



FOR YOUTH DEVELOPMENT®
FOR HEALTHY LIVING
FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

A SEAT AT THE TABLE

Influencing Social Change: What Earns Nonprofit Leaders the Opportunity to Significantly Impact Community Issues?

Author:

Jeffrey D. Andresen

YMCA of Greater Williamson County



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION MOVEMENT	4
Shifting from Reactive to Proactive	4
CASE STUDIES: LEADERS WITH THE RIGHT SKILLS TO DRIVE SOCIAL CHANGE	5
Case Study on Cooperative Intelligence: William E. Greehey, Haven for Hope	5
Case Study on Servant Leadership: Millard Fuller, Habitat for Humanity	7
Case Study on Social Entrepreneurship: Mimi Silbert, Delancey Street Foundation	9
CASE STUDIES SUMMARY	12
GETTING A SEAT AT THE TABLE	16
Solution No. 1: Adopt a Greater Good Mentality	16
Solution No. 2: Promote the Similarities in Processes	16
Solution No. 3: Establish a Reputation of Adding Value	16
Solution No. 4: Stay Relevant	16
Solution No. 5: Embrace Capacity-Building Skills	16
CALL TO ACTION	17
REFERENCES	19
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Historically, nonprofit organizations have served in a reactive, responsive role, often categorized for good work in a specific service niche (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007). In recent years, nonprofits have gradually earned a reputation as an obvious first choice to share the burden of resolving complex, quality-of-life issues that face society as a whole (Bryson, Crosby, & Stone, 2006). In some circumstances, municipalities and large corporations recognize the resources that nonprofits can bring to the table to garner support and maximize community impact (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007). In these cases, the choice to bring the nonprofit to the table is a reflection of the presence of leaders who possess specific leadership characteristics that are recognized and valued by potential partners.

A comparative analysis of three case studies isolates the unique attributes possessed by leaders who are asked to take a seat at the table and participate in joint partnerships that result in significant, efficient, and tangible community benefit. The pioneers highlighted within these case studies significantly raised the public perception of nonprofit organizations as drivers of social change. The success of these leaders can be attributed to their superior mastery of a singular or blended leadership style, deeply rooted in a guiding principle, and to primary motivation along with the ability to effectively demonstrate their value in addressing the social issue at hand. Leaders with such attributes are unique. While many nonprofit leaders may strive to sit at the table and provide input on public policy and social issues, many do not possess the inherent leadership skills universally recognized by others. Without leaders who have mastered these skills, the role of the nonprofit as a key partner for influencing social change will not exist or will be significantly marginalized.

JOIN THE DISCUSSION

Visit Exchange to join the discussion about various leadership styles and how Y leaders can adopt them to influence social change. As you read more about this topic, consider the following question:



If a YMCA leader does not have a seat at the table with other community leaders addressing social change in his or her community, how can one be secured?

www.yexchange.com

THE PUBLIC-PRIVATE COLLABORATION MOVEMENT

Municipalities can no longer fund the demands of community needs on their own (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007). We have turned into a society in which we want more than we can afford. With increasing demands on each tax dollar and competition for contributed funds combined with the rising cost of living, questions continue to be raised: How can we as a society address community issues positively and efficiently (Bryson et al., 2006)? What is the recipe for success? Which key ingredients will yield the most social impact?

As municipalities wrestle to meet complex community needs with diminishing discretionary resources, they are gradually exploring the feasibility of collaborative partnerships (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007). Can they do more with others than they could do alone? The answer is yes. Some of the most successful, vibrant, growing communities are finding creative ways to keep up with community demands for quality of life enhancement by initiating unique strategic alliances, including both private and public partnerships (London, 2012). Unfortunately, this is not always the case. One of the biggest stumbling blocks is getting the right leaders with the ability to drive positive change to sit at the same table—and then making sure that the environment around the table is conducive to solving problems and creating community assets in the most efficient, beneficial manner (ibid.). Successful collaborations require each of the partners to bring something of value to the table. Everyone around the table must universally recognize the value of each partner and appreciate their role (ibid.). But it is more than that. Each person must believe that other table partners have the “greater good” first and foremost in their motivational hierarchy—regardless of the method they use to solve the issue (ibid.).

SHIFTING FROM REACTIVE TO PROACTIVE

Public perception regarding the benefits of a nonprofit’s involvement in solving social issues is often contingent on the perception of the nonprofit leader’s ability to make an impact (Miller & Miller, 2007). If the nonprofit leader is seen as dynamic, successful, and capable, the impression is that his or her leadership skills can be transferrable and valuable in an alternative setting (Bryson et al., 2006).

Often the nonprofit partner’s involvement is limited to providing a support service. This is primarily due to a lack of awareness of the agency’s level of sophistication and how that agency’s competencies may complement the group’s ability to address comprehensive issues (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007). Several factors may contribute to this perception. Often the overwhelming magnitude of the nonprofit’s mission, combined with limited resources, results in executive workloads that minimize opportunities for public exposure of leaders. Thus, they remain unknown.

The stereotype also exists that nonprofit and for-profit executives do not address issues that are comparable in their level of sophistication (ibid.). This stereotype is magnified by a lack of nonprofit leadership exposure and by circumstances in which the systems used by the nonprofit are, in fact, truly unsophisticated. Regardless of the reason for this professional stigma, the paradigm shift allowing nonprofit leaders to be recognized as equally competent to their for-profit counterparts has required mutual acknowledgement of similar skills. Leaders who are asked to help influence social change possess a certain operational and leadership style that allows them to be recognized as successful, available for public exposure, and universally appreciated and respected for their skills (Bryson et al., 2006). This type of leadership has been recognized and documented in the for-profit sector for years, resulting in the migration and recruitment of for-profit leaders to the nonprofit sector (Simms, Milway, & Trager, 2009). Only recently has this trend reversed, and it appears to be limited to those nonprofit leaders who obviously possess transferrable, valued skill sets (Bryson et al., 2006). In many cases, these are the same leaders who are asked to sit at the table in order to lead or influence social change (Miller & Miller, 2007).

