

4

Social Entrepreneurship

Social entrepreneurship is one of the most powerful and important ideas to emerge in our society in recent years, and it is having a dramatic impact on every major university. A decade ago, the term was known only to a few theoreticians and isolated groups of enlightened idealists; just over five years ago an article in the *New York Times* describing the new field was considered to be groundbreaking.¹ Today, a Google search of the term results in 1.3 million hits, and tens of thousands of nongovernmental organizations now characterize themselves or their founders as “social entrepreneurs.” Influential commentators characterize the movement as the wave of the future—a compelling and effective means of employing philanthropic resources of all forms. Those who believe the research university must attack the world’s biggest problems cannot ignore this remarkable movement. Its development illustrates a central thesis of this book: when entrepreneurship is added to a mix that already includes significant financial and human resources and passion, remarkable things can happen.

The desire to heal the world and make things better is as old as civilization itself. By the turn of the nineteenth century, the idea of “scientific charity” emerged. The idea was that “modern” principles in health, education, and commerce could usefully be applied to the plight of the poor. The work of Florence Nightingale, the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and Goodwill Industries are popular examples of the results of this movement. Still, the word “entrepreneur-

ship" was seldom expressly associated with the impulse to "change the world," although Andrew Carnegie, in his essay "The Gospel of Wealth," paved the way. That changed in the late 1990s when the idea that entrepreneurship could have broad implications for the social sector began to take hold. Lord Young of Dartington, one of Britain's foremost social entrepreneurs, founded the School for Social Entrepreneurs in 1998. At around the same time, Bill Drayton, an early leader in the movement, began to characterize his Ashoka Fellows, a group committed to solving the world's most pressing problems through systematic change, as "social entrepreneurs" with the potential to bring about significant social change in a country or a multinational region. Large philanthropic funds and foundations began to emerge with "social entrepreneurship" as their mission. In fact, Ashoka's 1998 annual report was entitled "Leading Social Entrepreneurs." Words such as *sustainability* and *accountability* became central to the missions of organizations of all kinds that aspire to make a positive difference in the world. These groups wanted to go beyond the traditional donor-NGO relationship, to think more creatively, and to bring innovation to the process of social change. Most significant, high-visibility entrepreneurs began to employ their skills in activities, both nonprofit and for profit, to effect substantial social changes. The revelation that doing well and doing good need not be mutually exclusive led many in both sectors to believe that profit-seeking ventures could have an important role in addressing vast problems. The line between the private sector and the civic sector began to blur. What had begun as an obscure idea barely a decade ago had emerged as a full-fledged social movement.

What Is Social Entrepreneurship?

Like the definition of entrepreneurship itself, a definition of social entrepreneurship is elusive. It is difficult to capture in the definition the breadth and power of the concept without making it so inclusive that it loses its meaning. We will begin with a specific example of a social entrepreneur and then work backward toward a general definition. In 2006, Muhammad Yunus became the world's best-known social entrepreneur when he received the Nobel Peace Prize. Yunus grew up in Bangladesh and was trained in the United States as an economist and banker. He returned home to serve as a government bureaucrat and sought to establish a factory in his spare time. In 1976, Yunus encountered a group of forty-three women in the small village of Jobra

who scratched out a subsistence making bamboo furniture, but most of their income went to pay interest on usurious loans. Yunus lent the women twenty-seven dollars out of his own pocket and guaranteed them a larger loan if the initial loan was repaid.

These were the humble beginnings of what would become Grameen Bank. Yunus believed that placing lending decisions in the hands of small organized groups like the women in Jobra would dramatically increase the likelihood of repayment. The concept quickly expanded to other “unbankable” groups typically thought to be beyond the reach of any conventional financial institution. Over time, the practice became known as “microcredit,” and it has taken hold in virtually all parts of the developing world. The Grameen Bank itself has lent more than \$6.38 billion to 7.4 million borrowers. The same basic principles used to found Grameen Bank have been employed to establish Grameenphone, the largest private telephone company in Bangladesh. A number of other enterprises aimed at providing goods and services to the poorest members of Bangladeshi society have followed suit.

