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ABSTRACT

Due to changes in economic and social climate, including a decrease in state and federal funding, associate’s colleges began to supplement their search for funds by fundraising. Furthermore, associate’s colleges’ fundraising has evolved and the purpose of this research was to scrutinize philosophies, perspectives, practices, relationships, and experiences of collegiate staff involved in institutional fundraising in large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state in order to promote prosperity in resource development.

The researcher’s objective was to endeavor to document the roles of institutional actors in the fundraising process, their training, background, organization, and their differing approaches to tactics when soliciting corporations and individuals. In addition, the study looked at governance of foundations and fundraising staff specifics (job descriptions, student use, size related to funds generated). This included the roles of governance, philosophies, resources, methods of procuring funds, and reporting. This study displayed differences and similarities in fundraising practices at large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state and described the setting in which these events took place.

The participants in this study were ten fundraisers connected with associate’s colleges of varying ages, educational backgrounds, and fundraising experience. Data for the study were derived from semi-structured interviews with each fund raiser, a foundation meeting observation, and a review of fundraising related documents. Using basic qualitative methods, the researcher conducted a thematic analysis of the data which enabled him to organize that data into manageable segments where he coded it. This process enabled the researcher to establish connections between the collected data and the research questions. Three major themes emerged
from data analysis: (a) relationship management is fundraising; (b) relationship management is a product of resources and communication; (c) profitable fundraising involves maximizing the potential of four factors: participants, environment, experiences, and philosophy. Moreover, the study answered how large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state developed fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding.
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CHAPTER I:
INTRODUCTION

Defining Fundraising

According to Worth (1993), fundraising is simply “one specific, episodic aspect of resource development requiring interpersonal and communicative skills” (as cited in Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 717). In general, fundraising is merely a part of a larger process: building good relationships with people who come in contact with the college. Ultimately, Peters (1992) declared that relationships are the only factor in fundraising.

The average person may have trouble distinguishing the difference between terms like advancement, development, and fundraising. According to a presentation by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) president, advancement can be defined as “the set of management functions that includes fundraising, alumni relations, communications and marketing, as well as advancement services” (Lippincott, 2010, p. 6). In a college, an advancement office utilizes these means to better or grow an institution. This term is more synonymous with development, a term often wrongly equated to fundraising (Lippincott, 2010). In four-year colleges and universities, a development office may consist of an office of advancement, an advancement research office, and an office of gifts or giving. However, for purposes of this study on practices and experiences in large, rural associate’s colleges in the southern United States, advancement and development will be synonymous terms.

A development or advancement office’s primary role is soliciting gifts and donations from various sources. However, fundraising (the time spent trying to get gifts) is only one component of development or advancement (aligning institutional goals, planning, and fostering
environments where fundraising can occur). Specifically, a development office provides a number of “related services, including prospect research, database management, gift recording and processing, accounting, special-events planning and oversight, and donor relations” (Drozdowski, 2003, para. 8). Although the literature review will illuminate many specifics in both fundraising and development, for the purposes of this study, fundraising specifically describes the practices associated with soliciting private gifts from individuals for the purpose of community college advancement.

**Introduction and Statement of the Problem**

The community college landscape has changed numerous times in the United States. These changes that swept through the history of community colleges can be categorized into three waves (Milliron, de los Santos, & Browning, 2003). During their introduction from the 1900s and through the 1950s, the prosperity of these existing institutions and the emergence of new community colleges were the primary focus of lawmakers and administrators. In addition, there was a movement toward racial integration and increasing access for underrepresented student populations. During this era, community college fundraising was almost nonexistent.

The second wave of the 1960s through the 1980s consisted of community colleges moving into an array of educational, entrepreneurial, and social relationships including a “focus on workforce development and technology” (Milliron et al., 2003, p. 82). This growing bond between industry and community colleges fostered interest in resource development. In the mid-1980s, college leadership acknowledged the diminishment of state funding (Roney, 1993). By the late 1980s, the increasing federal budget deficit and the attractiveness of tax-limiting plans made it incredibly difficult for community colleges to maintain their core functions on their own (Roney, 1993). Colleges were forced to make an increasing effort to generate funds to retain key
services and to produce growth even in times of continual decreases in state funding. Most private fundraising began in the late in the 1980s for community colleges and accelerated in the 1990s. However, for many public two-year colleges, it would be a number of years before they aggressively engaged in fundraising activities.

Due to changes in economic and social climate, including a decrease in state and federal funding, a focus on institutional advancement occurred in the 1990s. During this period, community colleges ventured into multiple fiscal avenues to explore, develop and foster relationships so as to grow and maintain their institutions. Reduction of funding from state governments necessitated and increased fundraising endeavors. The evolution and interweaving of continued and complex relationships is described as the third wave, where the movement toward private fundraising has flourished (Milliron et al., 2003). Movements toward globalization and technology have aided the effectiveness of institutional advancement in this most recent wave. The great amount of growth that has occurred due to an increase in communicative technology, the development of software, social networking, and an increase in travel are attributes of the increasing trends in globalization. No place has this become more evident than in higher education in the United States. The growth of for-profit institutions, trends in integrating online courses into public curriculum, and business partnership ventures between college and corporations/industry have exemplified this march into the future.

There are more than 1,150 community colleges in the United States. Many of these have only been founded in the past 30 years, while most of the nation’s four-year institutions have been around over 100 years and have utilized this time to develop alumni groups, build endowments, and continue a legacy of successful fundraising campaigns (Angelo, 2005). Fundraising at the American community college has to make up for decades of inexperience.
This lack of experience can be illustrated in Kelly’s (1995) reporting of his findings on two major professional organizations of college and university fundraisers, the National Society of Fundraising Executives (NSFRE) and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). Kelly (1995) found that “less than half (44%) of the organizations represented in NSFRE had policies regarding the acquisition of gifts and 50% of these institutions count on professional fundraisers to abide by a code of professional ethics when receiving gifts or to judge gifts on an individual basis” (p. 132). This lack of clear and universal policies, procedures, and guidelines leaves many colleges and universities susceptible to pilfering and misappropriation of funds.

Today, many public and private institutions are developing “full partnerships on the economic and educational landscape,” a defining characteristic of the current era of community colleges (Milliron et al., 2003, p. 82). This has brought the application of business models into the community college setting, creating a perspective that America’s community college are no longer student-centered because of many administration’s strict adherence to corporate models in order to maintain key services without adequate funding (Milliron et al., 2003).

In addition, modern community colleges may exhibit defining characteristics from dissimilar waves. Metaphorically, oceanic waves collide, crash, merge and separate, as the educational waves and therefore, as the colleges and the traits within them. Likewise, “a number of institutions still wrestle with building bridges between the often segregated worlds of technical-vocational education and two-year liberal arts and general education programs” (Milliron et al., 2003, p. 83). This will continue as long as friction continues to exist between varying conservative and liberal philosophies within institutions and in surrounding external climates.
It is ironic that, while community colleges continue to experience reductions in funding, the government that is hindering their progress declares their continued and growing importance. In his September 2000 testimony to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and the Workforce, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan declared that community colleges, partially due to their involvement in workforce training, were becoming an essential factor in the health of the U.S. economy. He declared that

The dramatic increase in the demand for on-the-job technical training and the major expansion of the role of our community colleges in teaching the skills required to address our newer technologies are persuasive evidence that the pressures for increased learning are ongoing. (para. 7)

In spite of this statement, aid to our nation’s community colleges continues to diminish. This reduced financial support and increase in demand have created an environment in which community colleges have had to introduce austerity measures including eliminating programs, cutting back services, and seeking creative ways to enhance revenue from alternative sources (Kapraun & Heard, 1993; McLeod, Atwell, & Bedics, 1995; Katsinas & Hardy, 2012).

Gaskin (1997) asserted that public funding has been diminishing for a number of years. This caused community colleges to seek funding from additional sources and to increase tuition and fees. Additional scholars studied a national sample of community colleges and identified 27 institutions that had experienced a decrease in state funding (Collins, Leitzel, Morgan, & Stalcup, 1994). In this group, twenty-four (88.9%) had increased tuition and fees. Oftentimes, the immediate reaction of institutions is to raise fees and tuition to counter a reduction in state or federal funding (Collins et al., 1994; Hyde & Augenblick, 1980; Wattenbarger & Vader, 1986; Kenton, Huba, Schuh, & Shelley, 2005). This raise in tuition at community colleges is in direct opposition to the primary mission and original intent of community colleges to provide postsecondary access to an underrepresented student population (Labaree, 1997).
In 2006, a federal report by the Federal Commission of the Future of Higher Education on funding for higher education stated that support from state governments was at a 25-year low and “state funding for higher education will not grow enough to support enrollment demand” (p. 9). Murphy (2009) declared that because this funding is constantly being reduced for community colleges, fundraising efforts and plans may need to be incredibly sophisticated and complicated. In addition, there are a few fundraising professionals with the proven experience to head an advancement office; therefore, it is difficult to find effective staff to develop effective and complex fundraising strategy in an unforgiving economic climate (Murphy, 2009).

Hiring an experienced fundraising staff is even more difficult considering that American community colleges are already understaffed. In 2005, Polly Binns, executive director of the Council for Resource Development, an affiliate organization of the American Association of Community Colleges, explained that because community colleges are understaffed, strict yearly gathering and reporting of fundraising data is not a high priority and neither is developing the programs to do so, especially while community colleges are struggling to survive during an economic downturn (Angelo, 2005). To adjust for continuing economic hardships, many colleges have reduced staff and added fundraising responsibilities to previous community college employees adding to the hours spent at work and adding stress to already overworked employees. In addition, Muth (2009) explained that some four-year colleges are following a similar practice. At Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, previous institutional administrators were replaced with less qualified public relations people who travel directly to, and socialize with potential donors. By following this philosophy, colleges like Duquesne have increased their in-person visits to potential donors by 300% (Muth, 2009).
Additionally, the harsh economy has produced a necessity for inventive measures in procuring funds. This includes students extensively researching the financial situations of prospective donors and accompanying administrators on visits to donors before meeting them in person (Muth, 2009). Each of these measures takes away from resources that the colleges could use to educate and improve the lives of their students.

In addition to the fiscal strain to maintain services, community colleges must also incorporate modern measures to aid in the fundraising process, attribute funding to modern fundraising techniques, and create ways to handle newly acquired resources. Moreover, most community colleges are behind modern businesses in their utilization of electronic fundraising and are not adept at handling nonmonetary assets according to James Moses, a collegiate research director (Herrmann, 2008). Finally, to reward donors, on average, some colleges spend over $14,000 a year on plaques, medals, and other mementos or gifts to reward donors (Herrmann, 2008).