CASE STUDIES: LEADERS WITH THE RIGHT SKILLS TO DRIVE SOCIAL CHANGE

The case studies presented provide a snapshot of successful strategic alliances that resulted in monumental social impact. Each study highlights a pioneer who drove social change by using a distinct leadership style that ultimately galvanized significant partner involvement through a common value proposition. Each leader’s work has raised the public perception of nonprofit leaders and the ability of nonprofit organizations to accomplish solutions that result in significant, efficient, and tangible community benefit. Choosing to profile the leaders represented in the case studies was not a difficult task. The accomplishments of these individuals are well known—locally, regionally, and, in some cases, nationally. Their attributes are commonly acknowledged as benchmarks of leadership excellence. Each study identifies and defines their predominant leadership style as well as the guiding principle and primary motivation of that leadership style. Following the case studies, a compilation of the value the leader provided in addressing the social issue at hand and a comparison of each leader’s delivery methods are shown in tables 7 (page 12) and 8 (page 15).

CASE STUDY ON COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE: WILLIAM E. GREEHEY, HAVEN FOR HOPE

Maximizing community benefit through collaborations ideally equates to efficiencies and to more community good getting done for less (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007).

When an issue like homelessness is addressed by city leadership committed to attacking the root cause of the problem, why would they choose an individual who was mainly recognized for his business savvy to champion their cause?

As San Antonio analyzed the overwhelming magnitude of its homeless issue, city leaders realized that the complexity required multiple partners and funding sources. William (Bill) Greehey, a local businessperson who earned worldwide recognition for turning around a defunct oil and gas company, possessed the leadership and universal skills needed to galvanize other partners to address the issue: “It might appear that Greehey eschews government involvement, but that would be incorrect. If you look at what Mr. Greehey does, it’s all about partnership. Haven for Hope is a good example.” (“The Measure of a Man,” 2010). The snapshot provided in table 1 highlights how Greehey’s leadership style influenced social change.

SOCIAL ISSUE

In 2006, the serious homeless issue facing the city of San Antonio was not being adequately addressed by the city’s current service delivery method (Haven for Hope, “History of Haven for Hope”). Treating the root causes of homelessness in a single, central location had proven to be successful, but financially cumbersome, in other major U.S. cities. What became the focus of both city leadership and local

TABLE 1. CASE STUDY SNAPSHOT: COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE

Social Issue	Leader Profile	Value Proposition	Social Impact
25,000 homeless in San Antonio	Bill Greehey galvanized support and involvement from partners, who contributed the following:	Address the root cause of homelessness in San Antonio by co-locating social services on one campus	Largest, most comprehensive homeless transformational campus in the U.S.
Accessibility barriers to essential human services that reduce homelessness	City: \$22 million County: \$10 million State: \$6.1 million Private: \$60 million		60% success rate

Source: Statistics retrieved from Haven for Hope, “Homelessness Facts,” <http://www.havenforhope.org/new/facts.aspx>; “The Measure of a Man,” (2010, November), <http://texasceomagazine.com/features/the-measure-of-a-man-4/>.

philanthropists was the question: How do we afford critical campus services—such as education, shelter, job training, substance abuse treatment, medical care, case management, and so forth—in a convenient one-stop location?

LEADER PROFILE

A product of humble beginnings, Bill Greehey developed a strong work ethic with a dream of accomplishing more in life. After a stint in the U.S. Air Force, Greehey was the first member of his family and in his neighborhood to go to college. Graduating with honors from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Greehey went to work as a CPA for Price Waterhouse. In 1973, the courts appointed him president/CEO of LoVaca Gathering Company, an oil and gas company facing debt and a breach of contract suit. Greehey was charged with negotiating LoVaca out of bankruptcy. In 1980, Greehey created a spinoff oil company, the Valero Energy Corp. It was the largest oil and gas transaction known in U.S. history ("William E. Greehey," 2010). Today, Valero Energy Corporation has annual revenues in excess of \$1 billion, and most of Valero's monumental success has been accredited to his sheer determination and dedication. Greehey was dedicated to his employees, who he referred to as the "Valero family." Under his leadership, there was never a layoff. In 2003, *Fortune* magazine named Valero as one of the "100 Best Companies to Work for in America" (ibid.).

As a community leader and generous philanthropist, Greehey served on numerous nonprofit boards and national foundations. Most notably, he cochaired San Antonio Mayor Phil Hardberger's Community Council to End Homelessness, ultimately resulting in the development of Haven for Hope (Haven for Hope, "History of Haven for Hope"). He is currently chairman of the board of NuStar Energy L.P., and NuStar GP Holdings, LLC, both based in San Antonio (Greehey Family Foundation, "Bill Greehey Bio").

VALUE PROPOSITION

Approximately 31 percent of the homeless in San Antonio are families with children (Haven for Hope, "Homelessness Statistics"). Most homeless people lack basic transportation or the funds necessary to use public transportation. Haven for Hope alleviates the transportation barrier by providing a one-stop

shop for key services that are necessary for homeless individuals and families to transform their lives. More than 70 partner agencies provide a wide range of services on-site (Haven for Hope, "Partner Spotlight"). Development of the campus was spearheaded by the Community Council to End Homelessness, under the leadership of chairman Bill Greehey (Association of Fundraising Professionals, "San Antonio Businessman Bill Greehey"). Its intent is to deliver anything homeless people need, not only shelter, but also access to the key human services necessary to transform their lives and become contributing members of society again.

SOCIAL IMPACT

Greehey saw the need for a center, but knew it would require a lot of money. He convinced the city of San Antonio to contribute \$22 million and the county to contribute \$10 million ("The Measure of a Man," 2010). The state of Texas invested \$6.1 million for a detox center and for services to help the mentally ill (ibid.). With that amount of public participation, Greehey was able to raise another \$60 million from the private sector (ibid.).

For those homeless individuals who are not ready to get back into society, Haven for Hope provides the Prospects Courtyard, just outside the main campus. There, these individuals have access to clothing and showers, along with medical and dental care. They are not indoors, however, until they're ready to, as Greehey puts it, "transform their lives" (ibid.). Haven for Hope is considered a model for other cities dealing with their own homeless problem. To date, it has been visited by representatives from 200 cities around the country (ibid.).