In its citation, the Nobel Prize committee characterized Muhammad Yunus as someone who “translated visions into practical actions for the benefit of millions of people,” and these words might also characterize a successful social entrepreneur. Yunus tested and applied concepts originally enunciated by Akhtar Hameed Khan, founder of the Pakistani Academy for Rural Development. Most of Yunus’s for-profit and nonprofit enterprises are self-sustaining despite requiring initial support from government or other outside sources. Yunus was driven to dramatically reduce poverty in one of the poorest countries in the world, and he applied principles learned as an economist and banker to create a practical and sustainable business model that could be scaled to encompass the entire country. His original concept involved a dramatic innovation: the notion that very small loans could be made successfully to very poor people. Yunus’s Grameen Bank not only brought capital—and ultimately goods and services—to underserved markets, but it also created new markets that did not exist until his innovative ideas revealed them. From the beginning, Yunus embraced market principles; he understood that unless loans were repaid, including a reasonable rate of return on the principal, he could not sustain and grow his vision.

Of course, there is only one Muhammad Yunus, but his story suggests the outline for a definition of social entrepreneurship. Peter Drucker reminds us that “entrepreneurship is by no means confined to economic institutions.”² Duke University’s Professor Gregory Dees,

one of the intellectual leaders of the social entrepreneurship movement, says social entrepreneurs reach across sectors to effectively address the world's biggest problems. Social entrepreneurs blend social purpose with an entrepreneurial orientation. They value results over good intentions and are not particularly concerned whether their enterprises are for profit or nonprofit. They set clear goals, demand accountability, and embrace built-in feedback mechanisms that routinely measure profit and loss. They believe in market-based solutions but understand that not all projects can be sustained without outside support. Even self-sustaining enterprises need seed capital in the form of grants and contributions. Social entrepreneurs innovate with the relentless drive and enthusiasm common to all entrepreneurs, and they employ many of the same skills that are required to succeed in the commercial sector.

Why Is Social Entrepreneurship Important?

Social entrepreneurs will play a central role in responding to the challenges of the modern world, and we believe their presence will vastly increase the impact research universities have in addressing these problems. Aside from this lofty vision of the social entrepreneur's new role, there are more practical reasons why embracing social entrepreneurship makes sense for a research university.

The first is that students are passionate about it. Idealism is alive and well on college campuses, and there is evidence it currently thrives at a level unprecedented since the late sixties. Teach for America (TFA), a program that sends students from elite universities to teach in urban settings, is the largest employer of recent graduates from our campus, and 11 percent of the graduating class at Harvard applied to the program in 2008. In 2004, young voters reversed decades of declining participation, and in 2008 they turned out in numbers not seen since 1972. Professor Jeffrey Sachs, sometimes with the help of rock star Bono, routinely draws standing-room-only audiences to hear him talk about eliminating extreme poverty worldwide by 2015. Universities are responding to student activism with grants and tuition credits for students who forgo lucrative employment immediately after graduation in favor of lower-paying jobs that will improve the world. Among students we have mentored over the last several years, many are interested in dedicating their talents to social ends using modern techniques such as social entrepreneurship. They have plans of their

own in this area and are anxious to acquire the skills necessary to turn their ideas into reality.

For example, after studying the history and current status of Teach for America, one of our classes drafted a strategic plan and presented it to TFA founder Wendy Kopp. Kopp engaged in a class discussion as to how TFA's success—and the impact of the program's teachers—ought to be measured. Our class offered a critique of Kopp's expansion strategy and suggested that obtaining critical mass in fewer school districts might make more sense than placing teachers in a larger number of districts.

In another class, after concluding that environmental remediation was an issue of critical importance, we had a session with Tom Darden, founder and CEO of Cherokee Investments, a private equity fund of nearly \$2 billion focused on, among other things, brownfield remediation, with over 500 projects throughout North America and Europe. Cherokee purchases real estate unattractive to other buyers because of environmental problems, cleans up the sites, and sells or develops them for a profit. Our class used Cherokee's example to discuss strategy. Students wanted to understand the motivation of Cherokee's investors and the kind of return that was required in order to continue to attract capital. They also wanted to understand Cherokee's sustainable competitive advantage in light of the large number of copycat funds that were emerging. Ultimately, several new strategies emerged based on Cherokee's unique competencies, and at the end of class a group of students were anxious to pursue the discussion.

