

---

---

# Emerging Partnerships: *New Ways in a New World*

---

---

*A Symposium organized by*  
The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management

SPONSORED BY  
The Rockefeller Brothers Fund  
Mutual of America Life Insurance Company

CO-CHAIRMEN  
Colin Campbell  
Frances Hesselbein  
Thomas Moran

CHIEF RAPPORTEUR  
Richard F. Schubert

MODERATOR  
Iain Somerville

POCANTICO HILLS CONFERENCE CENTER OF THE ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND  
Pocantico Hills, New York



The Peter F. Drucker Foundation  
for Nonprofit Management

## About the Drucker Foundation

The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management, founded in 1990, is named for and inspired by the acknowledged father of modern management. By providing educational opportunities and resources, the Foundation furthers its mission to lead social sector organizations toward excellence in performance. The Foundation pursues this mission through the presentation of conferences, video teleconferences, the annual Peter F. Drucker Award for Nonprofit Innovation, and the development of management resources, partnerships, and publications.

Since its founding, the Drucker Foundation's special expertise and role has been to serve as a broker of intellectual capital, bringing together the finest leaders, consultants, authors and social philosophers in the world with the leaders of social sector voluntary organizations.

The Drucker Foundation believes that a healthy society requires three vital sectors: a public sector of effective governments; a private sector of effective businesses; and a social sector of effective community organizations. The mission of the social sector and its organizations is to change lives. It accomplishes this mission by addressing the needs of the spirit, the mind, and the body—of individuals, the community, and society. This sector and its organizations also create for individuals within society and the community a meaningful sphere of effective and responsible citizenship.

The Drucker Foundation aims to make its contribution to the health of the society by strengthening the social sector through the provision of intellectual resources to leaders in business, government, and the social sector.



The Peter F. Drucker Foundation  
for Nonprofit Management

320 Park Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022 U.S.A.

Tel: +1 212 224 1174  
Fax: +1 212 224 2508  
Email: [info@pfd.org](mailto:info@pfd.org)  
Web: <http://www.pfd.org>

**O**UR WORLD IS CHANGING IN PROFOUND WAYS AND WITH BREATHTAKING speed. THE potential for our families, communities, and institutions is both hopeful and troubling. Globalization and fast changing technology are creating new competitors and innovators in every industry. As small start-ups create thousands of new jobs, many major companies are shedding what traditionally were some of our best paying, most secure positions, creating tremendous anxiety. Despite the most medically advanced health care system on earth, millions of Americans lack access to basic care. Our institutions of higher learning are the envy of the world, while our K-12 system is struggling. Although many citizens every year improve their lot, 25 percent of our children live in poverty, and the gap between the richest and our poorest citizens is growing.

Government is cutting social spending and devolving responsibility to local entities that in many ways are unprepared for the new burdens faced. No longer is it a question of whether government should or should not shed its past commitment to ensure the integrity of the social safety net; for better or for worse that change is underway. And nonprofit organizations that have often needed to accomplish their mission with limited resources find themselves stretched to the breaking point.

The question now, even as the debate continues over social policy, is how our businesses, and in particular our social-sector institutions, can respond in the most efficient and effective ways. As government cuts back social spending, many people expect the social sector to absorb much of the anticipated need for services. Yet no one in the social sector believes they will be able to fill the gap without dramatically increased funding and improved efficiency. Nevertheless, federal funding for nonprofits (excluding health care agencies) decreased by 10 percent, in constant dollars, between 1980 and 1996, accord-

ing to Independent Sector. Furthermore, research by the 20th Century Fund shows that the health of the nonprofit sector is closely tied to the fortunes of the private sector. During economic downturns, when the need is greatest, social sector organizations may be least able to respond.

Against this challenging backdrop, we find broad agreement on the need for effective partnerships among organizations in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. Around the country, hundreds of largely unheralded local initiatives have brought together leaders of business, government, and voluntary organizations to accomplish common goals—in job training, education, social services, cultural appreciation, community revitalization. Yet the need to replicate their successes elsewhere grows daily.

To develop guiding principles that will enable others to apply these lessons, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Drucker Foundation, and Mutual of America invited 28 leaders from all three sectors to a two-day symposium at the Pocantico Conference Center. Among the participants were a ranking member of Congress, active and retired CEOs of major corporations, heads of national voluntary organizations, faculty from leading universities, a noted theologian, a city mayor.

