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Background and Motivation

- Economic, social, health, and demographic challenges facing southern Nevada are complex, dynamic, and interrelated, requiring a **coordinated** and **cooperative** approach.
- **Coordination** and **extension** of services, skills, and talents enables more efficient and comprehensive response to community needs.
- **Hallmarks of Extension**: openness, accessibility, service
Connecting is Fundamental to the Cooperative Extension Mission!

We Connect Campus and Communities

Image Source: Cornell Cooperative Extension. Ithaca, NY
Study Objectives

1. Identify and describe the structure of the southern Nevada nonprofit health, education, and social service network.

2. Identify organizational leaders – organizations that “make things happen”, bridge, broker, coordinate, cooperate, and extend
Data and Methods

- **Web-based survey to organizational representatives (Executive Director or comparable), 2012-13**
  - Organizations identified: 460
  - Contact information obtained: 390
  - Surveys received: 298
    - Saturation rate: 65%
    - Response rate: 76%

- **Social Network Analysis: map, measure, and analyze relationships between organizations**
  - Structure of the network
  - Positions of individual organizations within the network

Survey Content

- Asked respondents to list up to 20 non-profit organizations with which they were most connected (could be private or public, but restricted to health, social services, or educational fields)

- Types of connections:
  - Having a formal MOU
  - Participating in common projects or initiatives
  - Co-sponsoring events
  - Sharing personnel, volunteers, space, or data
  - Referring clients, receiving client referrals
  - Receiving/providing funding
  - Collaborating on grant proposals
  - Board member(s) in common
Southern Nevada Nonprofit Network Structure
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How Central is UNLV to the Southern Nevada Nonprofit Network?

Degree centrality represents cooperation, activeness, and extension within a network.

Degree Centrality - UNLV Ranks #1
Total Connections: 97
% of all possible connections: 21.3%

Notes: Larger circles indicate more connections in the overall network; Includes health, education, and social service non-profit organizations in Southern Nevada, 2012-13
## Ten Most Connected Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Ties/Connections</th>
<th>% of possible ties/connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Way of Southern Nevada</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP of Southern Nevada</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Square</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County School District</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Village</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill of Southern Nevada</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Family Services</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County Social Services</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree centrality represents cooperation, activeness, & extension within a network.
How Central is UNLV to the Southern Nevada Nonprofit Network?

Eigenvector centrality represents connectivity to other organizations that are also well connected; quick access to new ties.

Eigenvector Centrality - UNLV Ranks #2
How Central is UNLV to the Southern Nevada Nonprofit Network?

Betweenness centrality represents bridging, brokering and influence

Betweenness Centrality - UNLV Ranks #1
How Central is UNLV to the Southern Nevada Nonprofit Network?

Closeness centrality represents ease of information access and potential to mobilize others in the network. 

Closeness Centrality - UNLV Ranks #2
## Connecting, Cooperating, and Extending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centrality Measure</th>
<th>Implications</th>
<th>Southern Nevada Nonprofit Avg.</th>
<th>UNLV Score &amp; Rank (of 461)</th>
<th>Cooperative Extension Score &amp; Rank (of 461)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>cooperativeness, activeness, participation, extension</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>97 #1</td>
<td>4 #264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvector</td>
<td>fast access to new ties</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.22 #2</td>
<td>0.01 #260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betweenness</td>
<td>influence, bridging, brokering</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>12.25 #1</td>
<td>0.02 #262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>mobilization, access/spread of information</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.3 #2</td>
<td>7.6 #272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Connecting, Cooperating, and Extending

### How do Predicted Scores Match Actual Scores?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centrality Measure and Implication</th>
<th>UNLV</th>
<th>Cooperative Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>Actual Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Centrality: cooperativeness, activeness, participation, extension</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvector Centrality: fast access to new ties</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betweenness Centrality: influence, bridging, brokering</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness Centrality: mobilization, access/spread of information</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on multivariate regression models that used organization size, age, budget, and service type to predict centrality scores, UNLV over-performed and Coop Extension under-performed on all four centrality measures.
Southern Nevada Nonprofit Characteristics and their Implications for Cooperative Extension