Gary Hirshberg, a lifelong environmentalist and CEO of Stonyfield Farm, the world's largest organic yogurt producer, suggested that for-profit enterprises would lead in addressing global warming. Hirshberg made it known that he was not devoting any of his own time or energy to enterprises addressing global warming that were not profit based. In a recent collaboration with Muhammad Yunus, Hirshberg arranged a partnership between the Danone Group (parent of the Dannon Yogurt Company) and Grameen Group to create a social business venture that would produce inexpensive dairy products in Bangladesh. The use of profit-generating models enables Hirshberg and Yunus to develop scalable and sustainable enterprises that can have a measurable impact on nutrition in Bangladesh and elsewhere.

There has never been a shortage of idealism on college campuses, but now idealists are beginning to embrace many of the principles of

entrepreneurship. Measurable results are important. They do not discriminate between for-profit and nonprofit models to effect change. They are eager to make use of the tools employed by entrepreneurs—and they want to learn to think like entrepreneurs—but they have their own plans for making the world a better place.

The second reason for embracing social entrepreneurship on campus is that faculty respond to it. In fact, it can be the key to winning the hearts and minds of the faculty in the core disciplines at research universities. This was one of our premises at the beginning of our efforts to make entrepreneurship an important part of the intellectual fabric at UNC. The past five years have proven it to be true. We made Bill Drayton, a pioneer of social entrepreneurship and CEO of Ashoka, our first keynote speaker on entrepreneurship. Drayton has been laboring for thirty years to address the world's most difficult problems. In a series of meetings with faculty, students, and others, he described the efforts of Ashoka Fellows to create lasting social change and their realization that social change often requires entrepreneurial underpinnings in order to be sustainable. In essence, Drayton provided a seal of approval for the marriage of idealism and entrepreneurship that could not have come from those who could be perceived as having an agenda to bring entrepreneurship onto the campus. He also introduced a new way of communicating the tenets of social entrepreneurship that allowed academics of all stripes to embrace it as a practice consistent with their values.

The results of Drayton's visit were significant. An ongoing faculty seminar led by the chair of the faculty and attended by two other chairs was established. Serious scholarly research in anthropology grew out of that seminar. Ultimately, the university recruited an academic with research interests in social entrepreneurship. Departments began to compete to become the home for the social entrepreneurship curriculum. With respected senior faculty embracing entrepreneurship, younger faculty members were encouraged to join in. Though perhaps still a negative word to some, entrepreneurship had become a respectable topic of conversation, and thinking entrepreneurially was not only tolerated but encouraged by the university community. Social entrepreneurship was the key.

A third reason for advancing social entrepreneurship in the academy is that it offers an intellectual invitation for attacking big problems. In an institution like a research university, merely resolving to take on these challenges is usually not enough to foster more than a small number of unconnected, one-off projects funded by outside founda-

tions or agencies. When the funding goes away, the projects disappear as well. A clear intellectual framework and vocabulary are required to make entrepreneurship a part of university culture. The field of social entrepreneurship offers a unifying structure that connects multiple departments and disciplines within the university. It also connects the university to other like-minded educational institutions, private foundations, and an emerging social movement.

Typically, the first step in effecting cultural change involves creating a social entrepreneurship curriculum—by no means a novel idea. Less than a decade ago Stanford founded a social entrepreneurship workshop to employ Silicon Valley principles to attack social problems. The workshop, which draws on schools as varied as design, law, and mechanical engineering, was founded partly in response to students who demanded assistance with projects important to them. Five years later, a similar workshop was offered at Harvard's Kennedy School as part of the Reynolds Foundation Fellowships in Social Entrepreneurship, which also included the Schools of Education and Public Health. By now, similar programs exist at many research universities. Occasionally the programs spawn small but important enterprises and projects. We would hasten to add that as social entrepreneurship grows and evolves, distinguishing it from entrepreneurship in general becomes more difficult. Certainly, the for-profit versus nonprofit distinction is no longer determinative; so many profit-making ventures have important social components. If a broad definition of entrepreneurship is adopted the need to carve out social entrepreneurship as a course of study separate from general entrepreneurship may not be necessary.