An additional difficulty of fundraising at community colleges is that resource development protocols do not always merge well with a college’s planning process. Neither business models nor four-year college models correlate or work well within specific community college environments. Research continually stresses the importance of developing relationships to tap into community wealth, but there is no concrete process that always works, although there are data-driven factors in successful fundraising: 1) alignment of resource development with institutional mission; 2) integrating development planning into the colleges’ management plans; 3) and fundraising staffs/resource development offices must have access to institutional research and databases (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).
Furthermore, scholars have suspected that if collegiate administrators could better relationships with state government officials, and stress the importance of community colleges to the advancement of society, perhaps additional legislation could be proposed to add alternative funding sources (Kenton et al., 2005). However, history has proven that in times of difficult economic downturn, community college funding is victim to strenuous budget cuts (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

One major strain to community colleges, due to the necessity of procuring additional funds at these institutions, is that private fundraising has become a major aspect of the community college president’s job; moreover, it is surprising that few of these officers are educated or trained in how to secure funds from donors. According to Vaughan, Mellander, and Blois, over half of successful presidential candidates come from the position of chief academic officer where they had little or no training in resource development or private fundraising (1994). In the past, the president’s fundraising role could be limited to the hiring of advancement staff members. Today, presidents understand that this role has dynamically grown and become critical to the college’s prosperity (Miller, 1991). In today’s tough economy, the president’s role has expanded to being an ambassador between his or her institution and the legislature, and acting as a development officer who solicits resources from high profile donors to “ensure the short-term survival and long-term growth of the institution” (Hodson, 2010, p. 40). The difficulty of effectively governing a community college has grown almost exponentially in the past thirty years. Smith (1986) has recommended that at least 60% of a president's time be spent fostering relationships with legislators, public funding sources, and private donors. This takes a great deal of time and attention away from establishing and maintaining the internal relationships and culture of the college.
The president must rally involvement from the community, and regularly interact with constituents, the public, business leaders, and community groups interested in investing in the college (CASE, 1989; Robinson, 1990; Glass & Jackson, 1998a). In addition, Kaufman (2004) had declared that a president who does not foster these relationships and becomes excessively involved with the interior collegiate affairs is not likely to be a successful fundraiser.

Hodson (2010) suggested that if a president cannot maintain the sensitive balance of the office, then he or she will not succeed. Furthermore, the president must not become so overly absorbed in gathering constituents that they overlook the fundraising potential of faculty and staff. Moreover, a president should not get so absorbed in building relationships outside of the college that he or she forgets to retain the fragile balance of the institution and its other needs (Hodson, 2010). The president is to oversee the fundraising efforts of the development office and to coordinate their efforts into “a unified message and image to external constituencies” (Hodson, 2010, p. 42). The president can help to ensure this by incorporating the development office into strategic planning efforts and placing this office under an umbrella that includes public relations, grants management, and offices that communicate with internal and external stakeholders (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). Finally, Payton (1989) argued that fundraising is the greatest risk to community college presidents because of possible scandal and numerous internal problems that can occur. Yet, if fundraising is not successful, the president is responsible (Glass & Jackson, 1998a).

Another problem with private fundraising in the community college setting is the length of time community colleges have to wait before relationships are matured with potential donors to gain a significantly helpful gift. Presidents and development staff members must display boundless patience. Research shows that the fulfillment and culmination of a relationship that
ends with a large gift usually takes from 18 to 30 months (Nicoson, 2010). However, getting in financial trouble can happen in a matter of days. Gathering the gifts to free the institution from a fiscal catastrophe can take years.

One quandary facing community colleges is that local businesses may not be aware of how integral the community college is to the production of skilled employees. Development officers are concerned that local business and industry leaders are unaware of how much of the local labor force is trained by their college (Catanzaro & Miller, 1994; Lamme, 1995; Ryan, 1993). Moreover, businesses must realize that local colleges and industry must maintain strong and mutually beneficial symbiotic relationships to ensure prosperity and keep them both flourishing during harsh economic downturns (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

In addition, community college programs have suffered greatly in many states as funding continues to dwindle. Through 2010 - 2011, the Alabama Community College System educated 44% of the Alabama’s undergraduates, but received only 25% of the state’s higher education funding (ACCS, 2010). In the fiscal year of 2010 - 2011, state support represented 32.4% of total revenue, a decrease of 15.4% over 2007-08 (ACCS, 2010). By 2011, a number of Alabama community colleges closed the doors on collegiate programs, especially in athletics. Northwest Shoals, Gadsden State, and Beville State Community Colleges discontinued a number of sports programs. The increased need for funding oftentimes produces friction between college administrators and athletic leadership because they both battle for scarce resources and oftentimes have different visions of where the hard fought funding should go. This has motivated scholars to produce new research on this relationship (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

One further issue is that efforts of resource development and fundraising at community colleges are not usually set as a great priority until moments of fiscal crisis and economic
instability (Loessin, Duronio, & Borton, 1986; Townsend, 1996). In the past, few colleges highly prioritized preemptive measures. These measures have evolved within the last decade as all colleges have had to struggle and survive in a grueling economic atmosphere where government funding has continued to decline, and competition for increasing student enrollment has driven colleges to pursue erecting vast and sprawling megaliths. Methods of ensuring growth in student numbers often include erecting sports complexes and student centers to gain interest from potential students. Yet, these institutions build at a time of fear that there will be even less federal and state funding in the future. To maximize the potential for fiscal security, retain efficiency in maintaining the college functions, continue the upkeep of facilities, and institute new capital improvement projects, colleges should utilize models of fundraising with a long term perspective (Lorenzo & LeCroy, 1994; Mercer, 1994; Smith, 1994).

Before reviewing the literature involving studies of fundraising in the American community college, it is imperative to note that, because community colleges were created at the state level, they are controlled and governed by the states. Therefore, it is difficult for scholars to make broad generalizations for the entire nation. Accurate comparative results and data may be limited to states whose community college histories and organizational structures are similar to those studied (Kenton, Huba, Schuh, & Shelley, 2005). Furthermore, the policies that govern the funding of higher education differ among the states (Kenton et al., 2005).

**Rationale and Significance for the Study**

Private fundraising at community colleges is a momentous undertaking requiring input and effort from numerous entities: the president, head administrators, board members, staff, faculty, and volunteers. To be successful, stakeholders need to understand and embrace institutional goals, the role of each group, the procedures by which they operate, and the
relationships necessary for successful fundraising (Mixer, 1993). Successful fundraising practices oftentimes involve a tremendous effort of teamwork and organization. Today, fundraising is a complex, multifaceted activity within community colleges; however, there are many concepts left unexplored including the specific experiences of Alabama two-year college fundraising participants. More research needs to be performed inside Alabama community colleges to explore the practices of their fundraising professionals. This exploratory, multiple-case study attempts to distinguish if the practices utilized by other collegiate fundraising professionals are utilized by those in the three rural large northern Alabama two-year community colleges.

Data from this study can be utilized to assess the protocols and improve the experience of stakeholders in Alabama’s two-year college system. This research could help maintain the mission of Alabama community colleges, preserve key institutional functions, increase scholarship opportunities, and enhance fundraising efficiency. The information relinquished from this study can illuminate fundraising practices that effective fundraisers use at fiscally sound community colleges. If utilized correctly, these new practices can reinvigorate development offices that may have encountered a fundraising slowdown. This new research could revitalize the development and advancement offices of similar sized institutions. Finally, the outcomes of this study could be valuable to collegiate professionals who are implementing fundraising policy at their institutions and to educate foundation board members who wish to evaluate their overall efficiency.
Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

Due to changes in economic and social climate, including a decrease in state and federal funding, community colleges began to supplement their search for funds from federal grants by soliciting private gifts, establishing development offices and college foundations (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Community college fundraising has evolved into a complicated arrangement of symbiotic relationships that involves mutual and protective support amongst entities, organizations, business and industry (Hall, 2002).

Research indicates that there are many attributes and characteristics of successful fundraising in community colleges which include, but are not limited to: organizational structure (Bock & Sullins, 1987; Sader, 1986; Koelkebeck, 1994; Katsinas, Herrmann, & Traylor, 1990; Piland, 1994; Ryan, 2003; Holmes, 2010), planning and research (Murphy, 2009; Rivard, 2002; Hall, 2002; Nahm & Zerosky, 1993; Sheldon, 1994; Angotti, 1988; Degerstedt, 1985), relationship development (Hall, 2002; Huang, 1997; Hon & Grunig, 1999; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000; Worth, 1993; Glass & Jackson, 1998b; Peters, 1992; Hodson, 2010; Dunlop & Worth, 2000), and practices which oftentimes incorporate technology (Comstock, 2009; M. H., 2008; Carson, 2008; Nicoson, 2010; Angelo, 2005). The purpose of this research was to scrutinize philosophies, perspectives, practices, relationships, and experiences of collegiate staff involved in institutional fundraising in large, rural associate’s colleges in north Alabama in order to promote prosperity in resource development.

The researcher’s objective was to endeavor to document the roles of institutional actors in the fundraising process, their training, background, organization, and how their tactics differed when approaching corporations and individuals. Using observations, document analysis, and interviews, the researcher probed institutional fundraising philosophy while investigating
perspectives of how fundraising efforts were organized, managed, staffed, and carried out. In
addition, the study looked at governance of foundations and fundraising staff specifics (job
descriptions, student use, size related to funds generated). This included the roles of governance,
resources, methods of procuring funds, and reporting. This study displayed differences in
fundraising practices at large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state and described the
setting in which these events take place.

Therefore, the overarching research question this study attempted to answer was: How do
large rural two year colleges in the southeastern United States develop fiscal resources in a
climate of reduced state and federal funding?

Topical sub-questions related to this overarching research question were

1. What are the role, scope, and goals of private, corporate, and foundation
   fundraising at large rural community colleges in north Alabama;

2. What philosophies, structures, policies, and practices are in place to support
   fundraising efforts within the colleges;

3. Who decides what resources are provided to support the colleges’ fundraising
   efforts;

4. What are the obstacles, challenges, effectiveness, and productivity of the
   fundraising efforts at the two-year colleges studied;

5. How do the fundraising practices identified within the literature review compare
   to those at two-year large rural north Alabama community colleges;

6. Where do the primary fundraising functions lie at each institution;

7. What techniques are utilized in wooing potential donors; and

8. What factors help determine who approaches potential givers?
Definitions of Terms

There is a history of jargon involving fundraising. The term development was originally used in 1924 during a $10 million University of Chicago Development Campaign (Luck & Tolle, 1978). Development is a term that is synonymous with long-term fundraising. It involves the continued financial survival and prosperity of an institution (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Resource development is a term most often associated with community college fundraising. It is consistent with the college’s mission and involves the “process of securing external funds” (Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 4).

