this program.

In fact, ABYC was so impressed with the potential of the new program and

the efforts of the partnership that they designated Broward College as a Center

of Excellence, creating an opportunity for BC to offer ABYC certification classes

and professional development for graduates and working members of the marine

industry community. This opportunity extended the college's reach and impact

beyond the goals of the 2-year program. The collaborative relationship between

MIASF, Broward College, and ABYC created another tool to address the market

driven demand for certification and professional development classes, held in the

evening, for South Florida marine industry employers and incumbent workers.

The collaboration between Broward College and its' marine industry

partners continues to develop as contacts and resources are shared in an effort

to build a more effective program – a common goal for all concerned. MIASF's

Executive Director explains:

> Ninety nine percent of the people on the Advisory Board are
> probably members of the association, board members of our
> organization or former board members, or just members of our
> organization who see the strength in the program being built and
> understand the need for it and are there to make it as successful as
> possible. So we do have a strong presence on the Advisory Board.
> Then there are contacts. We expose them to other folks who might
> not be members but who are members of the county marina
> advisory board or the city of Ft. Lauderdale Advisory Board and
> members of the community who have a strong interest in the
> marine industry and sit on an advisory board of the county or city
> who have an interest in seeing this program become successful.
> They bring their particular knowledge or expertise and background
> to the table as well as their contacts.

The collaboration between Broward College and the program's Advisory Board

was clearly demonstrated during the initial campus job fair, held onsite at BC's

South campus in March 2008, which the researcher observed. The event was

designed to match area marine businesses as potential internship sites for the

Marine Engineering Management Program's first class of students. Several of the

Advisory Board members who owned or represented area marine business

employers, spent several hours at the campus interviewing students about

potential openings and giving them advice and feedback regarding what to

expect from employers in the future. The programs' recruiter and Associate Dean

were onsite and interacted with students and employers throughout the event.

The experience served to reinforce relationships with potential employers and to

provide direction for future internship site matching.

Accountability

The concept of accountability emerged as a clear theme throughout the

data. In Dees (2001) discussion of his definition of social entrepreneurs as

change agents, he specifically calls for a "heightened accountability to the

constituencies served and the outcomes created" (p. 4). The marine business

owner-employers and MIASF wanted the new program to address directly some

of the difficulties that they had encountered in trying to find skilled, work-ready

employees. The BC Dean discusses his considerations in developing the new

marine program:

> While we were listening to these folks, it became apparent that one
> of the important skill sets was soft skills--the communications,
> customer service. What we did was we included in our curriculum
> nine credits in those areas. So in addition to taking all of the hard
> skill technical areas of systems, they also have to take nine hours
> customer service, management supervision and communications.

The BC Dean addresses how the unique requirements of the community

college must be combined with the demands of the industry:

> As a community college, our vision and mission is an open access
> philosophy. If you wanted to go into a program like this, that is all
> you really need. We aren't going to close the door on folks. Now,
> with that being said, the other things we heard from our earlier
> conversations with industry, is that there seems to be a problem
> with people remaining drug-free, having criminal records, and these
> kinds of things. So what we do, we don't test people. As a college
> we don't test people. As we recruit people, we make it very very
> clear that this program has an internship component and that

employers will definitely drug test upon application and will do a criminal background check. We discourage people who cannot pass because we don't want to see people spend their money and, more importantly, their time, and not be able to get employed. It is a moral, ethical issue that we pre-warn students that they will be checked for these things and not to waste their time in the program if they know they're using drugs. If it's something they can say I was using drugs but now I'm not, because I'm really interested in this program, then we'll give them time to get clean.

The BC Dean wanted the marine industry partners to be committed and accountable for program support in terms of the time, energy, and resources needed to make the program successful.

When they are enrolled in the internship component, the instructor that carries the load for the internship, they maintain, actually the student maintains a journal with employer input and part of the responsibility of the faculty member that has those students on his roll is that he goes to visit the sites and visits with their immediate supervisor, whoever is in charge, so we can get feedback on not only how the student is doing, but about the skills we are teaching. Are they deficient in some way? It is a continuous improvement of our curriculum as well.

The BC Foundation was accountable to the partnership for raising the funds needed for the build out of the marine facility. Broward College and the partnership were accountable to the DOL and the ETA for the outcomes that were to be delivered according to the terms of the $1.9 million CBJTG. The BC Dean states:

It became pretty evident that this was a program that was needed here. The Department of Labor saw it that way as well and so what we basically wrote into the grant was that we were going to have at capacity for the program, have 120 students enrolled in the program and that we were going to graduate approximately 40 students annually from the program that would be ready to go into the industry.

Finally, because the program is mission focused for all stakeholders, each of the partners is accountable to their community constituents comprised of the BC students, marine industry businesses, and the program donors.

Sustainability

The concept of sustainability emerged clearly as a key concept from the research data, and it was certainly inferred throughout the social entrepreneurship and social enterprise literature as a concomitant concept to accountability. Sustainability in the literature refers to the underlying concept of creating social enterprise ventures to sustain operations and service provision; however, in this research it emerged as a concept with broader and deeper meaning.

Sustainability of the student's career path in the marine industry and in their academic pursuits is discussed from the perspective of an Advisory Board member and marine business owner:

> In this day and age, we have to have more skills involved and if we are going to be competing and we're competing now at a global level for talent, we have to have as many skills [as possible]. Individuals have to realize that they need as many skills as they can get. Technical skills as well as all these other work-related basic skills.

Sustainability means that students can earn a living wage as well to sustain their employment in the industry. One of the area marine industry employers explains:

> I would definitely start them at a higher salary because they're going to have a lot more knowledge. A lot of that comes down to personalities and whether they can work together in a small

company. That is what a lot of it is. Sometimes I say you might not know anything, but if you're smart enough and want to learn and have the passion and you want to learn this business, then you can learn it. That's my criteria. . . . My clients are hiring us as a professional company and expect my people to be oriented in what they're doing. I think what this program is going to help that aspect of our employees. . . . This program is helping to build that structure that we want in this industry.