Early efforts to teach social entrepreneurship had an important effect on the burgeoning field of study. Pioneers in the field relied on a highly anecdotal approach, lacking academic rigor. The need to build a legitimate academic curriculum compelled innovative scholars such as Gregory Dees at Duke to begin to define social entrepreneurship more precisely and lay out an academic framework for faculty; simultaneously, an increasing number of successful programs were emerging in response to student interest. Powerful and influential new institutions such as the Gates Foundation began legitimizing and supporting social entrepreneurship as an important means of attacking great problems. Bill Gates summed up his foundation's new approach: "We have to find a way to make aspects of capitalism that serve wealthier people serve poorer people as well."³ Jeff Skoll, the first president of eBay, endowed the Skoll Foundation with \$250 million to

movement by giving \$100 million to Tufts University with the understanding that the gift would be invested in entities such as Muhammad Yunus's Grameen Bank. According to Tufts president Lawrence Bacow, this gift would not have come to Tufts if there had not been a willingness to undertake an investment strategy centered around new financial institutions that have adopted a strategy for empowering the poor through microloans. Omidyar was willing for the income from his gift to be used for a broad range of projects at Tufts so long as the corpus was invested in ways that were consistent with the Omidyar microfinance strategy. On a much smaller scale, business schools at Oxford, Harvard, Stanford, and Duke have all attracted donor support for scholarship in social entrepreneurship.

The high-profile gifts by Skoll and Omidyar and the widespread interest in social entrepreneurship among influential entrepreneurs worldwide present a particularly attractive opportunity for research universities. Social entrepreneurship is entering the mainstream, and donors—especially entrepreneurial donors—will be increasingly willing to support the effort. The Skoll Centre serves as a model for what can be done within a traditional academic framework, and there will certainly be interest in moving beyond the business school (where the Skoll Centre is housed) to other venues within the university. But there is an opportunity here for doing more than just raising money. Social entrepreneurship offers a framework and a vocabulary for engaging important donors in the work of the university. Initially, entrepreneurs want to contribute because the project is something they understand and they have strong ideas about how it should be executed. As they become more involved in execution, they grow more committed to the effort and are therefore more likely to provide additional funds.

How Does It Work?

Having described the broad impact of social entrepreneurship on college campuses, we now turn to three specific examples.

MICROFINANCE AT TUFTS UNIVERSITY

Pierre Omidyar and his wife, Pam, are graduates of Tufts University. Before Larry Bacow was installed as university president, the Omidyars were generous contributors, and both served the school in various capacities. Bacow, an economist from MIT, had ambitious plans for the institution, beginning with a \$1.2 billion fundraising campaign called Beyond Boundaries. Few other universities had a pair of young

alumni as affluent as the Omidyars. When eBay went public in 1995, Omidyar was thirty-two, and his share of the company was estimated to be worth \$1 billion. In early talks with Bacow, Omidyar made it clear that he considered funds invested as part of a large endowment to be "lazy capital." Large endowments often return a mere 5 percent of their value to the university every year; Omidyar wanted his money to have a more immediate impact.

After meeting with Muhammad Yunus and a group of influential Silicon Valley CEOs in November 2004, Omidyar saw the link between microfinance and his work at eBay. Both endeavors involved individuals "discovering their power" and facilitated social change.⁷ The Silicon Valley CEOs calculated that it would take \$65 billion to meet the capital requirements of a fully funded worldwide microlending effort as outlined by Yunus—a sum that could not be raised with a strictly philanthropic approach. But since microfinance had a proven track record of achieving a return on investment, Omidyar considered a different approach: everyone in the room would need to pledge 1 percent of their net worth (an amount they estimated to be \$30 billion) to their alma maters with the understanding that the corpus was to be invested in microfinance and the income used in a manner satisfactory to the contributor and the institution.⁸ There was interest in the plan, but the conversation quickly focused on technical matters that Omidyar could not answer. Everyone agreed that the plan was enticing, if only Omidyar could address the details.

Not surprisingly, Omidyar accepted the challenge and engaged Bacow in a conversation to find a way for his contributions to Tufts to be invested in the kind of microfinance activities spawned by Yunus and his disciples. The fact that he was willing to contribute \$100 million to Tufts if the mechanics could be resolved added a certain urgency to the dialogue. Bacow knew Omidyar's proposition was a zero-sum game: either the institution determined how to make Omidyar's proposal work and got \$100 million, or it got nothing.