IN CONCLUSION

Bill Greehey's professional history demonstrated a leadership style of cooperative intelligence, not only in his successful for-profit ventures, but also in his approach to solving complex social issues in a nonprofit arena. Cooperative intelligence is relationship building, one person at a time. It is both an approach and an attitude. Cooperative intelligence is a highly effective leadership style because it puts people in the center. Peers and clients believe, trust, and respect the leader (Naylor, 2006). Table 2 (page 7) presents the hallmarks of cooperative intelligence.

Greehey’s leadership skills, honed during his years as a business executive, were exactly what was needed to galvanize the concept and collaborations necessary to establish Haven for Hope. This complicated endeavor required the ability to bring together a diverse group of individuals who had different motivations for pursuing a solution for the greater good. Y leaders are often called on in a similar capacity. In its unique community position, the Y is often seen as a neutral entity in which common ground can be established regarding social issues. The importance of Y leaders to possess cooperative intelligence skills is paramount to complement the Y’s position of neutrality and the cooperative good that can be achieved.

TABLE 2. COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE

What is it?	Cooperative intelligence is relationship building, one person at a time. It is both an approach and an attitude (Naylor, 2006).
What is the guiding principle of this approach?	Peers and clients must believe, trust, and respect the leader for him or her to have staying power. The quality of the human relationship drives success. Attitude sets the tone; we control our own attitude and behaviors. Projecting a positive attitude as one who provides a valuable service, intellectual capital, and great connections is the backbone of cooperative intelligence (ibid.).
What drives it?	Creating and maintaining relationships one at a time (ibid.).
Why is it effective?	It puts people in the center. Peers and clients believe, trust, and respect the leader (ibid.).

CASE STUDY ON SERVANT LEADERSHIP: MILLARD FULLER, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY

Why do cities across the world look to Habitat for Humanity as a part of their homeless eradication plan? It’s because the leadership of this nonprofit is universally recognized for bringing others to the table and for capitalizing on volunteer and donor-based philanthropy (Frick, 2004).

Millard Fuller, who cofounded Habitat for Humanity International with his wife, Linda, was committed to a missionary-type approach to influencing social change by serving others. His approach brought together philanthropic donations, in-kind service, low-interest loans, and service recipient participation. This unique method originally resonated with Christians seeking an opportunity to serve others, but soon caught on worldwide, owing to the universal enthusiasm experienced through this hands-on approach and the charisma of the leadership. The snapshot provided in table 3 highlights how Fuller’s leadership style influenced social change.

SOCIAL ISSUE

More than 800 million people worldwide live in urban slums. Without intervention, it is predicted that the number of slum dwellers will grow to nearly 1 billion by 2020 (Habitat for Humanity, “Why Habitat for Humanity Is Needed”).

LEADER PROFILE

Millard Fuller founded Habitat for Humanity in 1976 and served in executive roles until 2005. Raised in Alabama from humble beginnings, Millard became a self-made millionaire. A graduate of Auburn

TABLE 3. CASE STUDY SNAPSHOT: SERVANT LEADERSHIP SUMMARY

Social Issue	Leader Profile	Value Proposition	Social Impact
827.6 billion people worldwide live in urban slums; will grow to nearly 1 billion by 2020 without intervention	Millard Fuller achieved success by giving priority to the needs of colleagues and those served and possessing an attitude of humble stewardship	Volunteer workforce + Donated materials + Low-cost loan + Hands-on homeowner involvement =	More than 800,000 homes built or repaired since 1976
Lack of clean water and sanitation claim the lives of more than 1.8 million young children every year		Alternative to government-subsidized housing and homelessness	

Source: Statistics retrieved from Habitat for Humanity, “Why Habitat for Humanity Is Needed,” <http://www.habitat.org/how/factsheet.aspx>; Habitat for Humanity, “The History of Habitat,” <http://www.habitat.org/how/historytext.aspx>.

University and the University of Alabama Law School at Tuscaloosa, he successfully built a multimillion dollar marketing company by age 29. This success cost Millard dearly—his health, integrity, and marriage deteriorated. These crises caused him to reassess his ethics and pursue a different course. He and his wife reconciled, and he rededicated his life to Christ (Habitat for Humanity, “Fuller: Habitat for Humanity International Founder”).

Between 1968 and 1972, Millard and Linda Fuller became involved with a Christian community (Koinonia Farms) in rural Georgia where they pioneered a low-cost housing program. From 1973 to 1976, the Fullers developed a housing program in Zaire, Africa. Upon their return to America in 1976, the Fullers founded Habitat for Humanity International, a Christian nonprofit housing ministry dedicated to building and rehabilitating simple, decent houses alongside homeowner partner families. Habitat’s business plan relies on donation of money, land, materials, and volunteer labor. Home ownership requires qualification based on need, a down payment, no-interest mortgage, and hands-on labor during the construction of the home. All mortgage payments are used to build future Habitat houses (Habitat for Humanity, “International Housing Finance”).

Today, Habitat for Humanity is a worldwide organization with affiliate services reaching more than 4 million people and has constructed more than 800,000 homes (Habitat for Humanity, “The History of Habitat”). Habitat for Humanity is considered one of the answers to homelessness; it partners with municipalities, utility companies, foundations, developers, and philanthropists to curb the growing crisis of homelessness.

VALUE PROPOSITION

Millard and Linda Fuller were committed to a missionary-type approach to influencing social change by serving others while requiring the recipient of the service to participate in the process.

The burden of homelessness rests on the shoulders of many. Early on, the Fullers realized that they could not adequately effect change on their own. Habitat’s operational model—one that uses volunteer labor, donated materials, low-interest loans, and homeowner

participation—struck a visible chord and created a groundswell of support that was recognized by others as an impactful, effective, efficient approach to the burden they were bearing.

Millard Fuller’s practical approach to Christianity mobilized a volunteer and donor base that applied this approach to fulfill a sense of Christian servitude. The blend of volunteer effort, donated materials, and contributed land and money not only afforded home ownership to families without access to conventional methods of home financing, but also created a cash flow for future home construction. This self-sustaining model was recognized by other partners as a “seed charity,” which helped underprivileged families get on their feet and help themselves.