Sustainability also refers to Broward College's ability to sustain the partnership with the marine industry beyond the 3-year grant period so that the program remains relevant to the community. MIASF's Executive Director discusses their expectations for the program's longevity:

Absolutely, we get excited about things that are important to our industry and that will have a long lasting benefit. It isn't just going to be the project of the year; this will stand the test of time and after we are long gone, that school [BC] will be turning out well qualified [students and employees].

The MIASF Executive Director enthusiastically described the collaborative, mission driven focus of this partnership that nurtures the concept of sustainability:

This was a really deep collaborative effort and a marriage made in heaven too. They're excellent partners (BC) and it is exciting to be here on the ground floor, to be here at the start. It will outlast all of us here, we are confident of that.

Innovation

The Schumpeterian idea of innovation, a consistent concept in social entrepreneurship and social enterprise (Dees, 2001, 2003; Light, 1998, 2008), emerged as a prevalent theme throughout this study's data. Schumpeter's concept of creative destruction, whereby the entrepreneur is not an inventor but

instead someone who continuously creates change from an existing pool of resources, is the definition that is used in Dees (2001) work and the concept that is applied in this study . The marine program's development began as an innovative solution to address a community based issue that had not been resolved by existing resources. Led by the Dean's vision for a more effective solution to a community need, the Marine Engineering Management Program that Broward College and their community partners designed has utilized existing resources to develop a demand driven, responsive result. Continuous improvement, in the Schumpeterian sense, is a central theme in the data. For example, curriculum improvement is very much an ongoing process, as indicated by MIASF's Director of Association Services' statement: "It certainly isn't a final curriculum- it may need to be modified as considered necessary."

The new program's curriculum responded to the needs of the industry by including a soft skills component, a paid internship, and ABYC industry standards. It utilized an existing resource, the ABYC curriculum, and created something that addressed the unique needs of the community more directly. Responding to external community constituents is not a new concept for community colleges; however, investing the time, energy, and resources necessary to build a new program that incorporates market driven standards and includes all relevant external points of view is clearly innovative.

Impact

Impact is a critical concept in Dees' (2003) definition of social enterprise. The concept of impact to a social entrepreneur is juxtaposed with the concept of income for a business entrepreneur to differentiate the mission based, social purpose focus of social purpose enterprises. Dees emphasizes, and this researcher agrees based on the data, the notion of social impact that is aligned with the institutional or organizational mission is a key differentiating factor in a social enterprise partnership. Marshalling resources, not generating income, is the focus for the impactful work of social enterprise partnerships.

The mission focused goals of the marine program partnership created committed stakeholder positions that are well integrated with each partner's own core mission. The Marine Engineering Management Program at Broward College is designed to have an economic impact on the marine businesses that reside in the Tri-county area by meeting a market driven need to provide a work-ready supply of skilled workers for South Florida marine employers. One of the area marine business owners states the employer perspective:

> You need to have the education . . . Broward College has really brought the education up to a level for post high school students to have the opportunity to develop skills in the industry as well as having the best trained workforce. We have the [marine business] cluster here: we have business here, we have education here, we have good workers here, and that all helps develop the cluster so that when people have work to be done on their boats, they'll come here. I have had people call me from northern Florida saying the best trained workers are in South Florida and I'm going to bring my boat from St. Augustine down there. I've had people from Canada say; if I'm going to get any work done they're coming to South Florida because they have the best people there.

MIASF's Director of Association Services sees the program as an

opportunity to effect the long-term composition of the South Florida marine

workforce:

> Unlike a public vocational [high school] or technical [high] school,
> we have a greater ability to set the requirements and parameters
> for students coming in. [What I mean is that] we can make sure
> their basics are standard and what you would want or expect of a
> student – the reading, writing, and soft skills. Because BC can
> better select and offer a better standard of training to the student,
> we get a better student coming out and a better student coming out
> will ultimately translate into the industry having a better worker who
> can become a better manager and who, in turn, down the road,
> raises the quality of the workforce overall . . . I don't want any
> negatives towards what our standards of quality are now, but
> ultimately a better worker who can become a better manager can
> help create a better workforce.

The MIASF Director of Association Services elaborates:

> The advantage is ultimately a better workforce from those who start
> at the base level and move up through a career ladder to
> management. If we are doing a good job and, we are backfilling
> with more of these high quality workers, then we have a much
> better workforce. In 10 years, the students who graduate today,
> have earned their keep and are seen as professionals and veterans
> in their particular field, go up the career ladder, are now in middle
> management in a marina, boatyard or a marine business and they
> are utilizing skills they first started to learn at BC, then on their own
> out in the field, we have a better workforce at the end of the day.

This economic impact is tied directly to each partner's core mission which

further extends the benefit to all partners' constituencies: MIASF's member

businesses; Broward College's students, faculty and community members;

marine business owners and employers; Broward County schools; and the

Broward County WorkForce Board. Broward College's ABYC Center of

Excellence will further impact the marine businesses in the area by providing a

mechanism for incumbent workers to be trained and certified locally, saving time

and money.

For Broward College's principal partner, MIASF, the program goals benefit

their members directly, impacting the organization's mission and principal focus

of serving their members. The MIASF Executive Director:

> We do a lot of economic development projects and I never thought
> of this as an economic development. But frankly, as we help our
> members build their employment base with better-qualified people,
> it will help with stability, help businesses stay in business, and give
> them a reason to stay in this area. We have a problem that some of
> our members are, at this point just a trickle, leaving for more
> business-friendly environments—less taxes, lower insurance costs,
> to North Carolina. This will give them a good reason to stay in this
> area. That's economic retention, if not economic development.

<center>Summary</center>

In summary, the social enterprise program partnership that supports the

Marine Engineering Management Program at Broward College addresses a

community based issue by improving the current skill set of the workforce; by

addressing employer demand for a greater supply of qualified workers; by

helping to retain marine businesses in South Florida; and by helping to sustain

the workforce by replacing skilled workers as they retire.