Facilitated by Iain Somerville, founder and managing partner of Andersen Consulting's Center for Thought Leadership, the proceedings opened with presentations by Richard Cavanagh, president and CEO of The Conference Board; Lester Salamon, director of Johns Hopkins University's Institute for Policy Studies; and Peter F. Drucker. These talks were followed

by four concurrent break-out sessions in which all participants discussed the issues raised and reported back to the full group their recommendations for future action. The conference closed with a broad consensus on operating principles and next steps for promoting social partnerships.

### Summary of Remarks by Lester Salamon

A curious paradox confronts anyone interested in the American nonprofit sector and its relationships with government. For close to 50 years, from the mid-1930s to the late 1970s, nonprofit organizations were systematically overlooked in our public debates as attention shifted to government as the mechanism for solving social problems. Yet during this period the nonprofit sector grew as never before in its history. By contrast, in the years since 1980, nonprofit organizations have moved to the center of national attention, yet they have experienced some of their greatest strains.

The explanation for this paradox lies, I believe, in the confusion that was fastened on American thinking about the relationship between government and the nonprofit sector during the political debate that preceded the New Deal. Because of this confusion, our political rhetoric has come to portray these two sectors as inherently antagonistic, inviting policymakers to believe that they could strengthen the nonprofit sector chiefly by getting government out of its way.

In fact, however, the real relationship between these two sectors has been mutually reinforcing. As government grew in the 1960s and 1970s, it turned extensively to nonprofit organizations for help. As a result, an elaborate partnership came into existence between these two sets of institu-

tions. By the late 1970s, in fact, nonprofit organizations were receiving twice as much of their support from government as they were from private charitable contributions, and nonprofit organizations were delivering a larger share of government-funded services than government agencies themselves.

This relationship was not, of course, unique to nonprofit organizations. It reflects a broader pattern of “third-party government” in the United States, in which government turns to other institutions—universities, hospitals, social service agencies, banks and many others—to help it carry out public purposes. But nonprofit organizations were particularly well positioned to participate in these third-party relationships since they often operated in fields that government was newly entering, such as health care, employment and training, community development, social services, and many more.

Nor is this a new phenomenon. To the contrary, the history of government/nonprofit partnerships is older than the republic. The Massachusetts legislature made Harvard College, the nation’s first nonprofit institution, the beneficiary of a specially earmarked tax—the “colledge corne”—beginning in 1636. Throughout the 19th century, New York City made regular use of nonprofit agencies to help cope with the problems of poverty. By the 1880s, in fact, 60 percent of the revenues of New York’s nonprofit agencies serving needy children came from government sources. Even the U.S. Congress got into the act, passing a law in 1872 that provided federal support to the Little Sisters of the Poor to care for indigent residents of Washington, D.C. Thus, while these relationships grew massively in the 1960s and 1970s, they were hardly new.

This rich history of government/nonprofit cooperation offers both good news and bad news for today’s leaders. The good news is that government/nonprofit relationships actually work much better than our rhetoric suggests. Government support has been far more enabling than distorting for nonprofit organizations, allowing nonprofits to extend their reach and equipping government to carry out its mission with greater flexibility and local control.

The bad news is that the resulting system does not yet work as well as it needs to. The connections between government and nonprofit organizations have often been forged haphazardly and remain highly fragmented. Grant programs often impose narrow and cumbersome requirements about how money is to be spent. Training in the management of the resulting collaborative systems is still inadequate.

All of this suggests four principles to guide government/nonprofit relationships in the years ahead:

- *Don’t throw out the baby with the bath.*

Calls for government to completely remove itself from the social service arena miss the fact that the partnerships between government and nonprofits are a bargain for government and for society. Such partnerships combine the strengths of both parties, allowing nonprofits to apply their skills and mission to the delivery of necessary services, and allowing government to leverage its financial resources and public policy obligations.

- *Let nonprofits be true to their mission.*

Government should better accommodate the legitimate organizational needs of nonprofit organizations. More flexible payment schedules, for instance, would alleviate the cash flow problems many organizations face. Broader operating discretion would

allow nonprofits to assemble more integrated, responsive services and still retain their roots in the community. Government should avoid undue interference with the non-service functions of private agencies, such as their advocacy role. While recognizing that nonprofits are prohibited from partisan politicking, organizations that deliver services in an open and equitable manner should not be asked to give up their rights to advocate for changes in public policy as a condition of assisting government in solving public problems.