SOCIAL IMPACT

A balanced mix of charitable donations, volunteer labor, low-cost financing, and recipient families contributing to the process of helping themselves at their level of capability can effectively address homelessness. Government methods of addressing homelessness cost each of us, do not promote volunteerism or philanthropy, and are often ineffective and unsuccessful owing to a lack of homeowner buy-in and involvement. Habitat for Humanity’s method spreads the burden among caring community volunteers, donors, and recipients while preserving a lower tax base and increasing the quality of life.

IN CONCLUSION

Millard Fuller’s career is hallmarked by his servant leadership style. Servant leadership serves first, leads second. It achieves results by giving priority attention to the needs of colleagues and those served, and by possessing an attitude of humble stewardship (Greenleaf, “Servant Leadership”). Table 4 (page 9) presents the hallmarks of servant leadership.

Like Habitat for Humanity, the Y historically has been recognized as a service agency. Ideally, leaders in both organizations could benefit from a servant leadership style that emphasizes service to others. Fuller epitomized servant leadership, and his business model for Habitat for Humanity inspired countless volunteers and community stakeholders around a common cause. Using this servant leadership approach, effective Y leaders can accomplish the same level of social impact.

“We’ve ended poverty housing in Sumter County, Georgia [the location of Habitat for Humanity’s headquarters]. We solved it by putting together the Sumter County Initiative, a big coalition that includes everybody who is concerned with housing in this area in any way. We got them to the table, we worked together, and we solved the problem. Now this has given birth to the 21st Century Challenge, which advocates an end to poverty housing for every city—we’ve got about 100 cities involved. About a dozen of them have set a date for ending poverty housing. In every case, we just introduced that methodology and the plan of action and got everybody to join in”
 — Changemakers, 2004

TABLE 4. SERVANT LEADERSHIP

What is it?	Servant leadership serves first, leads second. It achieves results by giving priority attention to the needs of colleagues and those served and possessing an attitude of humble stewardship regarding the organization’s resources: human, financial, and physical (Greenleaf, “Servant Leadership”).
What is the guiding principle of this approach?	<p>“The big test is: do those served grow as persons: do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived?” (ibid.)</p> <p>“Caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built. If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving, one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most open course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them.” (ibid.)</p>
What drives it?	Involving others in decision making, strongly based in ethical and caring behavior, enhances the growth of workers while improving the caring and quality of organizational life (ibid.).
Why is it effective?	It places a high priority on attending to the needs of colleagues and those served (ibid.).

CASE STUDY ON SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: MIMI SILBERT, DELANCEY STREET FOUNDATION

Why would Delancey Street, a communal rehabilitation center, be internationally recognized for its recovery success ratio and self-sufficient operations? It’s because the leadership style that is modeled from the top of the organization penetrates and resonates throughout the organization’s ranks and graduates (International Forum, “The Social Entrepreneurs”).

Meager beginnings understate the origin of the Delancey Street story. Mimi Silbert, her partner, and four struggling addicts started a communal rehabilitation program in an apartment in downtown San Francisco. Through sheer determination and absolute commitment to helping hardcore addicts and criminals help themselves and be responsible for their own actions, Silbert grew the program into the Delancey Street Foundation, which is recognized today for its self-sufficient operations and participant recovery rates. The snapshot provided in table 5 (page 10) highlights how Silbert’s leadership style influenced social change.

SOCIAL ISSUE

Transforming ex-convicts, homeless people, and recovering drug addicts into productive members of society is a challenge that has had various levels of success despite the method and the millions of dollars spent on this issue annually. The Delancey Street Foundation has developed and sustained an organizational model that has achieved a greater than 90 percent success rate while establishing businesses that provide valuable services to the community and receiving zero government funds (Marz, 2010).

LEADER PROFILE

In 1971, Mimi Silbert, her partner John Maher, and four residents started an addict recovery program in an apartment in San Francisco (Delancey Street Foundation, “Our Enterprises”). Their unique communal living approach of “each-one-teach-one” soon blossomed (Downs & Gaines, 1999). As the participation grew, residents were expected to apply their skills and, in turn, teach other residents. The “Delancey Street Treatment Model” includes a residential stay ranging from two to four years and requires each resident to complete at least a GED (PBS, “Meet the New Heroes”). Residents master three work-related skills and are placed in positions of authority.

Delancey Street Foundation requires no paid staff to manage the process (Delancey Street Foundation, “Our Enterprises”). The genius of the program is its emphasis on self-governance and the introduction of self-respect, blended with an understanding and approach that each resident must count on other residents for the model to work. Delancey Street has grown to be a very successful rehabilitation model. Mimi Silbert’s perseverance, diligence, passion, and belief in this model broke down public stereotypes and barriers built by naysayers who believed in more traditional rehabilitation models and questioned the soundness of Silbert’s methods.

Under Silbert’s leadership, Delancey Street has developed multiple businesses in which residents work and pool their earnings while they learn social, educational, and life skills in their residential setting. This entrepreneurial approach, combined with

donations, makes the Delancey Street Program a self-sufficient organization that has graduated more than 14,000 rehabilitated individuals back into society—clean and sober, they contribute to their community and the economy (PBS, “Meet the New Heroes”).

VALUE PROPOSITION

Delancey Street residents are typically hard-core criminals who are hooked on drugs, have been incarcerated numerous times, and have hit “rock bottom,” owing to hopelessness, helplessness, and despair (Delancey Street Foundation, “Our Enterprises”).

The Delancey Street Program has the following three rules: (1) no drugs, (2) no violence, and (3) no threats of violence (ibid.). Residents are provided rehabilitation services by means of other residents who have been enrolled in the program and learned from their predecessors. They work in an area in which their skills apply and receive training from other residents in additional job skill areas. Educational courses are taught by residents who have mastered the courses previously (ibid.).

SOCIAL IMPACT

Silbert’s vision of giving convicts and drug addicts a second chance and “helping them help themselves” caught the attention of key community and governmental leaders (ibid.). The Delancey Street Model proved refreshingly successful to those politicians who had become disillusioned with the meager success and high costs related to traditional government-funded rehabilitation methods. The individual success stories and overall approach earned Delancey Street recognition for being a profoundly effective program (PBS, “Meet the New Heroes”).