In addition, relationship is a term echoed continuously in college fundraising literature. One important types of relationship is an exchange relationship. This occurs when two entities exchange services for the good of both (Hall, 2002). Many of the business relationships built between community colleges and the industries they serve are founded upon exchange relationships. These relationships work well because they attempt to serve the needs of the community (Hall, 2002). However, they oftentimes only benefit members of the business/industry and the college.

Some beneficial donations are inspired by enlightened self-interest (Mixer, 1993). Charitable contributions are more quickly offered by corporations if the funding offered provides them with some sort of an advantage either through public relations via public perception or through a future financial benefit that may come to fruition in the immediate or remote futures of an organization. This idea displays that organizations, educational or commercial, are more likely to offer aid when they realize it will benefit them in some way. Similarly, the phrase adoptive philanthropy occurs when donors support individuals due to a “feeling of surrogate kinship” (Schervish, 1997, p. 117).
Delimitations

This study was delimited to three participants involved in the fundraising process at three large rural community colleges located in north Alabama. The researcher chose large rural community colleges in north Alabama due to demographics, geography, enrollment, structure, size, and programs; as a result, generalizing the findings of this study may prove impossible. Because the study is delimited to a purposeful sampling of three Alabama administrators involved in the fundraising process at three large rural north Alabama community colleges, the results of this study may not be helpful to administrators in other institutional types or settings. In addition, this study is delimited by topic. The study is not specifically looking at grants or state and federal funding. The study’s focus is on gifts from private individuals and corporations and potentially other non-profit entities.

Limitations

The researcher acknowledges a number of potential limitations that could have negatively affected the study. They include the following:

1. The study will only include information provided by a sample of large rural community colleges in north Alabama, which is not necessarily indicative of the fundraising practices, culture, or beliefs of all community college fundraising participants;

2. Participant trustworthiness; and

3. Accuracy and completeness of documents.
Assumptions

The study was conducted based upon the following premises and assumptions:

1. The researcher presumed that the community college fundraising participant interviewed for the study will offer honest information regarding their experiences, practices, and perspectives; and

2. The researcher presumed that the data collected and analyzed will offer sufficient evidence regarding fundraising experiences, practices, and perspectives to answer the research questions of this study.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this study was to scrutinize the fundraising experiences, practices, and perspectives of fundraising participants at three large rural community colleges in north Alabama. Since the late 1980s, institutions of higher education have been forced to actively pursue additional financial support due to the reduction of state and federal funding (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Two-year colleges have become increasingly active participants in the pursuit of additional fiscal resources and are in fundraising competition with some four-year colleges and universities (Miller, 1994; Padover & Elder, 2007; Blong & Bennett, 1991; Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Therefore, a necessity to evaluate fundraising activities is present and such exploration will benefit institutions engaged in similar practices. Due to the necessity of private fundraising in higher education, development offices need information that can help operate more effectively and efficiently. The aim of this research is to fill a void prevalent in the literature.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter I includes the introduction and statement of the problem with research questions. Chapter II includes the review of literature pertinent to the study, beginning with a brief history of collegiate fundraising, followed by
practices in fundraising and advancement, the roles of participants, relationship management, sources of funding, community college fundraising including successful examples, athletics and fundraising, and research theories and policy. Chapter III includes a discussion of the theoretical framework for the study, research design, qualitative data collection methodology, and the data analyses method employed to conduct the study. Chapter IV will include information collected in the study including an analysis of data. Chapter V will include findings and conclusion of the study, and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.
CHAPTER II:
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction: History of Fundraising

Gifts for educational endeavors can be traced as far back as the library of Alexandria, built by Ptolemy I Soter (who reigned until 284 BC). It was the hub and storehouse of ancient knowledge. Part of the Mouseion, the Shrine of Muses, became a scientific research center and university. The financial awards that funded this megalith started the world’s first universal library, at one time housing as many as 700,000 scrolls in various languages. Here, the Old Testament was translated into Greek, and Euclid devised his Elements of Geometry (Silvera, 1974). However little was documented about fundraising techniques in early civilizations.

Fisher and Quehl (1989) have contended that early fundraising campaigns initiated by development offices in association with professional consultants did not begin until the early twentieth century. Fundraising for survival did not emerge as a necessity in higher education in the beginning. In fact, collegiate fundraising’s modern roots can be seen as an evolving force in the industrial revolution in Europe and the early Americas. It rallied local industry, brought outside investors, and eventually tied national economic ventures to social development. According to Berdahl, Altbach, and Gumport (1999), this collage of business, ethics, science, philanthropy, and the arts may have been the most important innovation of the whole era.

Fundraising in the United States and its Southeastern States

Later, in the United States, the land grant colleges, erected by the federal government after 1862, added additional science, engineering, and technology classes through vocational
universities, and increased access to many thousands of American citizens. These events converged into the Servicemen Readjustment Act of 1944 which made the idea of attending a college reachable for most Americans after 1945, and peaked with the growth of the American community college, making America’s higher education system the premiere access-based model of higher education in the entire world (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999). In 1965, congress ratified the Higher Education Act. This additionally increased the availability of postsecondary education to the masses (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999).

The Alabama community college system was very much a microcosm for what was occurring in the United States. New institutions sprung up and older colleges expanded. Nationwide, “Between 1965 and 1975, an average of almost one new community college campus opened each week” (Katsinas, 1994, p. 450). In 1972, amendments to the higher education act introduced Pell Grants for students based on financial need. However, by 1975, enrollment reached and stagnated at 11 million and financial need became an important factor in American higher education (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999).

In the state of Alabama, the community college movement exploded with an initiative by Governor George Wallace to provide Alabamians access and opportunity to postsecondary education (Katsinas, 1994). In addition, Wallace vowed to get funding to provide workforce training to compete with national averages (Katsinas, 1994). Between 1963 and 1987, forty-one separately administered two-year colleges came to existence in the state of Alabama (George C. Wallace, 1987). However, due to the often criticized tax laws coined by the Alabama Constitution of 1901, there are vast limitations that continually limit community college funding. Like many states, the bulk of Alabama education funding stems from dollars produced by sales and income taxes, two sources that become crippled during times of economic instability (Ivey,
Pudner, Budd, & Mebane, 2009). Furthermore, Waller (2003) pointed out that depending on a limited number of revenue streams is a particular source of concern for community colleges.

Access has always been a large part of the community college mission. However, financial uncertainty strains community colleges and their mission to serve underrepresented student populations. Breneman and Nelson (1981) have explained that during the 1960s and 1970s, there was tremendous growth in enrollment for underrepresented students in American community colleges. However, in past decades, these institutions have required more funding. Support has dwindled due to state and federal cutbacks and a redistribution of funding toward public four-year universities. Today, like public schools and four-year colleges, community colleges must also scramble for dwindling private and political dollars to maintain essential functions (Padover & Elder, 2007).

Additionally, in the 1960s state and local taxes, tuition, and fees were the primary sources of funds. Private-sector fundraising requiring affluent alumni was rarely considered (Clements, 1996). In the following decade, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) encouraged member institutions to begin development efforts. Around the same time, The National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) was chartered as an affiliate organization to offer aid and training on corporate donating, private foundations, and grantsmanship. In 1974, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), originally formed to help private and senior public higher education institutions, offered membership to two-year institutions (Clements, 1996; Miller, 1994; Smith, 1993; Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

The nation was at a crossroads in which underrepresented citizens were granted a great opportunity to better themselves. Community colleges were a major actor on this stage. Labaree
(1997) suggested that their primary role was to increase access and therefore promote socioeconomic equality. However, it was not until 1972, when the act was amended and students were introduced to new federal aid that incredible change occurred (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999). Federal financial aid was introduced and poor students had an opportunity for federal grants and/or loans to ameliorate the costs of higher education. Higher education opportunities became viable for American youth.

Moreover, from the 1970s and through the 1980s, there was a movement toward workforce development (Milliron et al., 2003). During this time, increased communication and partnerships developed between businesses and colleges. As these ties strengthened, collegiate administrators noticed fundraising opportunities arising due to these new relationships. During this era, American higher education began to evolve into a competitive capitalistic entity saturated with business models and entrepreneurial friction. This would be the climate that eventually fostered the for-profit college and added strict bureaucracy to the community college structure (Altbach, Berdahl, & Gumport, 1999).

In addition, collegiate fundraising began to flourish in the 1980s. Researchers began to note what the more successful colleges were doing (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). Simultaneously, due to an increased state and local tax base, the growth of financial aid, and all the tuition paid due to increased enrollment, the American community college flourished.

During the 1980s, the office of the college president changed dramatically due to institutional fiscal constraints, making fundraising an imperative aspect of the position. Moreover, fundraising ability is oftentimes an important factor when choosing a president, and it is an integral marker of presidential success. Cook (1997) declared that presidents of the past
oftentimes cement their legacies due to their ability to fundraise more so than the progression of overall institutional quality.

In the 1980s, public funding began to decline for community colleges. At the same time, the private sector exhibited consistent growth. A few community colleges began to shift their search for funds from federal grants to private gifts, establishing development offices and college foundations (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). During this period, Duffy (1980) found that continuous and adequate planning emerged as a determining factor in these colleges developing successful community college foundations.

Although, by 1987, 53% of the community colleges in the nation started foundations, many only served as collection agencies for likely contributors. By 1989, only 200 of the nation’s 1,222 community colleges reported having foundations often occupied in professional fundraising (Miller, 1994). Administrators at these institutions raised tuition, reduced services, closed doors, or began fundraising. Padover and Elder (2007) asserted that institutions began to successfully compete with four-year institutions to acquire significant gifts from donors. For this to occur, community colleges were forced to adjust missions and change institutional leadership culture. From an organizational perspective, due to its entrepreneurial climate, community colleges in the United States finally became designed to efficiently serve the public.

This organized planning effort involving the president and community has been categorized as an essential condition to success (Jenner, 1987). Degerstedt’s (1985) research that examined goal setting and planning in private community college fundraising confirmed the findings of previous data. He noted that colleges that had a genuine need for external funding and whose projects and services had been fully supported and highly prioritized by both the college and the foundation were more successful in fundraising. In addition, Jenner (1987)
found that integrating fundraising with institutional planning activities contributed to success. This trend would flourish in the next decade.

One of these planning activities, involving the workforce development movement, began a prospering partnership between business, industry, and the community college. According to (Milliron et al., 2003), these entrepreneurial expansions can be partially tracked through scrutinizing League for Innovation programs. The League began displaying vital corporate relationships between community colleges, industries and businesses, and in 1985 the League for Innovation held an event in Kansas City, Missouri, entitled *We Mean Business: Policies for Partnerships in Industry and Education*. According to scholars, this initialized a directive for community colleges to create services and programs to meet the needs of business and industry (Milliron et al., 2003).