The program partnership exhibits the characteristics of social

entrepreneurship and social enterprise because it is mission focused and

addresses a community based problem by utilizing business practices. The

partnership's mission based focus is designed to have impact and exhibits the characteristics of collaboration, innovation, sustainability and accountability.

The next, and final, chapter addresses the study's research questions, provides conclusions that are derived from the data analysis, discusses recommendations for practice and offers suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents conclusions and recommendations resulting from the case study research. Conclusions are provided within the framework of the research questions and the a priori and emergent themes that evolved from the literature review and the research respectively. Recommendations for future practice and suggestions for further research also are addressed.

The purpose of this study was to explore social enterprise as a conceptual framework for developing alternative revenue streams and innovative, demand driven programming for community colleges.

The study was guided by two questions:

1. How can social enterprise concepts be applied to the community college mission?

2. How can community colleges enhance revenue streams and develop innovative, market driven programming by employing social enterprise concepts?

Broward Community College, a large multi-campus institution located in South Florida and highly regarded for its innovation in programming and development of entrepreneurial revenue streams, was selected for this exploratory study of social enterprise partnerships. Interviews were conducted with key internal and external stakeholders that were involved in the development and maintenance of the Marine Engineering Management Program that was

developed in conjunction with the leading marine industry trade association and other community partners in an effort to address the academic, socioeconomic, and economic development needs of the constituent groups that the college serves.

In addition to on-site observations and interviews personally conducted by the researcher, media and documents from the college, regional workforce board and partnership organizations, along with other relevant marine industry Web sites were reviewed, analyzed, and incorporated into the research.

<p align="center">Discussion</p>

Research Question 1: How can social enterprise concepts be applied to the community college mission?

According to the college Web site, the mission of Broward Community College, the case study institution for this research, is "to provide high quality educational programs and services that are affordable and accessible to a diverse community of learners." Community engagement is a critical component of most community college missions; however, how each institution defines "community" and who the community college considers its' community constituents may vary widely depending on the specific vision and goals of the college. The universal tenets of affordability, open-access, and community engagement that are indigenous to the community college mission are decidedly compatible with the social purpose and mission driven focus of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship concepts.

Social entrepreneurship refers to the act of a social entrepreneur, an individual who garners resources to solve social problems by enlisting the community in which they operate for a collaborative effort that is self-determined and mission driven. Social enterprises are mission driven organizations (typically non-profits) that apply business practices to their social purpose mission. In this study, the terms social enterprise and social entrepreneurship are used interchangeably when referring to the character and intent of the community college partnership that is the subject of this research.

Social enterprise partnerships provide community colleges an opportunity to increase the reach and intensity of their mission focused impact on the vast and diverse community of learners that contemporary community colleges are now engaged in serving.

Research Question 2: How can community colleges enhance revenue streams and develop innovative demand driven, socioeconomically relevant programming by employing social enterprise concepts?

By employing the social enterprise concepts that emerged from this research, which include innovation, sustainability, accountability, and most importantly, collaboration, community colleges can develop successful partnerships with local businesses, industry organizations, and other concomitant mission focused agencies. These partnerships, when developed thoughtfully and organically, can enhance revenue streams, expand reach, and fill a community based need that is demand driven and socioeconomically relevant to the array of

constituent groups in the communities that the colleges serve. The Executive

Director of the Broward College Foundation states it succinctly:

> What do I consider to be the college's most successful program
> partnership? There are several, so let me start by telling you how I
> would define a successful program partnership. When industry
> makes an investment with the college-foundation to help support
> program needs, capital needs, and scholarships, well, it doesn't get
> any better than that. My guess is that most companies who are
> following their core mission (i.e. automotive, aviation, health care,
> etc.) realize they have a lot to benefit from making an investment in
> the local colleges and universities to send their employees to as
> well as recruit out of a school where they know what they are
> getting in terms of the education (relevance and rigor). So that
> being said, our most successful includes automotive, aviation,
> marine and health care.

Conclusions

In the social enterprise partnership framework examined through this

study, innovating and exploiting opportunity are a continuous process. Many

scholar- practitioners such as Brinckerhoff (2000) and Light (2008) support the

idea that social entrepreneurship and social enterprise refer primarily to revenue

generation through earned income strategies. However, in this study, the concept

as applied to community college partnerships incorporates Dees (2003) notion of

social enterprise that emphasizes innovation and impact over income. The

innovative exploitation of resources characterizes the social enterprise

partnership, creating the synergy that is realized by pooling partnership

resources toward a common goal, which has a far greater influence on

constituent communities than any one entity could achieve individually. Impact,

as it relates to mission, is more important than generating revenue. Programs

cannot operate without funds; therefore, sustenance of program initiatives

through the employment of innovative strategies to develop alternate revenue

streams is critical to the success of a social enterprise partnership. These

alternative revenue streams can include non-cash contributions and may in fact,

be void of any specific monetary value. However, depending on the particular

need, these in-kind donations for equipment and supplies, provisions for program

facilities, or access to technical personnel, and external stakeholders can often

provide greater utility than may be available to the college on its own.

Although often synonymous with the terms collaboration, alliance, and

relationship, in entrepreneurial business circles the word "partnership" can often

be construed to merely imply an association or alliance that has no common

mission or goal other than the generation of more income, additional members,

or an increased number of hits on a Web site. Business networking through

technology has diluted the meaning of alliance and partnership by allowing

anyone and anything to associate in the name of more or better leads, or

potential customers. The social enterprise partnership should be built thoughtfully

and organically, cultivating and utilizing personal relationships, as well as

networking referrals from the advisory board along the way. The ability to learn

from mistakes and a willingness to continuously improve the program are

essential to building an effective, sustainable program partnership.