TABLE 5. CASE STUDY SNAPSHOT: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Social Issue	Leader Profile	Value Proposition	Social Impact
Repetitive cycle of abuse, crime, and addiction among people in poverty, substance abusers, former felons, and others in need	Mimi Silbert achieved results by combining her passion for the mission with business-like discipline, innovation, and determination	Transform criminals, drug addicts, and the homeless into productive members of society through self-sufficient, nongovernment-subsidized rehabilitation programs	14,000+ graduates since 1974 98% success rate No cost to taxpayer or client
Costly and ineffective government-subsidized model of rehabilitation			

Source: Statistics retrieved from Delancey Street Foundation, “How We Work,” <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/hww.php>; Public Broadcasting System (PBS), “Meet the New Heroes: Mimi Silbert,” <http://www.pbs.org/opb/thenewheroes/meet/silbert.html>.

IN CONCLUSION

At the highest level, Mimi Silbert's work at Delancey Street is a stunning example of social entrepreneurship (Marz, 2010). Social entrepreneurship combines the passion of a social mission with business-like discipline, innovation, and determination. It is highly effective because it seamlessly blends dedication to a mission with outcomes measurement and accountability (Dees, Haas, & Haas, 1998). Table 6 presents the hallmarks of social entrepreneurship.

Helping people help themselves and generating enthusiasm and self-worth, all under the umbrella of a self-sustaining business model, are hallmark qualities of Delancey Street and social entrepreneurship. The Y is a nonprofit organization with a business philosophy that mirrors social entrepreneurship when its leaders have mastered skills similar to those acquired by Mimi Silbert. This leadership style is universally recognized as a superior approach to maximizing solutions for the greater good, and the skills associated with this method merit mastery among aspiring leaders in the Y Movement.

TABLE 6. SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

What is it?	Social entrepreneurship combines the passion of a social mission with business-like discipline, innovation, and determination (Dees, Haas, & Haas, 1998).
What is the guiding principle of this approach?	Social mission is explicit and central. Mission-related impact is the central criterion (not wealth creation). Always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity to create value (ibid.).
What drives it?	Advancing a social mission (ibid.).
Why is it effective?	It provides an excellent blend of passion for the mission with outcomes measurement and accountability (ibid.).

CASE STUDIES SUMMARY

When pursuing social change in a group setting, there is always that one person the group unanimously agrees must be involved for the process to be successful. It's that missing link in the chain, discovered when somebody puts their palm to their forehead in a moment of realization and says, "If we want to solve this issue, we need _____ at the table"; and then, everyone nods in unanimous agreement. I imagine a moment similar to this probably occurred with the three individuals highlighted in the case studies—very likely on a regular basis.

Comparing and contrasting each leader's individual approach against three established leadership styles reveals that each style is characterized by a specific list of attributes, as noted in table 7. Table 8 (page 15) indicates the primary and secondary leadership styles for the leaders detailed in the case studies. Each has a primary leadership style and related attributes that led to his or her success in collaborations. These are noted as **primary**. Each also has a subset of leadership skills that are apparent, but not as prominent, as other traits. These are noted as **secondary**.

TABLE 7. DETAIL OF ATTRIBUTES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership Attributes of Cooperative Intelligence (Naylor, 2006)

Cooperative Connection

- Encompasses emotional intelligence and appreciative inquiry
- Is altruistic
- Recognizes that fulfilling a mission depends as much on social capital as human capital—knowledge, expertise, and experience
- Recognizes that relationship building requires significant effort on his or her part
- Realizes every person they connect with is part of their network, every stranger has potential to be an important connection

Cooperative Leadership

- Has excellent listening skills
- Resists being consumed by ego and pushing his or her own agenda
- Welcomes intelligence from all available sources, inside and outside of the organization
- Attracts external resources because decisions are not made in isolation; knowledgeable
- Finds out what really motivates individuals
- Able to determine why people behave in a particular way
- Has strong ability to build relationships
- Helps others see how their work contributes to something beyond themselves
- Provides work that generates growth, recognition, meaning, and good relationships
- Involves employees and others in decisions that affect them
- Reflects on his or her personal leadership
- Sets the example
- Puts needs of organization first
- Is respectful
- Seeks common good
- Takes a problem-solving attitude, but does not solve others' problems
- Has a positive attitude, doesn't take oneself too seriously

Cooperative Communication

- Builds trust by telling the truth, doing what is right, and doing what is good for people and the organization
- Serves as a source of acknowledgement and appreciation
- Has excellent writing skills
- Shows discernment regarding preferred form of communication for various deliverables and circumstances (when to use email versus phone or face-to-face)
- Is an active listener—listens with ears, eyes, and emotions
- Is very observant—body language, tone of voice, feelings, and intent
- Refrains from judging—listens with an open mind

TABLE 7. DETAIL OF ATTRIBUTES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE (continued)

Leadership Attributes of Social Entrepreneurship (Dees, Haas, & Haas, 1998)

Serves as a change agent in social sector—bold visionary

- Makes fundamental changes in the way things are done in the social sector
- Attacks underlying causes of problems rather than treating symptoms
- Reduces needs rather than meeting them
- Seeks to create systematic changes and sustainable improvements
- Recognizes that actions have the potential to stimulate global improvements
- Looks for most effective methods of serving a social mission
- Mobilizes resources of others to achieve goals

Adopts a mission to create and sustain social value, recognizing that social mission is fundamental

- Profit is not gauge of value creation
- Social impact is gauge of value creation
- Long-term social return on investment is the goal

Recognizes and relentlessly pursues new opportunities to serve that mission

- Sees the possibilities rather than the problems created by change
- Has a vision of how to achieve improvement and is driven to make the vision work
- Changes models that develop as he or she learns what works, what does not work
- As a key driver, combines persistence with willingness to make adjustment as they go
- Asks “How” questions when encountering an obstacle instead of giving up (“How can we make this work?”)