As a result of this meeting, the League formed the Business and Industry Services Network (BISNET) and formally instituted a directive to make workforce development a major role in community colleges. In 1992, the BISNET leaders hosted a business and industry services workshop, followed in 1993 with a conference on total quality management. The flourishing correspondence between business and industry could no longer be ignored. This connection blossomed into the Community College Business and Industry Alliance, which brought together community college leaders and major technological companies such as IBM, Kodak, and Xerox. The Alliance helped lead a series of regional forums regarding business and industry training that culminated in the League’s first Workforce 2000 conference in 1994. “600 attendees were expected but 1,200 registered” (Milliron et al., 2003, p. 85). This type of event reflects the increased interest in workforce development that community colleges exhibited in the 1990s.
Community colleges fostered this growing partnership with industry and continued to focus on workforce development. Since the 1990s, and because two-year institutions stress workforce development, they have oftentimes displayed stronger ties with local technology, labor, and industrial organizations than their four-year counterparts. This is one area of fundraising that community colleges can utilize over four-year colleges (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). Additional data were generated through the research of Ryan (1993). He found that successful community colleges during this era raised much of their money from corporate donors (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

In 1990, philanthropic endeavors by community colleges generated less than 2% of the annual revenue, compared to 12% for public four-year institutions and 14% for private universities (Catanzaro & Miller, 1994). By 1992, twenty community colleges raised over $1 million, almost twice the number in 1990 (Alcantra, 1995). In 1995, the number increased to 26 (Council for Aid to Education, 1996b). During this year, corporations were the second largest contributors to community colleges, responsible for 32.2% of the voluntary support received (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). By the end of the 1990s, community colleges gained a significant amount of resources due to their relationships with business and industry.

Some states secured agreements with their community colleges to begin private fundraising endeavors. For example, Florida provided fund matching incentives to encourage the development of charitable endowments (Wattenbarger, 1994). To some extent, progress slowed due to community college presidential philosophies against state supported institutions engaging in private fundraising endeavors. A number of college presidents realized the emerging trend and succumbed to the prospect of soliciting funding that were much needed for their institutions (Anderson & Snyder, 1993). Some presidents feared that, if community
colleges were successful in raising money, state allocations would be greatly diminished. In addition, some administrators found the practice demoralizing and embarrassing (Bock & Sullins, 1987). However, McCabe (1996) gathered data that suggested private colleges were eager to gain public funding while many community colleges refused to compete for additional resources. McCabe noticed that many administrators believed that fundraising by community colleges created unhealthy competition for financially strapped private institutions, despite the fact that these very institutions were aggressively pursuing public funds. In addition, Woodbury (1989) noted that federal, state, and local appropriations and grants to private four-year colleges in the 1980s totaled as high as $1,612 per capita. This amount exceeded the $1,410 per capita allotted to public community colleges. Private two-year institutions almost matched their public counterparts, receiving $1,354 for each student (Woodbury, 1989).

Research has reinforced the influence of business models on community college practices (Burke & Associates, 2002; Burke & Serban, 1998; McKeown-Moak, 2000). Dowd and Grant (2007) declared that “Drawing on private sector management concepts, legislators and policy makers sought to finance community colleges in ways that promoted administrative efficiencies, market-oriented entrepreneurship, and academic productivity” (p. 232). In the past three decades, state appropriations formulas have been adapted to “promote quality, productivity, and accountability of community colleges” (Dowd & Grant, 2007, p. 232). This new direction spawned the terms “incentive” or “performance funding,” complementing or completely replacing models previously founded on enrollment numbers (Dowd & Grant, 2007, p. 232).

In the past, resource development had been perceived “as a second class college function, peripheral to the overall mission” (Blong & Bennett, 1991, p. 32). In addition, Ryan (1988) speculated that private support may be the greatest potential community colleges have for
increasing financial stability in the 21st century. Not only has his prediction begun to come to fruition but, unfortunately, private fundraising may be the only way these colleges can keep valuable services available to their communities.

Numerous scholars declare that utilizing a strategy that involves trying to maintain and grow an institution with continually less funds in a climate where costs continually increase is not a viable long-term strategy (Adams, Keener, & McGee, 1994; Lorenzo & LeCroy, 1994; McCabe, 1995; McClenny & Mingle, 1992; Mercer, 1994; Miller, 1994). Today, this has forced colleges to institute private fundraising just to survive and has pressed administrators to scrutinize data from successful endeavors at similar institutions (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

**Current Practices in Fundraising and Advancement**

Community college fundraising has evolved from an occasional effort to gather funding for a new scholarship or to purchase additional equipment into a symbiotic relationship that involves mutual and protective support amongst entities, organizations, business and industry (Hall, 2002). Planning is integral. A successful plan for fundraising should involve an institutional-wide initiative to make the collegiate climate fertile for new fundraising ventures. Creating a climate that supports fundraising requires the investment of faculty, staff, and governing board in promoting collegiate structure, protocol, and culture. To create this atmosphere, administrators must integrate change into the cultural fabric with minimal friction (Ryan, 1994; McCabe, 1996). This fundraising strategy should additionally involve collegiate “goals, objectives, strengths, and weaknesses” (Hall, 2002, p. 51).

Similarly, Strickland (2010) has argued that the drive to obtain any funding, including private fundraising, should be attached to the vision and plans of the college. In addition, a well-developed college plan should provide a strictly structured agenda in order to solicit external
funds (Nahm & Zerosky, 1993; Sheldon, 1994). The structure, organization, and planning should include additional information to assess the calculated risk of future fundraising projects and for feasibility studies and judgments about fundraising aspirations and objectives (Mixer, 1993). In addition, resource development strategies that emerge from the plan should ensure that the institution has considerable institutional support to integrate new activities, presents a documented need for prospective donors, and merits support from community organizations (Angotti, 1988).

Likewise, Keener, Ryan, and Smith (1991) found that the programs of the college should guide fundraising strategy. In addition, when school projects benefit the community and local businesses or our part of a joint venture, they are more likely to be successful, especially against those that are poorly organized (Bock & Sullins, 1987). Furthermore, Fred Wheeler, associate vice president for Development at Fairfield University (Fairfield, CT), stressed the importance of planning and giving everyone who has any stake in the fundraising process the opportunity to invest in the vision. He has also maintained the necessity of excellent external communication; moreover, Wheeler noted to never underestimate internal suggestions, because one rarely knows who will have the next great lead or idea (Rivard, 2002). Advancement professionals should heed advice from successful institutions. Many of the best models of collegiate fundraising do not come from prestigious private institutions. Many are exhibited by state, community, and technical schools that are utilizing their best resources and “pursuing those channels with innovation and determination” (Rivard, 2002, p. 38). This is an attribute of successful institutions (Rivard, 2002).

However, Duronio and Loessin (1993) compared institutional characteristics and conditions for success, pointing out that it is unlikely that certain studies or models can elucidate
why some institutions gather more voluntary financial support than others with similar characteristics. However, they did find that shared dedication to fundraising and leadership were consistent factors. Other scholars suggest additional necessary characteristics established at successful fundraising institutions. Glass and Jackson (1998a) have contended that a college’s mission and core values, and a president/community’s institutional vision should be at the heart of fundraising endeavors in the stages of goal setting, planning, and implementation. The resource development office must echo this same mantra. This office must have access to “institutional research, strategic planning functions, and databases” (p. 575). These same scholars argued that by combining both political and rational frameworks with fresh ideas and emerging fundraising trends, new ways to integrate resource development with institutional planning might occur.

In addition, a study by Bolman and Deal (1991) found that effective leaders in fundraising adhere to a number of principles: 1) fundraising is a primary responsibility of the administration; 2) leaders must provide leadership outside of the college and throughout the community; and 3) implementing a political framework when organizing and adopting advancement philosophies is a key component in fundraising. Kelly (1998) explained that great fundraising practices emerge from theories in the fields of organizational behavior, public relations, and communications. Her work provides four models of fundraising that is adapted from the scholarly work of Grunig and Hunt (1984) and Grunig and Grunig (1992). Grunig has argued that the complexity, centralization, age, and size of an organization affect the public relations department. As organizations age and grow in size and complexity, so does the public relations’ department and role. Kelly argued this same model can be applied to fundraising, and it parallels Grunig’s public relations models. The comparisons in these models help to reiterate
the importance of building relationships in fundraising, and that fundraising is more about associations and interaction with people than dealing with business and finance and higher education (Hall, 2002). A great deal of the psychology of giving involves placing value on donors having some say in where the gift goes (Hall, 2002).

The emerging profession of fundraising has made great strides in the past few decades (Carbone, 1989). More research is being compiled about successful fundraising practices and philosophies in two-year colleges and four-year colleges; however, in a profession, practitioners have a base of knowledge that can be mastered after extensive practice and time. Fundraising practice still lacks a standard set of skills that can be honed to perfection; although, social, leadership, and organizational skills are paramount for success. Carbone’s (1986) research has shown that the knowledge used by development officers is better obtained on the job and can be possessed without formal education.

One way that colleges have become successful is by concentrating efforts on a very small group of potential donors. At Greeneville Technical College, Fred Payne, Director of Institutional Advancement explains that the economy hurts small donors, and colleges need to give 80% of time to the top 20% of donors. He has contended that colleges are not looking for new small donors because it takes an incredible amount of resources to cultivate relationships. Payne used an example of a donor who was predicted to give only $10,000 but the college tried to make him feel special through conversation, letters, and phone calls (Rivard, 2002). Because the donor was so impressed with the attention he received, he asked what else could be done. Payne took a risk and asked for a monumental gift and received $2,000,000 (Rivard, 2002). Similarly, Monroe Community College also delegates additional resources to prominent potential donors. This institution uses a telemarketing firm to hire the college’s students to ask
certain parents for contributions. The campaign targets only families with a predetermined income (Rivard, 2002). These targeted drives proved successful.

With the rise in the necessity of fundraising came a need to be remarkably efficient at raising money with minimal resources. This created a need for technology in fundraising, including a means in which to separate and organize prospective donor list, gather additional information, and to create and maintain online auctions. College leadership must be ahead of these technological trends in fundraising including utilizing social media to effectively gather contacts, excite populations, and gather and track funds and gifts (Comstock, 2009).

Comstock (2009) also declared that the appropriate technology should connect and communicate data and activity in an efficient and timely manner and assess fundraising results. However, even with the growth of technology, according to the Survey of College Offices of International Advancement and Fundraising, colleges still primarily rely on the mediums of mail and telephone to communicate during fundraising campaigns. The survey, by Primary Research Group, finds that over 90% of colleges depend upon direct mail as a means of collecting funds and communicating with prospective donors (Herrmann, 2008). According to the survey, the average college in the study’s sample sent out more than 50,000 pieces of mail over the past year while four-year and graduate colleges sent out on average 14,000 more pieces than community colleges (Herrmann, 2008). These results suggest that, during the late 2000s, regular mail was perceived as an appealing means to communicate and gather funds by many colleges.