Social enterprise is driven by a social purpose mission and therefore

provides a more suitable context in which to build an accountable, sustainable,

collaborative partnership for community colleges and their partners. For community colleges, this can include providing ESL classes for a burgeoning immigrant community, retraining displaced workers or providing job training and childcare assistance to a single mom who is entering the workplace for the first time. In order for these social enterprise partnerships to be effective, each entity must display a sustainable commitment to building the program which is relevant to their own core mission and in turn increases their stake in a successful outcome.

In this study, the individuals representing the primary partners including Broward College, the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF), the Broward College Foundation and the Marine Engineering Management Program's Advisory Board members were all stakeholders in the successful development and implementation of the program as their organizational core mission was closely aligned with the goals and objectives of the program partnership. This stake in a successful outcome served as a catalyst for sharing resources and contributed significantly to the program's success.

The Opportunity for Community Colleges

Community colleges share many issues and objectives; most importantly, they have a common mission of open access and a dedication to serving the needs of their particular communities. In an increasingly competitive globalized market for training and academic instruction, and a spiraling decline in financial support for public education, community colleges are collectively pressed to find

new and better ways of generating "alternative" revenue streams. While there is

no prescriptive method for developing program partnerships for community

colleges or for developing new and better revenue streams, the template of

social enterprise partnerships described in this study can be employed as a

framework for addressing innovative programming and alternative revenue

streams. The elements of collaboration, accountability, sustainability, innovation

and impact that embody the social enterprise concept are inherent to building the

social enterprise framework. Using this framework for building future programs

and revamping current programs that are still relevant to the market driven

environment, community colleges can be more effective workforce providers and

responsible public stewards of public funds and the public trust.

Community College Leadership and Social Enterprise Partnerships

Much of the literature on entrepreneurial community colleges focuses on

the influence of the community college president as the primary driver of success

(Wiers, 2007; Dingfelder, 2007; Jones, 2005; Roueche & Jones, 2005).

Presidential leadership, while certainly important to the success of any

community college, does not stand as the singularly critical component in

developing social enterprise partnerships for community colleges. While

executive support is critical in order for the partnership to sustain itself, it is not

necessary that the partnership be established at that level. In some cases in fact,

it may be preferable that initiation occur at the mid-management level,

particularly where the contacts are established, as the day-to-day operational

maintenance of the program and the concomitant relationships must be developed and nurtured over the long term, requiring more time and effort than the college president may reasonably have available.

The community college president's support is certainly vital to provide college resources to the program partnership effort and to help develop and maintain the integrated social network that successful social enterprise partnerships require. However, social enterprise partnerships can be initiated and maintained at many administrative levels and require the active, day-to-day operational attention and commitment of an innovative leader with vision and tenacity, who is both collaborative and accountable, to prolong the program and the partnership beyond the developmental stages and ensure long-term sustainability. For the social enterprise partnership that was the focus of this research, the Broward College Dean exemplified the leadership, collaboration, vision and tenacity that was required to develop and maintain the relationships, resources and commitment to the Marine Engineering Management Program partnership's long term goals and objectives.

Entrepreneurship with a Social Purpose – More Relevant to Community Colleges

The entrepreneurial business paradigm that many community colleges have endeavored to emulate, such as the one that is featured in the popular book, *The Entrepreneurial Community College* (2005), has not always been received by faculty and other academic staff and administrators with enthusiasm or support. In fact, many college personnel view this purely as a business

paradigm that is oppositional to the mission and purpose of the community college as an open access, public institution of higher education. However, the social enterprise paradigm was conceived so that non-profit social purpose organizations could become more self-sufficient in accomplishing their mission-based goals through the prudent application of business practices in operations and program support.

For community colleges, the focus on impact regarding their social purpose organizational mission in concert with the application of business processes and practices to developing relevant, sustainable programming will go a long way in supporting the ideals of serving the community and maintaining good stewardship of public resources (Dees, 2001, 2003; Brinckerhoff, 2000). Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship concepts, as conceived in this study, provide a framework for developing program partnerships that are comprehensive and relevant to the market driven environment in which many community colleges must now operate. Yet, they also provide a mission based focus that considers the positive impact on students and the constituent community rather than profit or revenue for its' own sake.

The application of social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts to community colleges, and specifically to community college program initiatives and revenue stream enhancement, is not addressed in the literature and indicates an opportunity for further exploration.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Practice

Collaboration with individuals and organizations representing all relevant external stakeholders is a critical component of the social enterprise partnership framework embodied in this research and should be employed at the earliest stages of exploration in development of a new program or revamping of an existing program. Based on this research study, some recommendations that may be useful for other community colleges that want to apply social enterprise and social entrepreneurship concepts in the practice of developing program partnerships can be made:

- Develop an Advisory Board comprising a comprehensive cross section of significant constituent groups from business owners and employers, social purpose providers, professional associations, workforce boards, and other relevant parties from the surrounding program area to help determine if there is truly a market driven need for the program and whether the program can be sustained over time. Then ask questions and listen carefully.
- Think like a potential student and a potential competitor. Talk to other program providers to share best practices. Thoroughly research other existing programs in the local area, state, or region and identify how and where you might learn from what already exists in the marketplace.

- Continuously remain engaged with your partners in the development process, even after the program is fully operational in order to stay abreast of opportunities for program expansion and continuous improvements to enhance the program's effectiveness.

- Apply the social enterprise concept of innovation by committing to continuously improve and enhance the program and the corresponding partnerships throughout the life of the functional relationship.

Suggestions for Future Research

The Marine Engineering Management program at Broward College is in the very early stages of operation and will not graduate its' first class of students from the associate degree program until 2010. It would be prudent to reexamine the program subsequent to the expiration of the three-year grant term in 2010 to determine the extent to which the partnership has been sustained, the outcomes achieved, and the program enhanced.