Engages in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning

- Breaks new ground, develops new models, pioneers new approaches
- Applies existing ideas in a new way or to a new situation
- Displays creativity in applying what others have invented
- Applies continuous process of exploring, learning, and improving
- Shows high tolerance for ambiguity and aptitude for managing risk
- Treats failure as a learning experience rather than personal tragedy

Acts boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand

- Skilled at doing more with less and attracting resources from others
- Explores all resource options and uses scarce resources efficiently
- Leverages limited resources by drawing in partners and collaborating with others
- Develops resource strategies that support and reinforce the mission
- Takes calculated risks and manages the downside to reduce harm from failure
- Understands risk tolerance of stakeholders

Exhibits heightened sense of accountability to constituencies served and for outcomes created

- Takes steps to assure value is being created
- Seeks a sound understanding of constituents served
- Accurately assesses needs and values of people served, communities in which he or she operates
- Understands expectations and values of “investors” helping with time, money, expertise
- Seeks to provide real social improvements and attractive return to investors
- Creates market-like feedback mechanisms to reinforce accountability
- Assesses progress in terms of social, financial, and managerial outcomes (not simply in terms of size, outputs, or processes)
- Uses data to make course corrections as needed

TABLE 7. DETAIL OF ATTRIBUTES BY LEADERSHIP STYLE (continued)

Leadership Attributes of Servant Leadership (Spears, 2010)

Listening

- Listens intently to others
- Seeks to identify the will of a group
- Clarifies the will of a group
- Listens to what is said and unsaid
- Listening is coupled with periods of reflection

Empathy

- Strives to understand, identify with others
- Recognizes and accepts unique qualities in others
- Assumes good intentions of coworkers and colleagues

Healing

- Shows potential to heal one's self and one's relationship to others
- Recognizes an opportunity to help make whole those he or she comes in contact with
- Displays shared search for wholeness

Awareness

- Helps understand issues involving ethics, power, and values; improves ability to view most situations from a more integrated, holistic position
- Self-awareness

Persuasion

- Relies on influence over positional authority
- Convinces others rather than coercing compliance
- Builds consensus

Conceptualization

- Seeks to nurture one's abilities to dream great dreams
- Thinks beyond day-to-day realities
- Stretches thinking to encompass broader-based thinking
- Is a visionary
- Has the ability to balance between conceptual thinking and day-to-day operational approach

Foresight

- Can foresee the likely outcome of a situation
- Understands lessons from the past, realities of the present, likely consequences of decisions for the future
- Has an intuitive mind

Stewardship

- Has a significant ability to hold their institutions in trust for the greater good of society

Staff Development

- Believes people have intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers
- Committed to growth of every individual within the organization
- Recognizes responsibility for nurturing the development of employees and colleagues

Building Community

- Proactively identifies ways to build community among employees, community groups

TABLE 8. COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTES

Leadership Style/Attributes	Leader		
	Greehey	Silbert	Fuller
Cooperative Intelligence			
Cooperative connection	Primary	Primary	Primary
Cooperative leadership	Primary	Primary	Primary
Cooperative communication	Primary	Secondary	Secondary
Social Entrepreneurship			
Serves as a change agent in the social sector	Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Adopts a mission to create and sustain social value	Primary	Primary	Primary
Recognizes and relentlessly pursues new opportunities to serve that mission	Secondary	Primary	Primary
Engages in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning	Secondary	Primary	Primary
Acts boldly without being limited by resources currently in hand	Primary	Primary	Primary
Exhibits a heightened sense of accountability to constituencies served and for outcomes created	Primary	Primary	Secondary
Servant Leadership			
Listening	Primary	Primary	Primary
Empathy	Secondary	Primary	Primary
Healing	Secondary	Primary	Primary
Awareness	Secondary	Secondary	Primary
Persuasion	Primary	Secondary	Primary
Conceptualization	Primary	Primary	Primary
Foresight	Primary	Primary	Primary
Stewardship	Primary	Primary	Primary
Staff development	Secondary	Primary	Primary
Building community	Primary	Primary	Primary

GETTING A SEAT AT THE TABLE

Many nonprofit leaders are doing good work and could contribute to a comprehensive cause if asked to participate. Why aren't they asked?

- Many nonprofit leaders focus solely on their agency's mission owing to an overwhelming commitment to that cause (Nanus & Dobbs, 1999).
- Many nonprofit causes are considered singular in focus and only recognized as having the ability to affect a piece of the puzzle. As a result, their leaders may be stereotyped the same way. Nonprofit work is considered to be less sophisticated than for-profit endeavors (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007).
- Many nonprofit leaders do not possess a network of community leaders who appreciate and promote the universal skills that the individual may possess (Nanus & Dobbs, 1999).
- Owing to limited resources, many nonprofit systems reflect antiquated training, insufficient technology, and stagnated innovation. Unfortunately, this can stereotype the leader in a similar light (ibid.).
- Nonprofit executives are often motivated differently than their for-profit counterparts. The typical measurements and benchmarks that are recognized as signs of business savvy or prowess in the for-profit environment are not always the same benchmarks that are used in the nonprofit sector (ibid.).

To get a seat at the table, nonprofit leaders can adopt a variety of best practices to align themselves to a larger degree with the distinct leadership styles discussed.

SOLUTION NO. 1: ADOPT A GREATER GOOD MENTALITY

LEADERSHIP STYLE: SERVANT LEADERSHIP

Nonprofit leaders who want to be involved in influencing social change must adopt a holistic approach to solving community issues. This is best achieved by being receptive to alternative methods to achieve greater good (Miller & Miller, 2007). This attitude not only fulfills the needs of their specific agency but also positions them as community leaders who care about addressing multidimensional issues on a much larger scale.

SOLUTION NO. 2: PROMOTE THE SIMILARITIES IN PROCESSES

LEADERSHIP STYLE: COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE

Many operational processes are similar regardless of

the type of organization, public or private. In fact, owing to limited resources, internal processes used in the nonprofit sector (e.g., payroll ratios) are often required to be more efficient in order to streamline operations and maximize mission delivery (Nanus & Dobbs, 1999). To earn a reputation of having the ability to bring value to a group challenged with a comprehensive social issue, nonprofit leaders must present themselves and be considered by others as having the leadership skills that are exceptional and universal (Miller & Miller, 2007). Educating and involving the right community leaders on the nonprofit agency's operations will provide an opportunity to promote the similarities, sophistication, and process efficiencies that may exist.

SOLUTION NO. 3: ESTABLISH A REPUTATION OF ADDING VALUE

LEADERSHIP STYLE: COOPERATIVE INTELLIGENCE

In every community, there are specific leaders who are in the know and are respected and whose opinions count. Nonprofit leaders who wish to be involved in comprehensive social change must engage and secure the respect of these notable leaders who can validate and endorse the benefits related to that leader's involvement in addressing social issues (Whitaker & Drennan, 2007).