One important investment that development staffs need to make is an efficient means of organizing and reaching prospective donors. Some institutions have found electronic screening as a great way “to qualify constituents as prospects” (Nicoson, 2010, p. 73).
In electronic screening, members of the development staff, or an outsourced entity, screens prospective donors from an alumni database against national models, or a model from a personal database of past donors. These donors are categorized into different tiers of giving potential. No system is perfect, but it can lead to important additional research and provide a means to streamline and focus initial planning efforts (Nicoson, 2010). Lists can be detrimental in the success of a fundraising effort, but a number of technological means can be utilized for effective communications between institutions, volunteers, and potential donors. These methods include e-newsletters, listservs, advancement office websites, campaign specific websites, and general college websites to communicate about fundraising ventures and increase efficient communication (Herrmann, 2008). Moreover, the best systems today include advanced features for mobile access to donor profiles and ties with leading social networking tools like Facebook and LinkedIn (Comstock, 2009).

An emerging national trend has been to utilize technology in fundraising to manage a growing number of displaced alumni. In 2004, Michael Sinkus, chair and CEO of Marts and Lundy, was interviewed by Administrator magazine. He explained that one of the issues that was pervading “educational philanthropy is the enormous appetite for and utilization of data” with a trend toward utilizing data sets in fundraising strategies (Fundraising’s New Age, 2004, p. 5). To maintain and harvest the growing numbers of prospective donors and alumni, colleges will have to utilize new software and communicative technology while being bold in trying new ideas (Fundraising’s New Age, 2004, p. 5). Similarly, research has suggested that colleges must take calculated risks and sometimes deviate from the norm if the college’s local culture and environment seems responsive to undocumented strategies and ideas (Grant, Schatzberg, & Northcross, 2005).
One relatively new type of technological fundraising endeavor that has flourished using the internet is online auctions. These have proven successful in place of, or in addition to, silent auctions as a means of gathering additional funding for institutions. Carson (2008) noted a number of reasons why these auctions are successful. They include the following:

1. They can look highly professional with minimal effort;
2. Numerous volunteers and auctioned objects do not have to be managed, moved, and maintained;
3. People (including alumni and friends of the college) from all over the planet can bid at all times of the day or night;
4. Emails can be generated and sent to any number of acquaintances of the college in order to systematically invigorate and dramatize the bidding process; and
5. Assessing their effectiveness is simple.

Carson (2008) also cited examples of auctions. This includes the selling of an unwashed Lance Armstrong jersey ($110,000) and a stapler autographed by Paris Hilton ($4,000). In addition, one community college raised $45,000 in two online auctions. Some successful colleges are selling off opportunities to be a disc jockey for a day, and many are using these online auctions to sell collectibles like rare coins (Carson, 2008). Presidents who promote fundraising activities that utilize this type of technology have a great chance at increasing the fiscal security of their colleges while advancing the culture of their colleges.

Roles of College President and Advancement Officers in Fundraising

The previous experiences of college presidents play a role in how successful their fundraising campaigns will be. In his doctoral study, Koelkebeck (1994) interviewed ten California community college presidents. Presidents whose institutions raised less than
$100,000 were trained in the fields of teaching and administration, and spoke less about change, process, and planning than three of the five presidents whose institutions had annually raised around $400,000, had successful fundraising records, and backgrounds in planning, public relations, and/or marketing.

However, there are a number of data-driven practices presidents can implement to improve chances of success. In order to appeal to donors, community colleges presidents must demonstrate that their colleges are worthy of support (Duronio & Loessin, 1991; Russel & Wynn, 1996), are a good investment in the future of the community (Dempsey, 1992), and that the gifts and grants received will advance the plans of the institution (Miller, 1994). Community colleges must show the link they have to the economic and civic well-being of the communities they serve (Johnson, 1986). At times, many presidents have not been effective in convincing various potential donors of the value of their institutions and why they merit greater support (McCabe, 1996). Hodson (2010) declared that the primary role of a president is to provide inspiration and leadership toward a well-communicated and compelling vision for the future.

No other administrator “can create the vision, establish university-wide priorities, or make the case for support as effectively as the president” (Hodson, 2010, p. 40). Because of this, he or she should be at the heart of the fundraising process. Therefore, the most momentous and vital fundraising endeavors cannot be delegated to lower staff or foundation members. Ultimately, these fundraising endeavors must live and die with the president (Fisher, 1985). The president is responsible for organizing the efforts to turn a fundraising vision into reality by “breaking it down into actionable, strategic priorities” (Hodson, 2010, p. 40).

Additional research suggests that a fundraising vision implemented by the president is especially important at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. According to Hall-Russell
and Kasberg (1997), one of the strongest motivators for donations to HBCUs is the leadership and charisma of the institution’s president. These scholars declare that possibly the single most important contributing factor at HBCUs is the charismatic persona of the president, whose dynamic presence may rival that of popular personalities in government, entertainment, and even the heads of churches. This is additionally important considering that data suggest that these colleges do not aggressively engage their alumni in the giving process (Gasman & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003).

However, in all colleges and without exception, “The president personifies the institution” (Fisher, 1985, p. 51). His or her vision lends direction to the culture and mission of the institution. This vision produces a convincing, attractive future that inspires institutional stakeholders to commit and achieve a goal (Nanus, 1992). Because the president of a college can make sweeping and immediate decisions regarding institutional direction, he or she has the power to immediately create an impressive list of potential donors by simply stating a new initiative (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). However, starting new initiatives based on intuition may be unwelcome at institutions whose decisions are historically driven by research and data (Glass & Jackson, 1998a). Moreover, scholars acknowledge that the president can foster an open and accepting internal collegiate culture in order to make calculated risks to obtain great financial gain and prestige through encouraging the entrepreneurial spirit (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). However, this all relies on the president’s advancement goals.

Essex and Ansbach (1993) argued that the president is responsible for determining which institutional priorities and goals are most significant for private gifts to be solicited. Without the president’s consent, fundraising becomes stagnant, stalls, and dies, or great friction erupts because of opposing priorities within an institution. Another presidential challenge is overseeing
the fundraising efforts of the development office and coordinating their efforts into a cohesive meaning and presentation to external constituencies (Essex & Ansbach, 1993; Ryan & Palmer, 2005). The president can help assure this by incorporating the development office into strategic planning efforts and placing this office under an umbrella that includes public relations, grants management, and any other office that communicates with stakeholders within and without the institution (Ryan & Palmer, 2005).

In addition, this process needs to align with the strategic planning priorities of the college (Hodson, 2010). However, Willmer (1993) cautioned that the president’s priorities and goals should be realistic and not exceed adequate and reasonable institutional resources while he or she should maintain realistic expectations of what can be funded through institutional advancement. Also, in spite of competition for university resources, presidential fundraising initiatives and goals should be developed that can be “understood and supported by all levels of the institution” (Hodson, 2010, p. 41). Unfortunately, for a president to be effective, constituents must adopt these policies and take some responsibility for carrying out that vision (Fisher, 1985).

Furthermore, one of the essential functions of the president is to open communication and build relationships with donors. In certain situations, he or she should personally thank donors for their friendships and contributions because the reputation and prestige of the institution rests on the shoulders of this office (Keener et al., 1991; Ryan, 1994). One goal of the president must be to enforce a lasting relationship between the donor and the institution, not the donor and the president. Eckert and Pollack (2000) cautioned that a president realize that the importance of a donor’s relationship with the institution far exceeds that of the relationship between the president and the donor. Moreover, all employees of the college must recognize that they are merely the representatives of the institution (Kvet & Stewart, 2009).
Overall, the president is the primary institutional leader in all aspects including fundraising (Pray, 1981; Bock & Sullins, 1987; Fisher, 1986, 1989; Fisher & Koch, 1996; Glass & Jackson, 1998a). Because fierce competition for resources can exist within a college or university, the president is also responsible for determining the institution’s most significant financial needs for seeking private gifts (Hodson, 2010). Of equal importance is the president’s duty to educate board members and volunteers on how to solicit contributions prior to seeking these gifts (Daniel, 1991; Howe, 1991; Joslin, 1995; Glass & Jackson, 1998a). To be successful, presidents must understand basic philanthropic principles, and have some knowledge of trends in fundraising. Moreover, as the ambassador of the institution, the college president is expected to articulate how donors’ charitable gifts will enhance facets of the institution. He or she must be gifted at articulating the case for institutional support to internal and external sources (Hodson, 2010). To be successful with external relationships, the president must be a visible, charismatic, engaged and accessible leader (Hodson, 2010). He or she must communicate a vast number of ideas including institutional priorities to stakeholders.

Presidents will often encounter severe criticism from internal and external sources, especially during budget crises, when allocating resources to development offices because it often takes over three years for a successful investment to pay off (Fisher & Koch, 1996; Smith, 1993). Gathering major donations is a long-term process, not a short-term handshake between two passer-bys (Hodson, 2010). Furthermore, presidents may have to hire a proven development officer, allocate resources to move and educate staff, and provide large sums of money to begin projects. In addition, resources may be needed to invest in technology including means to gather and organize massive electronic contact lists in order to get a significant financial reward that takes numerous years and resources before any returns are seen (Glass & Jackson, 1998a).
A further responsibility of presidential fundraising involves spending time off campus to develop new relationships and foster existing ones. In addition, Satterwhite (2004) has suggested that the president must be consistently available to prospective donors because it improves donor dedication. Interacting with donors is an imperative part of this process. Donaldson and Smith (1994) interviewed a number of community college presidents who explained their innovative exercises in interaction. One president holds luncheons for small donor groups with similar interests. During this socialization, the president discussed the college’s goals and mission, and how additional resources could bring these goals to fruition (Glass & Jackson, 1998a).

A president must lead by example. He or she should set an example by giving a major gift to begin a fundraising initiative. This major personal donation proves that he or she is committed to the vision. This gift, best given at a social function, serves as a symbol of commitment and as a marker for internal and external donors to begin the investment. Presidents should spend an excessive amount of time at events for external entities in order to make themselves become a valued member of the community (Shaw & Shaw, 2008). Ryan and Palmer (2005) have explained that time spent must include making time to recruit valuable foundation members, build social networks with community organizations, join external boards, and become a leader in numerous outside organizations while gaining visibility for their college. This will gather some criticism from internal sources who believe the president should spend more time addressing internal issues (Ryan & Palmer, 2005).

However, if the internal balance of the college is not maintained during fragile periods when the president and the development staff are engaging multiple constituents and charming external stakeholders, then the additional resources may return to a frayed foundation, leaving
the workforce feeling secondary to the resources gathered. A president must be sure to make his or her college secure through periods that he or she cannot be on campus (Hodson, 2010).