Although community colleges share many distinguishing characteristics including their commitment to open-access, affordability, and serving their constituent communities, each college is uniquely identified by the geographic, demographic, and socioeconomic characteristics of the community that it serves. In this study, social enterprise concepts provided a framework that was employed to explore how community colleges might develop or revamp programs that are mission focused, innovative, and market driven in order to expand or enhance revenue streams. The particular socioeconomic conditions that are associated

with a community college can vary widely and will affect the type and quality of the partnerships that can be forged depending on the characteristics of the community in which they are examined. It is recommended that the social enterprise framework be employed in further case study research exploring community college programs in a wider variety of partnerships and community characteristics in order to examine the framework's efficacy and functional application.

Times are tough in public education and particularly given the current economic crisis that community colleges are experiencing, there is a need for fresh new approaches to enhance revenue streams, and develop market driven frameworks for program development thereby benefiting the burgeoning, diverse community of constituents that all community colleges serve. The need to leverage available resources and extend reach beyond the purview of state and local appropriations to sustain program and service operations calls for an innovative, collaborative solution that addresses the community colleges social purpose mission while applying the discipline and accountability embodied in social enterprise concepts. In the precarious environment of today's economic challenges, there could not be a better time to apply social entrepreneurship and social enterprise concepts to community college practice and conduct further evaluative research to enhance understanding and develop the literature on social enterprise and community colleges.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. B., & Dees, J. G. (2006). Rhetoric, reality, and research:

Building a solid foundation for the practice of social

entrepreneurship. In A. Nicholls, *Social entrepreneurship: New

models of sustainable social change* (pp. 144 -168). New York:

Oxford University Press.

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.a.) AACC Web site.

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/default.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.b.) AACC Web site.

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/significantevents.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.c.) AACC Web site.

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.). Characteristics of

community colleges. Retrieved April 2, 2008 from

http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/index_institutions.htm

America's Community Colleges: A Century of Innovation. (2001,

April/May). *Community College Journal.* 10-13. Retrieved

November 5, 2008 from

http://http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/ContentGroups/CC_Journ

al/april_My2001/p10-13.pdf

Avakian, A. N. (1995, June/July). Conflicting demands for adjunct faculty.

Community College Journal. 65(6) 34-36.

Bogdan, R. C., & Bilkin, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Brinckerhoff, P. C. (1994). *Mission based management: leading your nonprofit into the 21st century.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brinckerhoff, P. C. (1996). *Financial empowerment: More money for more mission.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brinckerhoff, P.C. (2000). *Social entrepreneurship: The art of mission-based venture development.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Brint, S. & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Budget Narrative and Abstract, South Florida Marine Technology Center of Excellence (n/d). Broward College (CBJTG) Community-Based Job Training Grant*.

Cheer fades as stocks plunge 9%. (2008, December 2). *New York Times.* Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/02/ business/02markets.html?_r=1&hp

Chow, P. (2007 July). Trends in international student enrollment at community colleges. *Connections: Community colleges in the U.S.* 1(3). Retrieved from http://educationusaconnections.iienetwork.org/file_depot/0-10000000/20000-30000/26726/folder/63728/Connections.vol.1.issue.3.pdf

Civic Ventures Purpose Prize. (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.purposeprize.org/

    finalists/winners2008.cfm

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college.*

    San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Community college engagement in community programs and services.

    AACC Research and Project Briefs. AACC Website. Retrieved

    November 14, 2008 from:

    http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/Briefs/Pages/

    rb03252002.aspx

Community College Research Center. (2002) Accountability and learning

    outcomes in community colleges. Retrieved November 14, 2008

    from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Seminar.asp?uid=8

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing*

    among the five approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Crutchfield, L. R. & Grant, H. M. (2008). *Forces for good: The six practices*

    of high-impact nonprofits. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Dees, J. G. (2001). *The meaning of "social entrepreneurship".* Center for

    the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship (CASE). Retrieved

    November 3, 2007 from:

    http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_sedef.pdf

Dees, J. G. (2003). *Social entrepreneurship is about innovation and*

   impact, not income. Center for the Advancement of Social

   Entrepreneurship(CASE). Retrieved June 12, 2007 from:

   http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/articles/1004/corner.htm

Dees, J. G. (March/ April 2007). Taking social entrepreneurship seriously.

   Society. 44(3*)* 24-31.

Dees, J.G., & Anderson, B.B. (2006). Framing a theory of social

   entrepreneurship: Building on two schools of practice and thought. In R.

   Mosher-Williams (Ed.), *Research on Social Entrepreneurship:*

   Understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field (pp. 39-66).

   ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series, 1(3).

Dees, J. G., Emerson, J., & Economy, P. (2001). *Enterprising nonprofits: A toolkit*

   for social entrepreneurs. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Dingfelder, D. C. R. (2007). *Exploring the dimensions of entrepreneurial*

   colleges. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 3283952).

Donham, B. (2003, November/ December). Maintaining high-tech

   programs on a low-tech budget. *Community College Journal.*

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins,*

   impacts, and futures of the community college. New York: SUNY Press.

Drayton, W. (2006). The citizen sector transformed. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social*

   entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change (pp.45-55).

   New York: Oxford Press.

Drayton, W. (2006, Winter). Everyone a changemaker: Social entrepreneurship's

ultimate goal. *innovations*. Retrieved from

http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/itgg.2006.1.180

Drucker, P. F. (1985) *Innovation and entrepreneurship.* New York:

HarperCollins Publishers.

Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the non-profit organization: Practices*

and principles. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Drucker, P. F. (1992). *The age of discontinuity.* New York: Harper & Row.

Drury, R. L. (1999). *Entrepreneurship education in the Virginia community*

college system. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT

9953707).