- *Preserve government oversight.* Nonprofit organizations must recognize the legitimate needs of the public sector for greater accountability, as well as the need of government agencies to monitor performance, account for finances, and assure equitable, nondiscriminatory practices.

- *Improve collaborative skills.* All of the above underlines the need for better training in the management of cross-sector partnerships. Providing such training is now one of the major challenges we face.

“Third-party government” and partnership between government and nonprofit organizations is one of the great American contributions to the practice of public administration. Having invented it, however, we now need to make it work.

### **Summary of Remarks by Richard E. Cavanagh**

Since World War II successful business/community partnerships have helped alleviate some of our most pressing social problems. In Atlanta, Pittsburgh, Minneapolis–St. Paul, among many others, business partnerships have made a real difference, and as resources become scarcer and problems more acute, our cities will increasingly look to such partnerships to

“do something.” But recent history shows that many of these alliances fail to achieve their goals. Observations of dozens of high-profile business and civic coalitions, including the New York City Partnership and Cleveland Tomorrow, suggest seven rules of thumb that mark successful efforts.

1. *The most effective partnerships involve groups of CEOs working together.* Unlike most managers, even most senior managers, CEOs can commit resources and exercise influence without seeking the boss’ permission. And CEOs command the attention of other leaders in government, education, labor, the community, and the media as few others can. The catch is, of course, CEOs are the most difficult members of the community to recruit for a project.

2. *Not all businesses are equally committed to or effective at building community partnerships.* Enterprises with an enduring interest in the vitality of a region (such as banks, utilities, or locally headquartered companies with a tradition of community service) are the best candidates.

3. *Nonprofit/community organizations must draw on their business partners’ real strength—not just their money.* Businesses can bring to bear particular expertise in marketing, financial management, and project management. Thus, economic development and job-creation efforts are generally more successful than school reform or social welfare efforts.

4. *Narrowly framed projects with measurable goals (for example, train and employ 1,000 at-risk youths) achieve better results than overly broad, open-ended projects (eliminate poverty in New Jersey).* Likewise, partnerships that pursue a few highly focused projects (no more than three) with limited duration do better than those that pursue far-reaching agendas.

5. Project-based coalitions, in which constituents play an active role and bring real talent to a specific task do better than general purpose alliances aimed at setting broad social agendas. All constituents (business, labor, government, and community groups) need to be involved in the project—but not necessarily from beginning to end. Ad hoc action beats endless debate.

6. The smaller the professional staff and the greater the involvement of volunteers, the more successful the project.

Membership-driven coalitions are more productive than staff-heavy alliances. And the most effective staff people tend to have broad experience in public, private, and nonprofit experience.

7. The media must be cultivated—and the credit widely shared. Elected officials and community leaders need public recognition to survive; business executives do not. Effective business partners are generous in covering their public and nonprofit counterparts in glory.

Business/community partnerships can accomplish a great deal by not trying to overachieve. By setting measurable goals, attaining their declared objectives, and moving from project to project, these alliances build credibility and momentum—key ingredients to any effective effort.

### Summary of Remarks by Peter F. Drucker

Too few in our society truly understand the concept of partnership—or the nature of the social sector. With government and business, the social sector is one of the three pillars on which modern society is based, and by far the most diverse. The one million nonprofit organizations in the United States that comprise the social

sector have only one common characteristic—their tax exempt status. It is their diversity—in mission, philosophy, and community—that uniquely qualifies them to deliver effective service to the community. But no one sector can do its job alone; business cannot thrive in a sick society. All three must work together. We must establish the independence and the interdependence of each sector.

The history of the social sector parallels that of industrial society. A radical change in philanthropy was the founding in 1890 of the first big foundations dedicated to specific causes. This was a break with the prior tradition of individuals giving directly to those in need—and was part of the rise of modern organizations.

Today, however, government/nonprofit partnerships are less a true partnership than they should be. Government views the nonprofit sector as a vendor; three or four nonprofit organizations might act as agents of the government to carry out such efforts as surplus food programs, much as distributors work with a major manufacturer. Those public/nonprofit relationships have changed little in many years.

By contrast, today's business/nonprofit partnerships are leading the biggest change in philanthropy since the rise of the big foundations 100 years ago—the shift from philanthropy to investment. We are no longer talking about corporations giving money to nonprofits—as necessary as that may be. We are now talking about a true partnership to build community and produce people who are needed by healthy businesses and a healthy society.