Because most community college development offices will have only one or two staff members, the president must hire highly skilled development professionals who are charismatic, organized, and can engage members of the college as proficiently as potential donors (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). An important aspect of impressing donors and gathering support is to have a highly professional and competent staff that exhibits expertise and exudes an inspiration for giving. In addition, the advancement staff must have a budget that allows them to follow through with ideas and make possible donors feel important (Kaufman, 2004).

**Development Offices**

Advancement and development officers must carry out many of the daily responsibilities and challenges of the institutional fundraising endeavors. There are a number of roles integral to the success of the resource development office: seeking available and additional fundraising sources, conducting research to prepare the president, communicating with potential donors, and developing new relationships (Ryan & Palmer, 2005).

In addition, it is imperative that development officers research internal strengths and weaknesses of the college to maximize gift gathering potential (Hendrix, 2000; Hall, 2002). These officers must also organize the time, resources, and data of the college’s fundraising team, and oftentimes provide valuable public relations work (Townsend, 1991). In community colleges, resource development officers should be able to contact foundation directors and trustees, sometimes acting as ambassadors between the president and them, addressing possible issues before they arise (Russell & Wynn, 1996).
Although the underlying theme of a department of institutional advancement should be the building of relationships, it should also be regarded as a highly important function throughout the institution. This perspective will aid in choosing a model that best fits the community college based on its enrollment, physical size, competition, and demographics. Institutional advancement officers should focus on the methods of structuring, maintaining, improving, and enhancing the relationship of the institution with society and selected entities that can help support the institution's mission (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Once resource development offices are sure that their activities are in sync with the collegiate vision, organization and execution are vital to meet these organized goals (Daniel, 1991). However, Duronio and Loessin (1991, 1993) found that formal planning and goal setting were not as important for successful resource development operations as the concepts and strategic focus of the resource development officer.

This entire interdependent view is firmly founded in the philosophy that institutional advancement involves an agreement between environmental demands and organizational necessities (Jacobson, 1986). Therefore, advancement offices should focus on donor motivations and student outcomes rather than methodologies of fund-raising; moreover, investors and administrators should set an environment of giving that can be followed by potential donors. This environment of giving includes friends, faculty, personnel, board members, and trustees (Joslin, 1995).

In order to achieve an environment of giving, Glass and Jackson (1998b) have suggested that resource development officers must be a part of the college’s development team. Involving development staff in strategic planning efforts is particularly important, and reduces the risk of “soliciting and accepting gifts that shift priorities and siphon resources from high priority subjects to lower priority ones” (Hall, 2002, p. 52). In addition, including development staff in
planning can help ensure that the college’s strategic plan addresses advancement as an important priority that provides “a road map for soliciting external funds” (Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 725).

Another role of the development staff is to control interactions between the president and possible donors so that conferences will be impressive and maintain institutional integrity (Hodson, 2010). This includes briefing the president on important information about the donor, including background details and interests, controlling the environment of the initial meeting, and scheduling additional communicative efforts like letters, phone calls, or additional meetings (Hodson, 2010).

Advances in technology and the adoption of business models have changed America’s collegiate fundraising landscape as well as the offices of the president and resource development. Fundraising tasks used to be mostly based on intuition; however, as the use of business models and the weight of institutional accountability have continued to mount, there has been a continued interest in data based strategy in fundraising. In just a few years, both the demand for funding and the sophistication of fundraising have dramatically increased. Moreover, development office staffs have grown at an incredible rate with the American collegiate system’s acknowledgement of the baby boom and the fact that most staff sizes are created and maintained based on numbers from the 1980s. In 2004, Michael Sinkus was the chair and CEO of Marts and Lundy, the New Jersey consulting firm that harbors one of the world’s largest stores of information about fundraising in higher education. He explained that management science is moving in but the corporate approach is not taking over; intuition is simply taking a back seat to a strategy driven by data and common sense: pushing an institution’s limited resources toward where they will get their best return (Fundraising’s New Age, 2004).
A good president must be effective at governing human resources. Therefore, the selection and hiring of advancement professionals should be taken very seriously, and once they are hired, deans and presidents should schedule times to meet with the advancement staff to strengthen and efficiently organize strategies for setting priorities and identifying donor prospects. Hodson (2010) explained that staff members must maximize efficiency and help plan against possible obstacles and unforeseen changes that may occur while increasing the potential for the president or dean’s fundraising initiatives. In addition, the entire fundraising team should involve not only alumni and faculty, but also past supporters and the friends and family of those groups (Higdon, 2003).

Shaw and Shaw (2008) have suggested that presidents should look at hiring their vice president of advancement much as they hire their most important athletic coaches, possibly looking past education to find an experienced, charismatic individual that has obtained the tools to proficiently allocate resources, identify great internal and external support, and gather major donations. After securing a head advancement officer, the president must build a relationship with that person to strengthen communications, gather trust, and (along with the board chair) align institutional vision and the methods to achieve it (Shaw & Shaw, 2008). Time is a precious commodity to deans and president; therefore, the head of advancement should identify only the top 1% of institutional prospects for the president to approach and continually engage (Slinker, 1988). The development officer and his staff should delegate authority in addressing other fundraising issues including who should approach and attract potential donors (Hodson, 2010).

This power to attract donors makes the development officer integral to an institution. However, some scholars are concerned by the amount of institutional power and prestige held by development officers (Duronio & Loessin, 1991). This perspective exists because they are privy
to the president’s agenda, aid in the development of new priorities and fiscal goals, and serve
directly under the president (Anderson & Snyder, 1993; Blong & Bennett, 1991; Keener, Ryan,
& Smith, 1991; Glass & Jackson 1998a). However, development officers are concerned that
local business and industry leaders are unaware of how much of the local labor force is trained
by their college (Catanzaro & Miller, 1994; Lamme, 1995; Ryan, 1993). In addition, it is
important for colleges and businesses to develop good relationships to ensure prosperity and
keep them both flourishing during economic downturns (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). During these
tough times, a high rate of turnover within a development staff can create incredible
disadvantages for the office because this interrupts the process of building and sustaining the
relationships (Nicoson, 2010, p.76).

The Roles of Deans

All institutional leaders should take a prominent role in fundraising if they are aware of
institutional fundraising goals and priorities, especially the academic deans (Glier, 2004).
College deans have an interesting set of fundraising roles and challenges. First, they must be
diligent in gathering resources and in soliciting rare or untraditional gifts. These include
everything from financial gifts donated to the institution or those inherited by the college even
real estate and art collections (Padover & Elder, 2007). Weidner (2008) noted that as deans’
succesesses grow outside of the college, it becomes more important for them to show humility and
appreciation toward faculty. In addition, because deans deal with educational programs and
students, they might be more passionate in conveying the necessity of private support within the
college to potential donors (Eckert & Pollack, 2000). In addition, since deans interact more
directly with the student body, they may be able to identify prospective alumni donors especially
through former students who have obtained leadership roles in an industry or corporation. Deans should also ensure that faculty can also be utilized in this role (Hodson, 2010).

Like the role of the president, the role of the dean is expanding. Program quality management used to be the primary and specific function of deans. However, due to nationwide funding constraints, the leadership role of the dean has grown to include advocating for external resources, recruiting faculty, updating technology, and financing research (Sheehan & Mihailidis, 2007). Deans must also oversee the management of an interwoven set of necessities including: “budgeting and fundraising, personnel and work environment management, program oversight, and external public relations” (Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies, 2001, p. 6). Because donors may be interested in the quality of these activities and the programs of the college, it may be best for deans to lead the charge in certain fundraising endeavors (Hodson, 2010).

Hodson (2010) has contended that college presidents, development officers, and deans should utilize advisory boards, especially the governing board, foundation board, and alumni board to increase the productivity of fundraising efforts. In addition, institutions may need advice from experienced professionals and consultants. When shifting resources is necessary in an institution, it is best for the college employees and internal stakeholders to hear this information from an external group of professionals. Oftentimes, seeking external fundraising counsel can be necessary if a president believes that a fundraising campaign needs an unprecedented amount of change or believes that efforts are not appropriately focused or organized enough to continue. Having this information expressed from an outside source should reduce institutional friction and galvanize the fundraising movement behind the president (Hodson, 2010). This type of external advice oftentimes reinforces stakeholder relationships.
Relationship Management in Fundraising

Scholars have noted the trend of community college fundraising leadership towards a focus on building relationships (Huang, 1997; Hon & Grunig, 1999; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000). This philosophical approach can lead to monumental success (Hall, 2002) and may be the key to securing institutional prosperity in fundraising.

Oftentimes, building relationships that produce significant and repeat funding involves more than just a simple relationship between the donor and the person who asks for a contribution. They involve webs of relationships between leaders and stakeholders on numerous fronts (Fundraising’s New Age, 2004). Fostering these relationships is at the heart of fundraising when these relationships are attached to short and long-term goals driven by the mission statement (Hall, 2002).

There are a number of relationship categories in fundraising including communal relationships, where the donor builds a lifelong affiliation with the organization, and exchange relationships, where both organizations have something to gain (Dunlop & Worth, 2000.) Scholars contend that communal relationships are imperative for long-term success while resource development and exchange relationships provide positive short-term results (Hall, 2002). Hon and Grunig (1999) have suggested that the development of these communal relationships with key figures is more important than devising exchange relationships (1999). Focusing on communal relationships in fundraising allows the coordinating entities to initiate a goal that can be more philanthropic and can benefit a larger spectrum of stakeholders that include the donor, college, and the community (Hall, 2002).

The entire process of resource development involves a number of steps. It starts with the college setting specific fundraising objectives and then initiating a plan to identify possible...
sources. Next, the development team must navigate through this sea of probable donors. This culminates with the building of relationships and the solicitation of gifts (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Nicoson (2010) explained that the final part of the fundraising process is commonly known as the *ask*. However, this scholar suggests that the entire strategic process should be considered as part of asking for the contribution. In addition, the asker should try to anticipate the objections of the prospective donor much like a persuasive essayist confronts suspected arguments before they can be brought up by the opposition. Furthermore, the asker should use multiple visits to make prospective donors feel important. The scholar suggested that development officers be honest, direct, and candid when asking for the gift while ensuring an opportunity for further discussion and securing a positive future relationship (Nicoson, 2010).