Drury, R. L. (2001, Spring). The entrepreneurial community college:

bringing workforce, economic and community development to Virginia

communities. *Inquiry, 6(1).* Retrieved from

http://www.vccaedu.org/inquiry/inquiry-spring2001/i-61-drury.html

"Economic Impact of the Recreational Marine Industry-Broward, Dade, and

Palm Beach Counties, Florida – 2005" for the Broward Alliance and

Marine Industries Association of South Florida. Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

January, 2006. Thomas J. Murray & Associates. Available from the Marine

Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) at 2312 South Andrews

Avenue - Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316

Esters, L. L. (2007). *The entrepreneurial community college president: a single state perspective. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 3300821).*

Evelyn, J. (2004, April 30). Community colleges at a crossroads. *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Vol. 50:34, p. A27-A28, Retrieved from EBSCO Host Database.

Farnsworth, K. (2006, October 27) The 4 lessons that community colleges can learn from for-profit institutions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 53 (10) B16-B18.

Florida Research and Economic Database (FRED). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://fred.labormarketinfo.com/

Florida Economic Outlook. (October 2008). Office of Economic and Demographic Research, The Florida legislature executive summary. Retrieved on January 6, 2009 from: http://edr.state.fl.us/conferences/fleconomic/ FEEC0810_execsumm.pdf.

Florida's Recreational Marine Industry-Economic Impact and Growth 1980-2005" for (MIASF) Marine Industries Association of Florida. (2005, November). Available from Thomas J. Murray & Associates at Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Email: tjm@vims.edu, Phone: (804) 684-7190

Fox, S. S. (2005). *A qualitative perception analysis of the Business Ownership Service System (BOSS) program: A performance based small business*

training program. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 3197395).

Friedman, T. L. (2006). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty- first century.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Hagan, E. (2004). *Entrepreneurship education: A new frontier for American community colleges.* ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 3162992).

Helm, S. (2004). Motivation for social entrepreneurship: Building and analytical framework. International Society for Third Sector Research. *ISTR Sixth International Conference Working Papers, Volume IV.* Retrieved June 12, 2007 from http://www.istr.org/conference/toronto/ workingpapers/ helm.scott.pdf

James, C. A. (2002). *A study of views about the inclusion of entrepreneurship education in community college programs.* ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 3103001).

Jones, B. R. (2005). *Drivers of change: Entrepreneurial leadership in the community college.* Retrieved June 1, 2007 from ProQuest Dissertation & Theses database. (AAT3203483).

Kelderman, E. (2008). Fresh round of state budget cuts hits higher education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved October 21, 2008 from http://chronicle.com/daily/2008/10/5085n.htm

Kenton, C. P., Schuh, J. H. & Huba, M.E. (2004, December). Funding models of community colleges in 10 Midwest states. *Community College Review.* 32 (3) 1-17.

King, D.A. (2005). *A qualitative analysis of major donor decisions in higher education.* (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 2005). ProQuest Dissertation & Theses database. (AAT 3178798).

Kisker, C., & Carducci, R. (2003, Winter). Community college partnerships with the private sector – Organizational contexts and models for successful collaboration. *UCLA Community College Review.* 31(3) 55-74.

Koh, H-K. (n.d.) *The impact of community colleges on international education.* Institute of International Education. Retrieved November 14, 2008 from: http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=42055

Kotula, J. R., & Decker, H. J. (1989). Managing the community college with an entrepreneurial spirit. League for Innovation in the Community College. *"Leadership 2000" Conference Proceedings, June 11-14, 1989,* San Francisco, CA. (ERIC database: ED340395).

Laanan, F. S. (2001). Accountability in community colleges: Looking toward the 21st century. In B. K. Townsend, B. & S. B. Twombly(Eds.), *Community colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 57-76). Westport, CN: Ablex Publishing.

Langrell, J. R. (1990). *Institution entrepreneurism in selected single-campus*

    Florida community colleges. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses database.

    (AAT 9024099).

Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in*

    the twenty first century. New York: Palgrave Publishers LTD.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S. T. & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At*

    work in the new economy. New York: Palgrove McMillian.

Light, P. C. (1998). *Sustaining innovation: Creating nonprofit and government*

    organizations that innovate naturally. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.

Light, P. C. (2006, Fall). Reshaping social entrepreneurship. *Stanford Social*

    Innovation Review. Retrieved from

    http://wagner.nyu.edu/performance/files/ReshapingSE.pdf.

Light, P. C. (2008). *The search for social entrepreneurship.* Washington, D.C.:

    Brookings Institution Press.

Marine Workforce Study for the Tri-County Region. (2008, June 30). Center for

    Urban and Environmental Solutions at Florida Atlantic University.

Marine Workforce Study for the Tri-County Region, Executive Summary. (2008).

    Retrieved from http://www.wf1broward.com/upload/4184/

    Marine_Workforce_Executive_Summary.pdf)

Martin, R. L., & Osberg, S. (2007 Spring). Social entrepreneurship: The case for

    definition. *Stanford Social Innovation Review.* (pp. 29-39). Retrieved from

    http://www.ssireview.org

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.*

　　San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in*

　　education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S., & Simpson, E.L. (2000). *A guide to research for educators*

　　and trainers of adults (2nd ed). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing

　　Company.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M.A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed).*

　　Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Moltz, David. (2008, August 22) The community college enrollment boom.

　　Inside Higher Education. Retrieved from:

　　http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2008/08/22/growth

Nicholls, A. (2006). Introduction. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social*

　　entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable change (pp. 1-35).

　　New York: Oxford University Press.

Nicholls, A., & Cho, A.H. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: The structuration of a

　　field. In A. Nicholls (Ed.), *Social entrepreneurship: New models of*

　　sustainable change (pp. 99-118). New York: Oxford University Press.

Office of Public Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA).

　　(2007, December). *Legislature may wish to consider options for enhancing*

　　Florida's recreational marine industry, Report No. 07-48. Retrieved from:

　　http://www.oppaga.state.fl.us/reports/econ/r07-48s.html

Pathways to encore careers: How 10 community colleges are preparing boomers

  for encore careers. (2008, October). MetLife Foundation/ Civic Ventures.