Richard Cavanagh's finding that narrowly based projects do better than broad, overly ambitious projects implies that business does not see its nonprofit partnerships

as a vehicle for good works, but as a means of social entrepreneurship. It is a new approach in which time, money, and resources are seen as investments. With this approach, business asks, “What do we expect to get back from this investment in the community? What is the rate of return?”

Business sees that it is investing not just in the future of the community but in its own future; it is a matter of economic self-interest. It may have longer, less predictable lead times or less quantifiable results, but it is a sound business decision. This new approach has implications for leaders in all three sectors.

- **Partners need to think through the three or four areas in which they can have the greatest impact the fastest.** All the questions one would ask about an investment come into play. This kind of concentration on a few key areas is different from the traditional approach of the nonprofit foundations that hand out money to a large number of organizations.

- **Partners avoid investing resources in weak ventures.** This has serious consequences for public education. Businesses look for school systems that produce results, and, unfortunately, that is rarely the public school systems. It is more often the parochial school, which gets results but rarely gets business or public funding, as opposed to public schools, which get money but produce few results. Likewise, the most effective drug and alcohol abuse programs are those of nongovernmental nonprofits.

- **Partnerships cannot work unless they are seen as investments focusing on results—primarily social rather than financial results.** The goal is not to assuage needs but to build islands of strength and exam-

ples for others. Money follows opportunities, not problems.

- **Partners seek a pluralism of arrangements.** You cannot shoe-horn all organizations into the same relationships. But the focus must always be on achieving clear, and preferably measurable, results.

Thus, today’s business/social sector partnerships are as important a social innovation as the rise of organized philanthropy a century ago or the New Deal 60 years ago. They are viewed as investments, not philanthropy. Partners take a narrow focus and expect a high return for the money spent. Partnerships by themselves will not be able to turn around a sick community. But by focusing on building strengths where they exist, they produce results, examples, and new leadership.

### Questions for Peter Drucker

*Q: How can you sustain partnerships over the long term? Is there a life cycle to social partnerships issue similar to the life cycle in business ventures?*

*PFDR:* Yes. As with any investment, you set goals and objectives in advance, and once those objectives are attained you move on to something else. In most places in the United States, people would put education high on the list of priorities. There is little to do for adults who have come through a damaged system except to repair the damage done. But in primary and secondary schools we have the potential to create social health. Optimistically, in 10 to 15 years we may succeed in building examples of high-functioning schools—unlikely public schools—that can begin to do that. You experiment and see what works. As in any investment, you hope seven out of 10 efforts will produce results, and when they do they no longer need

your support. So you look for what's next. We have to commit ourselves for the long term, set clear goals, and analyze results each year. And when something does not work out we learn from that and move on.

*Q: What are the most common failures of public/private partnership?*

*PFD:* The primary failure is to start by asking how much money you have to spend, rather than to start by defining the goals you want to achieve and then asking how much money is required. You don't build on money, you build on purpose. The second great failure, especially for nonprofit organizations, is selling a good cause and not marketing a changed community. Business partners become unhappy when they don't see results. Finally, the relationship between the nonprofit staff, who do the work and are also a source of inspiration to constituents, and board members, who are more business oriented, is often difficult.

Nonprofit leaders need to educate and understand their business partners; nonprofit leaders are often so absorbed in the worth of their cause and the needs of their organization that they see business partners as simply a cash cow—and cash cows eventually go dry. Nonprofit organizations need to demonstrate a core competence in public/private partnerships. But building this core competency starts with the question, "What are my partner's objectives?" Nonprofits have to understand that government must satisfy the demands of a diverse constituency and must insist on a level of uniformity. And government has to appreciate that nonprofits can compensate for the weakness of federal or state agencies, by reminding us that things have to be done locally.

*Q: Can you clarify what standards partner-*

*ships can use to assess their performance?*

*PFD:* Sit down with key people and outside friends and think through your assumptions—especially if you've been successful. Automatically review your performance every three years—and whenever something unexpected happens, especially unexpected success. Such success often suggests opportunities to do something different or better. Ongoing assessment should be part of the operating procedure of every nonprofit and every business.