Successful fundraisers sometimes utilize a large number of volunteers trained in this process of solicitation, especially if the college lacks a large number of fundraising professionals to do so. They also know when to bring in the highest tier of collegiate leadership into the fundraising process. Their expertise and prestige is invaluable in certain situations (Grant, Schatzberg, & Northercross, 2005). Finally, if successful, the donor should be thanked personally or by some means of heartfelt correspondence (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Gaining and maintaining trust is an integral part of inspiring donor confidence. One proven method is for institutional leaders to prove to both potential and previous donors that their money is going to where it was suggested, wished, or promised. This is one important aspect of the fundraising process. In addition, the college should set priorities for what level of gift should receive a thank you letter or phone call from an appropriate collegiate representative or even from the president (Hodson, 2010).
Furthermore, it is important for administrators to maintain and build internal relationships at the college to gain support for fundraising endeavors and to preserve morale. Preserving relationships with staff and faculty should be a priority of the institution at all times, especially when plagued by the stress produced by drives for funding. Likewise, colleges must be able to create a prosperous future by tapping in to the potential support of their local communities (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Alumni

It is imperative for administrators to maintain a positive relationship with their alumni. One tool that can aid in this process, and is a trait of successful fundraising is having a large, wealthy, and active alumni base. Unfortunately, colleges that lack influential and prospective alumni donors and have less than adequate institutional resources may more often be unsuccessful (Dowd & Grant, 2007). Regardless of support, the focus of all alumni associations should be to concentrate efforts in soliciting funds from these potential donors (Padover & Elder, 2007).

Recently, relationships with older, less-involved alumni, has become a key focus of many development offices (Comstock, 2009). Stinson and Howard (2010) recorded that some “donors expressed willingness to do more on the academic side but openly stated they didn’t feel any real connection to the college or department where they had received their degrees” (p. 325). Colleges must act on this lack of personal interest felt by donors and expressed by alumni. When institutions foster caring and long lasting relationships, they attract donations (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Using advanced technology to track relationships with alumni has become an important aspect of the fundraising process. Angelo (2005) points to an interview with University
Business, where Brenda Babitz, president of The Monroe Community College (N.Y.) Foundation Board explained that one of the most important investments that a community college can get involved in is creating an alumni database. The cost of software and tracking down alumni is menial when compared to the substantial fiscal possibilities. Babitz also utilized consultants for researching best fundraising practices in community colleges and promotes investing in fundraising research is an additional valuable commodity. This foundation president included this philosophy when devising an exemplary fund drive.

In 1990, when Brenda Babitz became foundation president of Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York, she immediately began a new fundraising campaign that included a telemarketing fundraising drive that utilized an alumni database (Angelo, 2005). Years later, she spent $7,000 on research that would help identify alumna prospective donors. During this campaign, one alumnus agreed to $500 by telephone. This eventually escalated to $5,000 and then finally one million dollars. Planning and organization aided in this process, but continual contact and caring attention to the donor finalized it. However, oftentimes the surrounding business and cultural climate should decide how donors are best solicited.

Once alumni databases have been constructed and actions have been initiated to gather funds from these sources, development offices at rural community colleges with weak industrial and business sectors should focus on soliciting support from local retirees who live close to the college or who see the college as an important cultural resource. These members of the community may serve as useful volunteers to the college or valuable donors (Bass, 2003).

In the past, community colleges have been more successful in establishing alumni programs with specialized groups like nursing and technical fields instead of by class. Although some graduates have been solicited for sizeable donations, their giving has not been consistent or
dependable (Keener, Ryan, & Smith, 1991). Local business leaders, out of work laborers seeking employment opportunities and additional workforce development training, and non-traditional students in continuing education classes, have become strong contributors to public two-year institutions. However, the lack of funding from alumni has left administrators with reasons to focus on other possible external funding sources.

**Additional Funding**

Angelo (2005) has contended that most community colleges receive only a small percent of yearly funding from alumni and individual donors (around 5%). However, four-year colleges and universities have received their largest sources of support from donors according to a Council for Aid to Education survey (2012). In 2004, gifts from alumni and individual accounted for 48.8 percent of the funds raised in higher education (Angelo, 2005). The most recent fiscal report for 2011 showed that private contributions to America's higher education institutions grew from 8.2% to $30.30 billion (Council for Aid to Education survey, 2012).

Many forms of collegiate funding, such as state appropriations and auxiliary revenues, are driven by enrollment. Some state and federal performance funding including grants and contracts for funding special populations in programs such as TRIO and GEAR UP are not funded by state appropriations. One option to private fundraising is researching and writing grants. In addition, data shows that success in obtaining grant funds is likely to be determined more by grant writing ability than by institutional size (Dowd & Grant, 2007). This leaves hope for institutions that perform poorly in private fundraising ventures.

However, some scholars believe that community colleges are in an excellent position to take advantage of educational sales and services as a means of generating revenue. “This can be done by being active in economic development, workforce development, federal welfare-reform
programs, and community service” (Kenton et al., 2005, p. 119). Raising funds is integral to the success of the American community college. However, it is also imperative that community colleges are perceived as stakeholders in the surrounding communities that fuel the economy and are the primary means of providing craftsmen, skilled workers, technical professionals, and laborers (Milliron et al., 2003).

**Fundraising Examples**

There are a number of proven fundraising methods. Zeiss and Paneitz (2003) noted that the move toward private fundraising must be aligned with grant-writing activities and leverage ongoing business and industrial activities. These methods include letter drives, dinners, auctions, and tournaments, “planned giving programs, and special campaigns for capital projects or endowments” (Dowd & Grant, 2007, p. 234)

Marketing campaigns are an additional means of soliciting donations from business and industry. In 1984, “sponsorships involving nonprofits increased from $200,000,000 to $2,000,000,000” in 1994 (Smith, 1994, p. 353). In the past, small business philanthropy was overshadowed by high profile corporate donations (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). However, Mixer (1993) found that “a 1990 study of 75 small businesses in San Francisco found that 95% of the firms made philanthropic gifts, 90% of which were gifts of less than $10,000” (as cited in Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 721). Many companies’ missions, initiatives, and focuses emphasize utilizing community resources and students as workforce; this proves that the importance of businesses investing in local colleges has grown. This reciprocal investment has spawned a number of advantages (Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 721).
Corporate Involvement

Stendardi (1992) explained that modern corporate philanthropy is intended to create a specific and measurable benefit in a reasonable amount of time. There are often mutual benefits for community colleges and the local businesses that surround them. These collaborations produce special training for students and community members to provide a well trained workforce for these companies, and the businesses oftentimes provide much needed funding to the college, as well as, internships and job opportunities to college students and graduates.

This symbiotic relationship has grown significantly with the movement toward workforce development (Hall, 2002). Worthwhile examples include the operations at Maricopa Community College in Phoenix, Arizona. This college provides computer training for highly technological programs that support the needs of local companies like Intel and Motorola (Van der Werf, 1999). Companies donate expensive equipment to aid in student training that is aimed specifically for these local industries (Hall, 2002).

Another example comes from the Caterpillar Corporation. Around 1980, Caterpillar and its foundation donated $50,000 in grants for community colleges to offer diesel-technician programs. This benefitted the company and the college (Nicklin, 1990).

Brenda Babitz, foundation president at Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York, proclaimed that because her graduates oftentimes stay in the community, and that local companies will need a trained work force to help them pull out of a dismal economy. Her college has used the economic downturn to its advantage (Rivard, 2002). This is an enduring example to other colleges suffering from a distressed economic environment.

Furthermore, Fred Wheeler, associate vice president of development at Fairfield University in Connecticut, argued that even though state institutions face the same difficult
economic times as corporate entities, they are still able to harness a continually growing resource that corporations do not have access to alumni. He declared, “They are an institutions’ most valuable resource for fundraising” (Rivard, 2002, p. 37). However, many times it is non-alumni donors that help bare the fiscal load of local colleges.

**Private/Individual Donors**

Sometimes, community members donate because of the direct positive relationship they have had with the college. In addition, many peoples’ quality of life greatly increases by the education or experiences they receive at community colleges. These alumni are an integral part to successful fundraising at two-year institutions. In addition, some community members may come to the realization that the community college system may be the only option that underrepresented and disadvantaged citizens have to improve their lives. Finally, the local residents may want the community college to reflect the positive aspects of the community or be a microcosm for the customs, culture, and values of the town. These are the donors that community colleges must engage (Angelo, 2005). Donors of this caliber have a great attraction to the college and should also be encouraged to include the college in its wills or trusts (Padover & Elder, 2007).

Angelo (2005) explained that donors who give to community colleges oftentimes have a greater attraction and feel a special kinship to that institution. Van der Werf (1999) has provided examples of bonds between community and college. One great example of an extraordinary relationship between a two-year college and members of the community exists between Allen and Isabelle Leepa and St. Petersburg Community College. This married couple gave a $19,000,000 art collection to the college because they felt a special connection with the institution. According to Mrs. Leepa, the husband and wife were attracted to the school and
making a substantial donation because of the college’s “pioneer spirit” and the school’s unyielding support of the arts. Like other donors, the couple exhibited little concern with receiving something in return for their gift; they were honored to support “the creative and innovative spirit they admired in the college” (Van der Werf, 1999, p. A43). Oftentimes, donors like this view gifts as investments, not donations (Hodson, 2010). However, many times these types of gifts are not given until donors find a sense of personal fiscal security.

Similarly, some scholarly work has been done on giving in relation to life cycle (Olsen, Smith, & Wunnava, 1989). As children move out, parents are left with more money to spend freely. Many donors explain that, as they became more economically sound, they made more meaningful, philanthropic gifts to the institution. As giving capacity increases, donors who make major gifts look to it as a means of giving back to society (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

**Foundations and Trustees**

There are a number of key concepts necessary in maintaining a college. According to community college boards and administrators should aggressively hunt alternative funding, and provide additional training for high level administrators and either enhancing or establishing new foundations (Kenton et al., 2005). Glass and Jackson (1998a) have argued that establishing a foundation is a core component to developing a successful, progressive institution. Furthermore, Brenda Babitz, Foundation President at Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York, stated that the most important thing an administrator can do is to have a highly effective, high profile board of directors to govern the foundation. To get these members, an advancement officer needs a structured plan to present prospective board members with their exact expected activities and responsibilities (Rivard, 2002).
The average community college foundation has only a handful of staff members who are responsible for “cultivating alumni, generating and sustaining an annual fund, overseeing some kind of capital campaign” and fostering relationships with board members and prospective donors (Murphy, 2009, p. 6). Today, many community colleges are faced with this incredible challenge converged with the terrible economic conditions compounded with the lack of a sizeable support staff in an environment where each employee carries an almost overwhelming number of tasks and responsibilities (Murphy, 2009). In addition, the amount of funding generated by foundations is critical to the success of many colleges. In 1996, the Council for Aid to Education (1996b) reported that 19.8% of the funds received by community colleges in 1995 came from foundations, much more than the amount of total funding gathered by alumni (Angelo, 2005).