  Retrieved November 5, 2008 from:

  http://www.civicventures.org/communitycollege/reports/ECCreport.pdf

Phelan, D. J. (2005, Winter). The changing role of the President as a

    fiscal leader. *New Directions for Community Colleges.* (32) 87-98.

Phillippe, K. A., & Sullivan, L. G. (2005). *National profile of community*

  colleges: Trends and statistics. Washington, D.C.: Community

  College Press.

Roueche, J. E., & Jones, B. (2005). *The entrepreneurial community*

  college. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

Samuelson, R. J. (2008, November 10). The economy - A darker future for us.

  Newsweek. (19) 29-30.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development.* Cambridge:

  Harvard University Press.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy* (3rd Ed.) New

  York: Harper.

Schwab Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship. (n.d.) *Five year evaluation*

  report, 2000-2005. Retrieved from

  http://www.weforum.org/pdf/schwabfound/EvaReport_SchwabFoundation

  _200_2005.pdf

Seidel, J. (1998). *Qualitative data analysis.* Retrieved on May 16, 2008

  from http://www.qualisresearch.com

Selingo, J. J. (2008, November 7). State budgets are likely to squeeze 2

  year colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* 55(11) p. A1.

Shults, C. (2001). The critical impact of impending retirements on

  community college leadership. *American Association of Community*

  Colleges Research Brief, Leadership Series. (1) 1-12. Retrieved

  November 14, 2008 from

  http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/Briefs/Documents/1106200

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics,*

  policies and the entrepreneurial university. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins

  University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004*). Academic capitalism and the new*

  economy: Markets, state and higher education. Baltimore: Johns

  Hopkins University Press.

Smith, K. C. (2007). *The development of an associate degree in*

  entrepreneurship at Delaware Technical & Community College Jack. F.

  Owens Campus business administration technology. ProQuest

  Dissertation & Theses database. (AAT 3247700).

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S.

  Lincoln (Eds), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research.*

  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publishers.

Study of Policies Regarding the Use of Adjunct Faculty. (1998, November

17). State Council of Higher Education for Virginia [Report].

Retrieved November 14, 2008 from:

http://www.schev.edu/Reportstats/adjunct98.pdf?from=

Stromquist, N. P. (2002). The university as the spearhead of globalization.

Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power,

technology and knowledge. (pp. 103-132). Lanham: Rowman &

Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Suarez-Orozco, M. M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (2004). *Globalization: Culture*

and education in the new millennium. Berkley: University of California

Press.

Sygielski, J. J. (1998). *The community college's role in workforce development:*

Competing perspectives. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database.

(AAT 9918729).

The National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education. *Measuring up 2000:*

The state by state report card for higher education. Retrieved from

http://measuringup.highereducation.org/2000

The State of the Broward Economy. (2008 Fall). Broward County Planning

  Services Division. Retrieved from

  http://www.broward.org/planningservices/stateofbroweconomy2008.pdf

Vanwagoner, R. J., Bowman, L. S. & Spraggs, L. G. (2005, Fall) Editor's choice:

  The significant community college. *Community College Review.* 33(1)

  38-50.

Wiers, A. J. (2007). *A partnership of education and entertainment: A case study*

  of the Larry Gatlin School of Entertainment Technology at Guilford

  Technical Community College. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database.

  (AAT 3268379).

Williams, G. R. (1997). *Factors influencing the management of self-supporting*

  continuing education profit centers at selected mid-Atlantic community

  colleges. ProQuest Dissertation & Theses Database. (AAT 9731509).

Willis. J. W. (2007). *Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and*

  critical approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Zakaria, F. (2008, October 20). The economy – There is a silver lining.

  Newsweek. (16) 27-29.

Zumeta, W. (2003). Higher education finances: In recession again. *The NEA*

  2003 Almanac of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National

  Education Association.

APPENDIX A
Informed Consent - Participant

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study that will take place from January 2008 to May 2009. This form outlines the purpose of the study and provides a description of your involvement and rights as a participant.

I consent to participate in a research project conducted by Rosanna S. Diaz, a doctoral student at National-Louis University located in Chicago, Illinois.

I understand that this study is entitled Higher Education and the New Capitalism: Social Enterprise Partnerships and the Opportunity for Community Colleges. The purpose of the study is to explore social enterprise as a conceptual framework for developing sustainable revenue streams and innovative programs at community colleges.

I understand that my participation will consist of one interview lasting 1 – 2 hours in length with a possible second, follow-up interview lasting 1 - 2 hours in length. I understand that I will receive a copy of my transcribed interview at which time I may clarify information.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and can be discontinued at any time until the completion of the dissertation.

I understand that only the researcher, Rosanna S. Diaz, will have access to a secured file cabinet in which will be kept all transcripts, taped recordings, and field notes from the interview(s) in which I participated.

I understand that the results of this study may be published or otherwise reported to scientific bodies, but my identity will in no way be revealed.

I understand there are no anticipated risks or benefits to me any greater than that encountered in daily life. Further, the information garnered from the study will be of benefit to community college administrators and their partner organizations.

I understand that in the event I have questions or require additional information I may contact the researcher: Rosanna S. Diaz, 5030 North Monticello, Chicago, IL 60625, Email address: rosanna.diaz@nl.edu

If you have any concerns or questions before or during participation that you feel have not been addressed by me, you may contact my Primary Advisor and Dissertation Chair: Dr. Diane Oliver, National Louis University, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, 60603, 312-261-3728; Email address: diane.oliver@nl.edu

Participant's Signature _____   Date_____

Researcher's Signature _____   Date_____

APPENDIX B

Confidentiality Agreement
Data Transcriptionist

This confidentiality form articulates the agreement made between Rosanna S. Diaz, the researcher, and Cheryl Peterson.

I understand and acknowledge that by transcribing the audiotapes provided to me by Rosanna S. Diaz, that I will be exposed to confidential information about the research study and the research participants. In providing transcription services, at no time will I reveal or discuss any of the information of which I have been exposed.