*Q: What are the key management issues you come across in partnerships?*

*PFD:* Staff-board relationships are always a source of conflict. After every meeting, staff members complain about it. Partners need to trust each other and educate each other. A main management issue is that business executives complain that nonprofit organizations are not run professionally, and the nonprofit staff complains that business is meddling. Both are right. But you want a certain amount of meddling. You want a committed board, and a committed board meddles. You should establish a rule that the board must assess itself. Board members must contribute to the work of the organization.

*Q: What leadership styles are required to make a partnership effective?*

*PFD:* That is a crucial question, but I'm not sure I have the answer. There are probably as many effective leadership styles as there are people in the room. Leadership style has to fit the personality and values of the leader. Nonprofit partnerships in particular require strong leadership because they are the most complex organizations.

*Q: What are the stages of crisis in a social sector organization?*

*PFD:* The first is when something big happens in the outside world. The first

thing Frances Hesselbein did at the Girl Scouts was to look at society and see an enormous pool of young girls who were not whites living in the suburbs. She saw that the Girl Scouts were in crisis, and worked for years to get Girl Scouts to accept diversity. Without her intervention, the Girl Scouts may not have survived. Whenever a small local outfit goes national—as we see local megachurches now going regional, helping other churches—that is a crisis because you have to restructure and have to change your partnership. The local church that expands regionally may have had a drug abuse program with strong community support; now it has to create partnerships in new communities, working with six churches and regional companies. That presents a very different set of problems.

*Q: How do you know when you're in a crisis?*

PFD: When things that always worked suddenly don't work. When you see that you have outgrown your way of doing things.

*Q: Business/social sector partnerships have had mixed results. How does their experience apply to education?*

PFD: Twenty or 30 years from now this will remain a public education society, especially in higher education. Many independent undergraduate colleges will disappear from the scene. We know that business puts its money where it finds results. Yet many in the community still hope to convert what are now totally nonfunctioning schools into schools that are merely poorly functioning—and those people wonder why business is not supportive. Business is not interested in public education, but in education, period. They are interested in students learning with enthusiasm, in teachers feeling motivated and involved,

and in parents believing in the schools. We need to see a meaningful group of children succeeding in schools. We have to focus on a target of opportunity, and at the moment I don't see that in the public schools. But we have working examples from non-tax-supported, nonprofit schools to show public schools what can be done.

*Q: You seem to dismiss public partnerships with haste. But don't NASA, agricultural extension programs, the National Science Foundation and affiliated universities, the National Institutes of Health, and other examples suggest that there are some very effective public sector partnerships?*

PFD: All of those examples share a common trait: They have very clear goals. For the NIH, for example, it was to eradicate malaria. For NASA, to put a man on the moon. When you have a public body with a clear mandate or goal, then they can be effective. They are not focused on need, they are focused on opportunity.

## Obstacles and Observations

In four concurrent breakout sessions, conference participants identified major obstacles to achieving effective social partnerships. The obstacles, though formidable, relate more to matters of culture, attitude, and historical happenstance than to structural impediment. Participants later formulated a set of guiding principles, largely based on these four challenges.

- The differences in language and culture among the three sectors can make simple communication, let alone genuine collaboration, difficult.
- Business is too often viewed as simply an arm's length funder of worthy causes or a recalcitrant party to social change, rather than an active investor seeking mutually beneficial returns. Nonprofits, meanwhile,

can be viewed as less professional or less well managed, or as a junior member of the partnership.

- Relationships between the public and voluntary sectors are seldom equal partnerships. Too often government views the nonprofit agencies that deliver many of its social programs as mere distributors, with little latitude to act, innovate, and exploit their real strengths.

- The diverse but fragmented nature of the nonprofit sector can make it difficult to replicate local successes.

Befitting their varied backgrounds, viewpoints, and professional experience, the participants offered a wide range of specific comments and recommendations regarding social partnership. Their comments, as reported by the breakout groups, encompassed funding, management strategy, and public policy:

### **Funding**

Seventy-eight percent of donors do not itemize deductions and get no tax breaks for their contributions. We need to provide better tax incentives for average donors.

Despite the fears of many, public funding has not undermined the mission of the nonprofit sector. Nonprofits worry that public sector funding can inhibit their criticism of public policy, but the fact is, strings are attached to most funding sources, public or private. Nonprofits need to cultivate a multiplicity of sources, rather than choosing one or another.

Recent tax proposals would give individuals a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for donations to a designated charity. However, public funding to that organization would be reduced by an equal amount. This in effect transfers to individuals funding decisions that should remain in the public arena. In the name of localism, such poli-

cies really fuel parochialism. Cherry picking the problems that we choose to address creates artificial definitions of success.