Ultimately the Omidyar-Tufts Microfinance Fund (OTMF) was established as a separate tax-exempt legal entity. It derives its tax-exempt status by virtue of the control exerted by Tufts, but Omidyar and his advisor, Michael Mohr, participate as board members. Entrepreneurs have short time horizons, and Omidyar was eager to demonstrate the investment model. The OTMF mandate is to be fully invested within thirty-six months. Income and return from investments are split equally between reinvestment in the fund and expendable funds for Tufts. Because of the unpredictability of the returns, Tufts

is dedicating its share to discretionary spending that can be scaled in either direction depending on the success of its investments.

Predictably, things have not gone exactly as planned, but many of the surprises have been good ones. Rather than indirect investments through other funds, direct investments, at least initially, have predominated. As a result, Tufts investment officers have developed valuable expertise in microfinance and view it as an alternative investment along the lines of venture capital or real estate. In fact, Bacow described the OTMF as a kind of venture capital fund for microfinance. At the moment, the fund is dealing with two countervailing developments. On the one hand, the field has become crowded, and not all of the players are looking for an investment-like return. On the other, microfinance itself is rapidly evolving from a small-loan model to a financial services approach that dramatically increases the kind and number of enterprises available for OTMF investment. Bacow is optimistic that some early investments may result in exceptional returns, but both he and Omidyar are certain there will be bumps along the way. Taking the attitude of a true entrepreneur, Omidyar said, "I'm sure we will learn a lot in the process."⁹

The OTMF has also had what Bacow calls "a transformative effect" on Tufts.¹⁰ Faculty and students have become actively engaged in a variety of world problems through the Institute for Global Leadership. Research on microfinance has been funded through the Department of Economics and the profile of the school's commitment to social entrepreneurship has never been higher. The next several years will determine the dimensions and sustainability of the transformation Bacow describes, but there is little doubt Omidyar's fund will be viewed as a groundbreaking development for social entrepreneurship at a research university.

REDUCING TOBACCO USE AND JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

For years, Michael Bloomberg has ardently campaigned against smoking. He has also been a loyal and generous supporter of Johns Hopkins University, serving as the chairman of its Board of Trustees and as a lead donor to the Bloomberg School of Public Health, generally acknowledged as the top school in the field. Bloomberg's unique understanding of the smoking issue and his appreciation of the resources of a university such as Johns Hopkins gave rise in 2005 to the multifaceted Bloomberg Initiative to Reduce Tobacco Use. Bloomberg's efforts exemplify an entrepreneurial mindset; from the outset, he sought to leverage the resources he contributed by involving a wide

array of others in his effort. At Hopkins he reached beyond the School of Public Health to involve the Center for Communications Programs and departments of Epidemiology, Biostatistics, Environmental Health Sciences, Health Behavior and Society, and International Health. This team would have been ideal if research alone was what Bloomberg had in mind—but making a dent in worldwide tobacco use would take more than just research, and he knew it. Bloomberg commissioned a study led by the World Health Organization that concluded that the direct and indirect effects of tobacco make smoking the world's number one health hazard and contribute to scores of serious diseases. The study also established clearly defined milestones and metrics, another hallmark of entrepreneurial thinking, to measure the effects of the Bloomberg Initiative. Three other outside organizations were also recruited to the effort: the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the World Lung Foundation, and the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. Bloomberg had the pieces in place and a plan for attacking the problem.

Bloomberg's initiative had been launched over a two-year period with the support of an initial grant of \$125 million. But he was far from done. On July 24, 2008, Bloomberg and the Gates Foundation joined together to commit \$500 million toward an effort called MPower which will implement the work of the Bloomberg antismoking initiative with special emphasis on China, Russia, India, Indonesia, and Bangladesh. Without question, Johns Hopkins has become the center of the universe when it comes to reducing tobacco use. Leaders from around the world attend its Institute for Global Tobacco Control Leadership Program. Five university departments and the School of Public Health have collaborated in the effort. Successfully employing an entrepreneurial approach, Bloomberg brought together a breath-taking array of financial and human resources to focus upon an important problem. He established clearly defined goals and identifiable metrics for success. This is exactly what we have in mind when we characterize entrepreneurship as the missing ingredient on university campuses. When it is added to an already-fertile mix, astounding things can happen.