### Organization Inception (%)
- Before 1960: 47.5%
- 1960 to 1979: 9.3%
- 1980 to 1999: 12.4%
- 2000 to Present: 30.7%

### Number of Employees (%)
- 1 to 10: 24.5%
- 11 to 30: 9.3%
- 31 to 50: 12.4%
- 51 or more: 53.8%

Southern Nevada’s non-profit sector is young and runs on lean resources. Younger and smaller organizations need more help (from other strong organizations in the community) with information access, mobilizing, bridging, brokering.
Perceived Barriers to Nonprofit Collaboration

- **Time Constraints**: 31.8% (Greatest Barrier), 32.3% (2nd Greatest Barrier)
- **Lack of Shared Vision**: 29.0% (Greatest Barrier), 22.1% (2nd Greatest Barrier)
- **Reluctance to Share Resources**: 20.3% (Greatest Barrier), 16.1% (2nd Greatest Barrier)
- **Lack of Knowledge about Good Partners**: 19.4% (Greatest Barrier), 12.9% (2nd Greatest Barrier)
- **Problems with Leadership**: 6.9% (Greatest Barrier), 9.7% (2nd Greatest Barrier)
Perceived Barriers to Nonprofit Collaboration

Funding & Resources: Quotes from Respondents

- “Resources are key. Our non-profits are woefully understaffed and underfunded.”
- “Too many agencies are still so worried about covering staff costs that it is difficult to collaborate on program need because the agency is applying for staff cost above all needs.”
Perceived Barriers to Nonprofit Collaboration

Knowledge & Training: Quotes from Respondents

- “There are some good people doing good things in our community but most would benefit from training on organization skills, good business practices, and marketing their needs to the community.”
- “We would love to see some educational workshops on applying for grants.”
- “I think there is a desire to serve the community, but a lack of understanding on how to do that effectively (apply for funding, appropriate evaluation of existing programs and services, etc.)”
Perceived Barriers to Nonprofit Collaboration

Community Planning: Quotes from Respondents

- “Common communication vehicles and forums could improve the ability to know about other partnerships.”
- “I would be interested in participating in discussions with other local non-profits just to obtain information about who they are and who they serve.”
Perceived Barriers to Collaboration Can be Targeted (Directly or Indirectly) through Strong Cooperative Extension Programming

Examples from Penn State
Perceived Barriers to Collaboration Can be Targeted (Directly or Indirectly) through Strong Cooperative Extension Programming

Examples from Penn State

- Workshops and Courses
  - Getting the Most from your Grant Writing Efforts
  - Managing Volunteers to Build Community Capacity
  - Facilitating Effective Communications and Managing Controversial Issues
  - Understanding Economic Change in Your Community (complete with local data)
  - Strategic Planning for Communities and Organizations
Perceived Barriers to Collaboration
Can be Targeted (Directly or Indirectly) through Strong Cooperative Extension Programming

Examples from Penn State

- Better Kid Care: professional development to early-care and youth development professionals to improve quality of care and educational practices.
Example from Penn State

PROSPER: PROmoting School-Community-University Partnerships to Enhance Resilience

- Brings evidence-based prevention programs to schools and communities with goal of strengthening families, building youth skills, and reducing youth substance use and other problem behaviors

- Led by community teams made up of representatives from Penn State Extension, school district personnel, representatives from community service agencies, parents, youth, and other community members
Summary and Implications

- UNLV is central to the southern Nevada nonprofit network (strong participation, influence, access to information/resources, ability to mobilize);
- The southern Nevada nonprofit network could extend its reach and impact with the help of strong Cooperative Extension presence/programming that focuses on:
  - Training and development
  - Maximizing existing resources (personnel, financial, time) through community teams
  - Promoting evidence-based services and programs
  - Serving as a hub for strategic planning and connecting organizations
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To access full report: https://www.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/24/Lincy-NonProfitNetworkFullReport.pdf