### **Management Strategy**

There is a difference between project partnerships, which have a clear beginning and end, but may not solve enduring problems, and problem partnerships, which set larger, longer term goals. The question is how to marry the virtues of each. That requires public sector agencies to segment problems into manageable pieces, with ongoing performance evaluations and guideposts to success. We need specific, midcourse assessment of the success of a partnership, including a review of program costs, benefits, and effectiveness.

The tight controls imposed by categorical grants and other regulatory constraints limit the effectiveness of individual projects. A 15-person nonprofit agency may have to manage 60 different accounts that could be more effectively used if the agency had greater flexibility.

Program funders need to sustain new leadership models that, over five to 10 years, can grow from a single strong figure to a broader group of community constituents.

As is true of all organizations, even the best intentioned nonprofits can become bureaucratic and develop a self-perpetuating orientation. This runs counter to the principle that a partnership should have a specific objective and should be terminated when that objective is met. To support that principle, specific projects and partnerships in general should have a sunset period—a specific time by which the work should be completed or their value assessed.

### **Public Policy**

We need local community involvement and the personal energy of private citizens,

with less government policymaking. Block grants to state and local government are more effective than categorical grants that seek to establish national policy.

Embracing the nonprofit sector with a “suffocating bear hug”—as an excuse to get government out of social welfare—is unwise. Simply putting more money in the hands of the wealthy and trusting them to use it for high social purpose doesn’t work.

We need to explore new opportunities for church and parachurch groups to partner with government, as long as they deliver services in a nondiscriminatory fashion. Churches are but one type of values-based organization, like youth and social service agencies, that can jointly be more effective.

School reform remains one of the most difficult areas in which to see results. Institutional paralysis runs deep, and business partners often overlook the importance of work rules as an impediment to change. Most school reform efforts seriously underestimate the necessary duration of the commitment; it takes more than two years of work to show results.

### Principles of Partnership

**I**n a closing session, participants and presenters reached agreement on five guiding principles for moving forward. Twenty-eight leaders from around the country, from public, private, and nonprofit institutions and representing the spectrum of political viewpoints, reached remarkable consensus about the need and the means to achieve effective social partnership. All recognized that the challenges facing government, business, nonprofit organizations, and society as a whole are too great to be addressed by any one sector. All leaders, to succeed, must build bridges. To provide a framework for such efforts, the group, act-

ing as partners, delineated the following principles:

- **Partners must understand not only the values, goals, and constraints of the partnership itself but also the values, goals, and constraints of the other partners.** It’s not enough to ask, “How do we accomplish our agenda?” You must also ask, “How do we help our partners accomplish their agenda?” That is especially true for nonprofits, which tend to worry most about their own needs. You must educate other members of the partnership, but you must also satisfy other members’ expectations.

- **Partnerships must translate broad goals into measurable, interim targets and time frames.** All partners must be committed to the shared mission and objectives before taking the first step. Goals must be attainable but meaningful.

- **Different issues require different types of partnerships.** Some are appropriately corporate-initiated, others are social sector-initiated, still others are government initiated. Openness to the leadership needs of the project is key. Equal partnership is the goal.

- **Partnerships rely not just on the clarity of mission but also on a mutual understanding of partners’ roles.** Partnerships often come to grief when they are successful. That is when partners often realize that they have different definitions of results, and thus different definitions of success. Unless there is agreement in the beginning about the definition of success and expected results trouble is likely.

- **The three sectors of society have different needs and objectives, but must work together.** Their relationships and responsibilities vary in terms of policy making, funding, leadership and execution, but the three sectors are equally important.

Finally, participants agreed on first steps

for implementing the lessons of the conference. Conference sponsors plan to disseminate information about effective partnerships. Members of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Drucker Foundation will explore ways to work as both a broker and an information clearinghouse, to create and publicize successful models so others can act on those examples.

As part of that exploration, conference sponsors will pinpoint areas of greatest need and potential benefit for social partnerships. This will be an organized effort to bring together funding, leadership development, and technical expertise to support promising ventures between public, private, and social sector organizations. There remains much to be done, but the way to achieve results is increasingly clear, and the time to get started is now. The need is urgent.