ATTACKING WORLD HUNGER AT UNC

Kelly Fogelman, a medical student at the University of North Carolina, was doing health assessments at a Nicaraguan orphanage in the summer of 2000. Known as Los Chavalitos, the orphanage founded by Alejandro Obando serves twenty-two children and is located on a farm

with a small staff and a few animals. Kelly's assessment revealed the children needed better nutrition than what was available. The answer was chickens. Thirty hens would produce enough eggs to feed the orphanage as well as generate revenue by selling the excess at a local market. But how does a financially strapped medical student provide the funds to buy nearly thirty chickens and construct a chicken coop? The solution came to be known as Hunger Lunch.

Like most entrepreneurial ideas, the basics of Hunger Lunch are simple. Donated food is used to provide UNC students with a rice-and-bean lunch at a minimal cost. The weekly lunches bring in money to support hunger-related programs and increase awareness of world hunger at the same time. Upon returning to school, Fogelman implemented the model by holding a Hunger Lunch twice a month at the UNC medical school. Food was supplied by the hospital cafeteria, a price of three dollars per plate was established, and student volunteers served the meals. At the end of the school year, profits amounted to about \$2,500, enough to construct a chicken coop at Los Chavalitos and purchase thirty hens. Soon, those hens were laying twenty-five eggs per day, meeting the requirements of the orphanage and leaving a surplus of eggs to sell at the local market. Obando started a bank account with the profits and continued to use the money to finance and improve his operation.

With the model established, and with one year of experience, the question was could it be expanded? A sophomore premed student named Sindhura Citineni picked up the mantle. She heard Fogelman tell the Hunger Lunch story at a public service seminar and immediately saw the potential. At 3 A.M. the next morning, she came across an online map of the world with blinking lights. When a light blinks, it is because a person has died from malnutrition. Citineni had spent her eighth-grade year in India and had mental images of people in extreme poverty that she had seen but never talked to. That night "a switch went off." She wondered, "what if that [person in extreme poverty] was my dad," realizing that "he was someone's dad or brother."¹¹ The next day she met with the manager of Lenoir Hall, the campus dining center, and negotiated a deal. The rice, beans, and cornbread would be supplied for a dollar, and she would sell it for three. With \$150 of her own money, Citineni launched Hunger Lunch on the main UNC campus and cleared \$450 the first day—a sign that the model might have "legs."

The next step was to build an infrastructure that would move Sindhura's vision of a student-led attack on world hunger into a sustain-

able enterprise. She recruited a number of students to help her, and they entered a business plan competition for social ventures. One of her associates, Joel Thomas, emerged as her “inside operator” to complement her visionary leadership. The group quickly reached two conclusions: they wanted to turn Hunger Lunch into a national student organization, and they did not have the skills to do so. Not surprisingly, they decided to act on both propositions simultaneously. The organization was renamed Nourish International, and chapters were established on the campuses of Duke, North Carolina State, and Elon University. Weekly Hunger Lunches remained the cornerstone of the group’s revenue-generating activities, and scores of students were sent each summer to work on hunger-related projects in Africa and Latin America. At the same time, Thomas and a number of his colleagues enrolled in the minor in entrepreneurship at UNC, and Nourish International became part of the campus Launching the Venture program (discussed in Chapter 3). Business models were conceived, debated, and reworked at the same time the organization was actually implementing its plan. At the heart of the discussions was the issue of sustainability: how could Nourish avoid the old donor model and create a series of activities that would consistently generate income to support its mission? The fundamental mission of the organization was also honed. Could Nourish truly have a measurable impact on world hunger, or should it focus more on providing college students with a life-changing experience that would, over time, build a national constituency for attacking the problem? Should the group focus only on a few projects and send all of their students each summer to work on them, or should each Nourish chapter sponsor its own project? Should revenue generation expand beyond Hunger Lunch, and, if so, what would be the next blockbuster?

These and other questions were explored and addressed over a two-year period. The group raised outside support to supplement Hunger Lunch and received prize money from competitions that it entered. In the summer of 2008, students from campuses throughout the United States came to Chapel Hill for a week-long program, and by fall there were Nourish chapters on twenty-three campuses, including Harvard, Yale, and Stanford. Predictably, the rapid growth has produced new challenges. Other events now complement Hunger Lunch as revenue generators, and each new chapter of the organization seems to have a twist on enhancing the top line. Sorting out the relationship between the national organization and the chapters is also a source of

healthy dialogue. Interestingly, the discussion that began in the classroom of an introductory entrepreneurship class is framed in terms of “core competencies” and “value added,” notions previously reserved for commercial activities. Now they have been embraced by students who want to change the world.