SOLUTION NO. 4: STAY RELEVANT

LEADERSHIP STYLE: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Nonprofit leaders must strive to ensure that their own agency's systems are recognized as current and effective (Nanus & Dobbs, 1999). This standard of excellence will ideally generate widespread acknowledgement of universally transferrable skills as it relates to broader social issues.

SOLUTION NO. 5: EMBRACE CAPACITY-BUILDING SKILLS

LEADERSHIP STYLE: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Nonprofit leaders need to understand the importance of benchmarks related to business aptitude in other industries and to put them into practice (Bryson et al., 2006). As the nonprofit leader demonstrates the ability to master these skills, a perceived sense of commonality will develop with peers that are outside of his or her traditional sphere of influence (Miller & Miller, 2007).

CALL TO ACTION

There is an obvious expectation that, regardless of the type of business leaders are managing, recognizing their abilities begins with a proven history of success in their respective industry. Success reveals itself in a number of different ways: exceptional financial stewardship; superior mission delivery; and a competent, productive, dedicated workforce (Miller & Miller, 2007). Having observed such success, one could automatically assume that there must be a quality leader at the helm—and there probably is. There are many successful companies led by successful leaders. However, specific attributes differentiate a leader who is recognized as successfully advancing a company versus one who is recognized as having universal skills that would influence social change.

The case studies in this white paper illustrate three distinct leadership styles that resulted in significant community impact: cooperative intelligence, social entrepreneurship, and servant leadership. The Y has leaders who have mastered these leadership styles. This is demonstrated by the numerous national and local Y conferences at which a panel, composed of municipal leadership, Y leadership, and other key community players, presents partnerships that are successful not only for the Y but also for the greater good.

Always the pioneer, it is common for the Y, as a movement, to host these types of forums for community development. Unfortunately, our audience is primarily made up of Y leaders who are considering Y issues in isolation. This format can be compared to a conversation confined to a card table with friends versus the breadth of input one could have at a conference table with a variety of people discussing topics on a much larger scale. If the mastery of a specific leadership style is the first step to ensuring a seat at the table, the next logical step is to take advantage of opportunities that will help solidify an invitation to sit at the “adult’s table” rather than the “kid’s table.”

Statewide and nationally, some membership-based organizations—owing to their makeup and purpose—are recognized as a platform in which solutions to social issues are explored on a broader scale. The Texas Municipal League and the National League of Cities are

examples of state and national organizations in which Y leaders could be involved and establish themselves as individuals who are prepared to contribute solutions to broader social issues.

The leadership best practices highlighted in this paper all help individuals become productive participants in organizations like the Texas Municipal League and the National League of Cities. However, whereas the Y, as a culture, is known for inviting non-Y leaders who can benefit our social agenda to the table, other organizations may or may not be as proactively inviting. For this reason, to ultimately become recognized as a valued table mate, Y leaders must take the initiative to become involved and apply the leadership best practices.

For some Y leaders, getting involved in addressing broader social issues is natural. For others, the required initiative, discipline, and persistence are not skills they inherently possess. Using the skills identified through this research and the case studies as a launching point for outcomes measurement, the development of a mentorship program specifically designed to refine these skills may be the most helpful support for advancing their effectiveness.

Aspiring leaders who had the privilege of interacting on a regular basis with one of the individuals highlighted in the case studies would potentially acquire some of these leadership skills through modeling. Such a mentoring approach is effective because of the proximity and intimacy of the relationship. In the absence of one-on-one interaction, it may be difficult for an aspiring leader to fully master the same set of skills at the same rate of speed—or at all.

It is important to note the potential for strong leaders to be resistant to the idea of being mentored, especially in light of a long history of personal successes in which assistance wasn’t needed. Furthermore, acknowledging a need for mentoring may be perceived as a leadership weakness. With these considerations in mind, the mentor program should be designed so that the approach complements the universally recognized skills the mentee has already mastered. The mentor team should focus on introducing alternative strategies that will be productive but may appear foreign and feel unnatural to the

mentee's current style. The framework for this process should include the following components:

- **A Mixed Mentor Team.** YMCA of the USA (Y-USA) develops a mentor team consisting of Y leaders and non-Y leaders with demonstrated success in influencing social change on a broader spectrum.
- **An Individualized Support System.** The mentor team taps into the existing YMCA Field Services Team to flag communities where (a) opportunities exist for the Y to be involved in significant social impact, and (b) the local Y leadership could either benefit from the mentor program or is not uniquely positioned to be at the table. Once identified, the mentor team will be introduced as a possible support system to the local Y. This individualized support system will include:
 - A review of the community climate and potential for Y involvement to influence social impact
 - An audit of the leader's capacity and readiness for participation
 - A recommended approach to securing a seat at the table
 - Ongoing guidance and mentoring, as needed
- **Internal Commitment.** Once the success of this mentor model is demonstrated and has established a proven track record, Y-USA may promote a national internal movement in which getting a seat at the table to influence social change becomes paramount to the goals of every Y leader. This can be accomplished by tracking and aggressively promoting the successes of the original group of leaders and replicating it for others as they strive to become involved in addressing broader social issues.

There are countless YMCA leaders who are playing a significant role in affecting specific areas of social change in their communities. These leaders may not be the same ones recognized internally within our organization and may, in fact, go unnoticed within the Y Movement because their leadership style does not fit the profile that is traditionally considered successful. Within the Y, there are also capable leaders who are recognized in their communities for delivering exceptional mission-based services; however, the skills necessary to effectively manage a self-contained agency are not always sufficient to address multidimensional social problems in a broader setting. This leads to two questions:

1. What set of criteria should be used to identify the subset of Y leaders who currently have the capacity to influence social change on a broader scale, but remain relatively unknown within the Movement?
2. Can a mentoring team successfully support aspiring Y leaders who are part of a community on the cusp of social change, but do not currently possess the necessary leadership skills?

Ultimately, we must have leaders who possess a leadership style that is universally recognized as beneficial to effecting social change. To fulfill our commitment to social responsibility, the Y has an obligation to identify, develop, and support superior leaders and help them secure a seat at the table.