## Appendix: Recommended Resources

The Drucker Foundation Future Series:  
**The Leader of the Future** (edited by Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith, and Richard Beckhard; Jossey-Bass, 1996)  
**The Organization of the Future** (edited by Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith, and Richard Beckhard; Jossey-Bass, 1997)  
**The Community of the Future** (edited by Frances Hesselbein, Marshall Goldsmith, Richard Beckhard, and Richard Schubert; Jossey-Bass, 1998)

**New Life at Ground Zero: New York, Home Ownership, and the Future of American Cities** (by Charles Orlebeke; Rockefeller Institute Press/Brookings Institution; 1997; 800-275-1447)

**Innovative Public/Private Partnerships: Environmental Affairs** (The Conference Board; 1998; 212-339-0345; [www.conference-board.org](http://www.conference-board.org))

**Council for Economic Development.** Extensive public policy research includes numerous reports on school reform. (212-688-2063; [ced.sohonet.com](http://ced.sohonet.com))

**The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management.** Conferences, teleconferences, publications, and other resources to enhance nonprofit performance and cross-sector collaboration. (212-224-1174; [www.pfdf.org](http://www.pfdf.org))

## Emerging Partnerships: *New Ways in a New World*

*A Symposium organized by*  
The Peter F. Drucker Foundation  
for Nonprofit Management

SPONSORED BY  
the Rockefeller Brothers Fund  
Mutual of America Life Insurance  
Company

CO-CHAIRMEN  
Colin Campbell  
Frances Hesselbein  
Thomas Moran

CHIEF RAPPORTEUR  
Richard F. Schubert

MODERATOR  
Iain Somerville

POCANTICO HILLS CONFERENCE CENTER  
OF THE ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND  
Pocantico Hills, New York

**Appendix: Roster of Participants**  
*(Affiliation, at time of symposium,  
provided for identification only.)*

**Robert Buford**  
Chairman & CEO  
Buford Television, Inc.

**Colin G. Campbell**  
President  
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

**Richard E. Cavanagh**  
President & CEO  
The Conference Board

**Richard J. Ciecka**  
Vice Chairman of the Board  
Mutual of America Life Insurance  
Company

**Alfred C. DeCrane, Jr.**  
Retired Chairman & CEO  
Texaco, Inc.

**Peter F. Drucker** (by video)  
Honorary Chairman  
Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit  
Management

**Dudley H. Hafner**  
Executive Vice President  
The American Heart Association, Inc.

**Frances Hesselbein**  
President & CEO  
Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit  
Management

**Nancy L. Johnson**  
U.S. Representative  
Sixth Congressional District, Connecticut

**William A. Johnson, Jr.**  
Mayor  
City of Rochester, New York

**Roberts T. Jones**  
President & CEO  
National Alliance of Business

**David R. Jones**  
President & CEO  
Community Service Society of New York

**John D. Kemp**  
President & CEO  
Very Special Arts

**Philip Lader**  
Administrator  
U.S. Small Business Administration

**Alfred F. Lynch**  
Vice President and Director of  
International Development  
JCPenney Company

**Robert H. McNulty**  
President  
Partners for Livable Communities

**The Reverend Loren B. Mead**  
Founder and President  
The Alban Institute, Inc.

**C. Douglas Miller**  
President & CEO  
Norrell Corporation

**Mark Harrison Moore**  
Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice  
Policy and Management  
Kennedy School of Government, Harvard  
University

**Thomas J. Moran**  
President & CEO  
Mutual of America Life Insurance  
Company

**Marnie S. Pillsbury**  
Executive Director  
David Rockefeller Fund

**Hugh B. Price**  
President & CEO  
National Urban League, Inc.

**Mark Rosenman, Ph.D.**  
Vice President, Social Responsibility  
The Union Institute

**Dr. Lester M. Salamon**  
Director  
John Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies

**Richard F. Schubert**  
President & CEO  
Points of Light Foundation

**Benjamin R. Shute, Jr.**  
Secretary and Treasurer  
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

**Iain Somerville**  
Partner  
Andersen Consulting

**Patrick Waide**  
Chief Operating Officer  
Sullivan & Company

**Raul Yzaguirre**  
President  
National Council of La Raza

*Staff*  
**Paul M. Cohen**  
Managing Editor, *Leader to Leader*  
Jossey-Bass Publishers, Inc.

**Rob Johnston**  
Vice President  
The Drucker Foundation

**Clarence Pearson**  
Vice President  
The Drucker Foundation