In addition, at no time will I maintain copies of the electronic or paper documents generated. Further, upon completing each transcription, I agree to provide the electronic and paper documents to the researcher:

Rosanna S. Diaz
5030 North Monticello
Chicago, IL 60625
Email address: rosanna.diaz@nl.edu
rdiaz123@sbcglobal.net

I understand that a breach of this agreement as described above could result in personal and professional harm to the research participants for which I will be held legally responsible.

Transcriptionist's Signature _____   Date_____

Researcher's Signature _____   Date_____

APPENDIX C

Interview Discussion Guides

PARTNERS/ ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Broward Community College

Marine Engineering Management Program

Participant's Name _____

Company _____

Title _____

Affiliation with BCC Marine Engineering Management Program

_____

1. How would you describe your involvement with the BCC Marine Engineering
Management Program?

2. What was the genesis of your involvement with the program? How and when did you
originally become involved?

3. What do you contribute to the program as a partner/ Advisory Committee Member?

4. What have been some of the biggest challenges for the Marine Engineering
Management program? PROBES: development, funding, curriculum, recruiting students,
faculty, etc

BCC PARTNERS, Discussion Guide, Page Two

5. What has each of the partners (BCC, MIASF, Advisory) contributed to the program?

Building/physical plant	Student recruitment/ advertising
Funding/seed money/ cash	Faculty recruitment
Program design	Internships
Equipment/ technology	Employ Grads
Curriculum/ technical advice	Community relations/ Publicity

6. What do you see as the biggest advantage(s) of the partnership?

7. What do you see as the greatest disadvantage(s) of the partnership?

8. What if anything would you change/ do differently regarding the partnership?

                                                                                    program?

Interview Discussion Guide
DEAN/ Staff
Broward Community College
Marine Engineering Management Program

Participant's Name _____

Company _____

Title _____

Affiliation with BCC Marine Engineering Management Program

---

1. Can you describe the genesis of the Marine Engineering Management program at BCC? Where did the original idea come from? How long did the development process take from conception to inception?

2. How was the framework for the program originally conceived?

3. Where did the original/ seed funding for the program come from? BCC? Grant? DOC? Donations? Foundation? Private Partners? Other?

4. What have been some of the biggest challenges for the Marine Engineering Management program at BCC? PROBES: development process, funding, curriculum, recruiting students, faculty, etc.

5. How was the program curriculum developed? Who had input to curriculum development? BCC? Partners? Advisory Committee? Others?

BCC DEAN, Discussion Guide, Page Two

6. Are students required to complete an internship or practicum? How are sites chosen and assigned?

7. How is the program marketed? Students and faculty recruited?

8. How was the Advisory Committee selected? Who is on the committee? Where and how often do they meet? (ATTACH LIST)

9. What does each of the partners (BCC, MIASF, Advisory Committee) contribute to the program? Anything else?

Building/physical plant	Student recruitment/ advertising
Funding/seed money/ cash	Faculty recruitment
Program design	Internships
Equipment/ technology	Employ Grads
Curriculum/ technical advice	Community relations/ Publicity

10. What if anything would you change or do differently regarding the program?

11. Enrollment Figures:
> Current
> Projected

12. Plans to sustain program beyond grant funding? Budget (ATTACH BUDGET)

Interview Discussion Guide
FOUNDATION DIRECTOR
Broward College

QUESTIONS REGARDING THE MARINE ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM:

1.   How would you describe your involvement with the Broward College Marine Engineering Management Program?

2.   What was the genesis of your involvement with the program/ How and when did you originally become involved?

3.   How have you/ your office specifically contributed to the Marine Engineering Management Program?

4.   Where have you found the greatest community/ private support for the program?

5.   What have been some of the biggest challenges for the Marine Engineering Management Program?

6.   What do you see as the biggest advantage of the partnership?

7.   What do you see as the biggest disadvantage of the partnership?

8.   What if anything would you change/ do differently regarding the program or partnership?

Interview Discussion Guide
FOUNDATION DIRECTOR
Broward College

QUESTIONS REGARDING NEW PROGRAM INITIATIVES IN GENERAL:

1.   Please describe your involvement with the new program development process.

2.   How new program initiatives are typically funded?

3.   What types of program partnerships exist at the college?

4.   How are these partnerships typically developed, i.e. where do they originate?

5.   What do you consider to be the college's most successful new program?

6.   What do you consider to be the college's most successful program partnership?

APPENDIX D

Marine Engineering Management - Associate in Science

Year 1 Semester 1
ENC1101 English Composition
MNA1161 Intro to Customer
MTE1004C Intro to Marine Technology
MTE1400 C Marine Electricity
MTE2490C Marine Electronics   15 hours

Year 1 Semester 2
SPC1024 Intro to Speech or
SPC1600 Intro to Public Speaking
MTE 1018C Rigging & Make Ready
CHM 1025 Intro to Chemistry and
CHM 1025L Intro to Chemistry Lab or
PHY1001 Applied Physics and
PHY1001L Applied Physics Lab
MTE 1040C Marine Diesel 1
MTE 2041C Marine Diesel 2   16 hours

Year 1 Semester 3
HUM Humanities Elective
MNA 2345 Principles of Supervision
MTE 2949 Marine Internship Co-op   8 hours

Year 2 Semester 1
Area 3 Social Behavioral Science
MTE 1542C A/C & Refrigeration Systems
MTE 2541C Marine Aux Systems
MTE 1167C Marine Fuel Systems, Diesel and Gas 12 hours

Year 2 Semester 2
MAC 1105 College Algebra
MAN 2021 Intro to Management
MTE 2420C Advanced Electricity
MTE 2234C Inboard/Outboard Saildrive
MTE 1312C Advanced Marine Composites   15 hours

Total Semester Hours   66 Hours

Note: Students must fulfill the computer literacy general education requirements within the first 15 hours of BC credit by successfully completing the basic student technology test or pass the CGS1060C to earn the degree (http://www.BC.edu/images/ProgramSheets/2198.pdf).