REFERENCES

- Association of Fundraising Professionals. (2009, June 9). **San Antonio Businessman Bill Greehey Named 2009 Outstanding Volunteer Fundraiser**. Retrieved from <http://www.afpnet.org/content.cfm?ItemNumber=2898>
- Bryson, J. M., Crosby, B. C., & Middleton Stone, M. (2006). The design and implementation of cross-sector collaborations: Propositions from the literature. **Public Administration Review, Special Issue** (66, Issue Supp s1): 44–55. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00665.x
- Changemakers.net. **How Habitat for Humanity grew to be a near-billion-dollar global enterprise**. (2004, November). Retrieved from <http://proxied.changemakers.net/journal/04november/habitat.cfm>
- Dees, J. G., Haas, M., & Haas, P. (1998, October). **The meaning of “social entrepreneurship.”** Retrieved from http://www.caseatduke.org/documents/dees_sedef.pdf
- Delancey Street Foundation. **How we work**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/hww.php>
- . **Frequently asked questions**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/faq.php>
- . **Our enterprises**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/enterprises.php>
- . **Our story**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/ourstory.php>
- . **What we believe**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/wwb.php>
- . **Who we are**. Retrieved from <http://www.delanceystreetfoundation.org/wwa.php>
- Downs, J., & Gaines, E. (1999). **Ethics of development in a global environment: Creating hope in a world of despair**. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/class/e297c/poverty_prejudice/citypoverty/creating.htm
- Frick, D. M. (2004). **Robert K. Greenleaf: A life of servant leadership**. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Greehey Family Foundation. **Bill Greehey bio**. Retrieved from <http://www.greeheyfoundation.org/biography.html>
- Greenleaf. **What is servant leadership?** Retrieved from <https://greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/>
- Habitat for Humanity. **Fuller: Habitat for Humanity International founder**. Retrieved from <http://www.habitat.org/how/millard.aspx>
- . **Habitat for Humanity fact sheet**. Retrieved from <http://www.habitat.org/how/factsheet.aspx>
- . (2010, December 13). **Habitat for Humanity Reaches milestone: 400,000 homes built or repaired since 1976**. Retrieved from http://www.habitat.org/newsroom/2010archive/12_13_2010_hfh_reaches_milestone.aspx
- . **International housing finance**. Retrieved from http://www.habitat.org/housing_finance
- . **The history of Habitat**. Retrieved from <http://www.habitat.org/how/historytext.aspx>
- . **Why Habitat for Humanity is needed**. Retrieved from <http://www.habitat.org/how/why.aspx>

- Haven for Hope. **History of Haven for Hope**. Retrieved from <http://www.havenforhope.org/new/history.aspx>
- . **About homelessness in Bexar County**. Retrieved from <http://www.havenforhope.org/new/facts.aspx>
- . **Homelessness facts**. Retrieved from <http://www.havenforhope.org/new/facts.aspx>
- . **Partner spotlight**. Retrieved from <http://www.havenforhope.org/new/partners.aspx>
- International Forum, The. (n.d.). **Social entrepreneurs provide examples of leadership and vision....** Retrieved from http://www.internationalforum.com/Text%20Pages/metaphores_for_leadership.htm
- London, S. (2012). Collaboration and community. In M. B. Mortensen & J. Nesbitt (Eds.), **On Collaboration**. London: Tate. (See also www.scottlondon.com/reports/ppcc.html)
- Marz, N. (2010, January 13). Mimi Silbert: The greatest hacker in the world. Retrieved from <http://nathanmarz.com/blog/mimi-silbert-the-greatest-hacker-in-the-world.html>
- Miller, W. R., & Miller, J. P. (2007). Leadership styles for success in collaborative work. Retrieved from <http://www.leadershipeducators.org/Resources/Documents/Conferences/FortWorth/Miller.pdf>
- Nanus, B., & Dobbs, S. M. (1999). Leaders who make a difference: Essential strategies for meeting the nonprofit challenge. In **The Leadership Challenge: Essential Strategies for Meeting the Nonprofit Challenge**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Naylor, E. (January–February 2006). Introducing cooperative intelligence. **Competitive Intelligence Magazine** 9(1), 6–9. Retrieved from <http://www.scip.org/Publications/CIMArticleDetail.cfm?ItemNumber=1337>
- Public Broadcasting System (PBS). **Meet the new heroes: Mimi Silbert**. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/opb/thenewheroes/meet/silbert.html>
- Simms, D., Smith Milway, K., & Trager, C. (2009). Finding leaders for America's nonprofits. Boston: The Bridgespan Group. Retrieved from <http://www.bridgespan.org/finding-leaders-for-americas-nonprofits.aspx>
- Spears, Larry C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. **The Journal of Virtues & Leadership** 1(1), 25–30.
- The measure of a man**. (2010, November). Retrieved from **Texas CEO Magazine** <http://texasceomagazine.com/features/the-measure-of-a-man-4/>
- Whitaker, G. P., & Drennan, J. C. (2007). County and municipal government in North Carolina, Article 11, Local government and nonprofit organizations. UNC–Chapel Hill School of Government. Retrieved from <http://www.sogpubs.unc.edu/cmgs/cmgs11.pdf>
- William E. Greehey 1936–. From small town to big time. In **Reference for Business** (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/biography/F-L/Greehey-William-E-1936.html>

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JEFFREY ANDRESEN

**PRESIDENT AND CEO
YMCA OF GREATER WILLIAMSON COUNTY**

Jeff Andresen is the President/CEO of the YMCA of Greater Williamson County. His Y career spans more than 27 years; he previously held positions at YMCAs in Wyoming, Portland, Oregon, and Hawaii.

Creative partnerships have been the hallmark of Jeff's career, including school district, city and county, and state-funded YMCAs. Hospital collaborations, bond-funded initiatives, and private partnerships have resulted in an expanded Y presence in communities that would be underserved using a more traditional method. The YMCA of Greater Williamson County has been recognized year after year as a preferred strategic partner with area cities, county government, and educational institutions in central Texas.

Jeff holds a bachelor's degree in psychology from Montana State University and was a two-time All-American gymnast and member of the Montana State Athletic Hall of Fame. Jeff is married and has four children.