Two schools of thought exist about trustee involvement in community college fundraising. One demands that trustees should be kept at arm's length. The other advocates that they should be heavily involved. Regardless, the board of trustees has a role in deciding where the foundation directs funding (Sader, 1986; Koelkebeck, 1994). To limit the power of an independent foundation, college presidents and chairmen of the board can serve on the foundation board or its executive committee. This promotes effective cooperation and improves supervision, communication, and organization, (Katsinas, Herrmann, & Traylor, 1990; Piland, 1994). Moreover, to ensure that the foundation board and the college trustees have a mutual understanding and share a vision for the future of the institution, the president should organize and oversee or author a memorandum of understanding. A clear definitive statement will regulate and limit the activities of the trustees to the goals and priorities of the college specifically explaining the mutual roles of both entities (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). For example, a
2002 memorandum of understanding instituted between the Palomar Community College District and the Palomar College Foundation specifies that whereas the foundation will “conduct all activities . . . relative to securing, maintaining, and increasing scholarship funds” (Palomar Community College District, 2002, p. 24), the district will have responsibility for “selecting recipients according to donor criteria” (Palomar Community College District, 2002, p. 24). In addition, the Association of Governing Boards and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (2005), which have collaborated on the development of an online “illustrative memorandum of understanding,” note that these memoranda should, among other features, “clarify the foundation’s standing as an independent public trust,” describe “how funds shall be transferred between the foundation and the institution,” and detail policies concerning the “use and sharing [of] donor and alumni records” (Ryan & Palmer, 2005, p. 46). Furthermore, Ryan (2003) suggested that institutions should create distance between themselves and their foundation protecting its status as a private organization. These foundations should create an independent board of directors, pay for any office space that is located on the campus or owned by the university, pay foundation employees with foundation resources, retain and pay for independent counsel, voluntarily release information requested by external organizations, regularly release reports that chronicle the foundation’s activities, and create an agreement between the foundation and the institution that clearly defines the relationship between the two organizations and affirms the foundation’s independence. (p. 46)

States like Alabama that have a history of corruption in the community college system should maintain a truly independent board to avoid scandals of community college leadership. Considering the amount of corruption found in the Alabama community college system due to issues with presidents, trustees, and boards, it should be recommended that separation exists between board members and the college in this state. “Since it was rocked by a widespread
corruption scandal six years ago, the Alabama Community College system has seen six different people in the role of chancellor or interim chancellor” (Stratford, 2012, p. 64).

Angelo (2005) has admitted that private foundations at community colleges have not been as successful soliciting donations as universities because they are limited to the economic condition of the surrounding community. Furthermore, institutionally-related foundations should facilitate funds management and direct fundraising activities including the acquiring, receiving, processing, managing and investing of gifts (Holmes, 2010).

**Fundraising in Community Colleges**

Oftentimes in higher education, advancement professionals review an annual fundraising survey completed by the Council for Aid to Education to assess current fundraising strategies. In 2004, “the top 15 public two-year colleges brought in $64.4 million in fundraising dollars, while the top 15 four-year fundraising institutions brought in $4.7 billion” (Angelo, 2005, p. 63). All colleges and universities raised $34 billion dollars while all community colleges raised $1.2 billion, around 3.5% of the whole. However, this survey displayed results of only 100 of the 1,157 community colleges participating in the council’s survey (Angelo, 2005, p. 63).

Until all colleges make it a priority to report fundraising data, research in this field will remain difficult. However, available data suggests that private fundraising has grown almost exponentially. In 1990, few colleges reported to the Council for Aid to Education's Survey of Voluntary Support that they raised an excess of $1 million per year. By 1996, the 99 colleges that participated in the same survey reported contributions to those institutions totaled over $85 million, a 17.4% increase during a year when private contributions to higher education experienced only a 3.2% rise (Council for Aid to Education, 1996a). According to this research, 67 community colleges tracked by the Council received an 8.9% increase, higher than any other
type institution. Although only a small number reported, this was a significant indicator (as cited in Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Conrad, Davis, Duffy, and Whitehead (1986) proclaimed that community college advancement differs from development at universities, because of funding sources, the role of local communities, and the organizational models utilized for the fundraising efforts. However, these differences do not always imply disadvantages. Furthermore, community-college leaders have only recently recognized the necessity in private fundraising (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Because of this, their institutions may be in position to strenuously pursue raising funds and to receive large financial gifts due to the potentially symbiotic relationships between local business and community college leadership (Hall, 2002).

Although Nazzaro (1992) explained that ties formed between alumni and their community colleges are oftentimes weaker than that of four-year colleges, and two-year institutions have more difficulty in procuring funds from their alumni, the researcher provided a case study utilizing County College in Morris, New Jersey, that exhibits an important exception and an excellent model. This institution created and maintained a successful alumni program that fostered student and alumni pride, developed an introductory foundation for funding, and developed long term relationships, commitments, and social webs with alumni to build bridges to positive relationships with local corporations. This study focused on a handful of alumni who became college representatives. They worked as fundraisers and spokespeople with local businesses on behalf of the institution. As a result of this new program, alumni chapters were created where members were featured in a county college alumni directory for the campus and were eventually solicited for funds. This venture proved to be very effective for the institution and still provides a great model for similar institutions.
Another potential fundraising benefit that community colleges may hold over four-year colleges occurs due to an environmental advantage. Because a communal and provincial atmosphere is prevalent at community colleges, the development staff can stay in closer physical contact with donors, who should be invited to campus often and feel as if they are part of the institution in purpose and mission (Keener et al., 1991). Moreover, community colleges are bonded to the communities they serve in a way no other postsecondary educational institution can be. Because their foundations are so firmly rooted in their surrounding communities, their advantage lies in the potential private support that can be generated if the community proudly accepts partial ownership. In addition, these colleges can attract the most influential community figures to promote the well-being of the institution and to foster new and existing external relationships (Rouche, Baker, & Rose, 1989).

In addition, community colleges have the advantage of close relationships with their local business communities. However, awareness of the colleges’ contributions is often limited or unrecognized by its community which makes fundraising particularly challenging even though “everyone is a potential donor” (Strickland, 2010, p. vii). Overall, the college must take advantage of the resources in proximity to their institution and foster the relationships that cultivate contributions (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

**Reasons People Donate**

In a 2001 single-state case study, Dowd and Grant (2007) studied the assets and revenues of 14 Massachusetts’ public community college’s foundations. The researchers hypothesized that colleges serving wealthier communities would be more successful in obtaining gifts from performance and private funding than colleges serving poorer communities. Through this Massachusetts case study, no evidence was found that community colleges serving wealthier
communities have an advantage in obtaining performance incentive funding over colleges in less affluent areas. However, there are a number of factors that contribute to successful soliciting of funds from donors.

Making donors feel that they are receiving an excellent return on their investment matters. In 2008, Dartmouth College utilized an April email campaign that raised $200,000 in funding. Every week, Dartmouth-themed gifts would be auctioned off, including art by local artists, IPODs with music from local artists, and Kindles with books written by Dartmouth alumni, including one from the new president (McClure, 2009).

In 1993, CEOs of major corporations surveyed by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities cited the following reasons for giving to community colleges. They include the following:

1. They were part of the community where the plant was located;
2. The college provided new employees for the company;
3. The college provided training programs for current employees; and
4. The college served employees’ children (Balz, 1987).

Although donor motivations vary due to conditions concerning socioeconomic climate, retention among donors is ultimately a matter of maintaining a positive relationship (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007). Moreover, the reputation and character of the staff member or administrator that asks for the donation is a critical factor in fundraising success. Nicoson (2010) echoed that “Donors don’t give to causes; they give to people with causes” (p. 73). This adage emphasizes the importance of charisma and passion among fundraisers while simultaneously expressing how donors can be influenced by the “personality, professionalism, and character of the asker” (Nicoson, 2010, p. 73). A statement from Miller’s (2010) work epitomizes this idea: “Asking for
money to fill a gap in public funding generally isn't the right approach” (p. 49). Donors want to feel as if their donation is going to be special. Miller’s work relinquishes that people do not want to see their gifts used for necessities but to make good institution, a better one. The gift should be as meaningful to the giver as it is to the school, and its direction should be guided by the donor’s aspirations for the gift (Hodson, 2010).

Howe (1991) outlined two principles that many presidents should utilize in their fundraising efforts: potential donors rarely give unless asked and potential donors would rather give for an opportunity to promote special growth (not make donations toward basic needs in order to keep a program alive). Glass and Jackson (1998a) have contended that “donors give to help institutions realize their aspirations or to meet unique challenges, not to bail them out of difficult situations” (p. 576). They also give to make positive change in people's lives and society as a whole.

In addition, major donors need to feel that their gifts are used for something well-planned and strategically organized. They will want to be knowledgeable of the institution’s continued direction and be allowed to view the president’s vision. This includes knowledge of the institution’s strategic agenda along with specifics involving where donations will be going and what can be accomplished with them (Hodson, 2010). To create this atmosphere, many colleges allow donors to be a significant part of the process.

One successful college, Middle Georgia Technical Institute, based its private fundraising on an invitation to donors to “participate in programs that mirror their values, preserve their interests, meet their needs for recognition and satisfy their desire to improve the quality of life in the community” (Joslin, 1995, p. 22). This foundation has a statement of philanthropic values and a strategic plan that allows donors to assist in the fulfillment of the institution's future
dreams and plans. Furthermore, strategies that involve gathering community advocacy and investor feedback prove fruitful (Glass & Jackson, 1998, p. 728).

Oftentimes, these gifts come from non-alumna. In 1995, non-alumni individuals were responsible for the largest percentage of voluntary support given to community colleges, contributing 37.7% of gifts reported. In contrast, according to the Council for Aid to Education, (1996), donations from non-alumni individuals to senior public and private institutions ranged from 17.5% to 30.7% (as cited in Glass & Jackson, 1998b). In the same year, alumni provided only 3.3% of the voluntary support for community colleges, contrasted with 10.1% to 23.9% for all types of senior public institutions and 28.9% to 39.8% for all types of senior private institutions (Council for Aid to Education, 1996b). This suggests that community colleges may not harness the same fundraising potential that bolsters four-year schools because of the lack of alumni support (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Community College Endeavors

Community colleges are now placing more emphasis in their broad resource development efforts on private fundraising (Hall, 2002). Success in these fundraising endeavors involves “an alignment with vision and mission and attention to external conditions” (Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 727). However, there are a number of ways to define the success of fundraising endeavors.

Such measures include the following: 1) the amount of money raised, without norms for comparison (Clements, 1991; Duronio & Loessin, 1991, 1993; Glandon & Keener, 1994); 2) the percentage of total institutional revenue generated through private gifts and donations (Glennon, 1986); 3) the amount of private money raised per student (Clements, 1991; Council for Aid to Education, 1996a); 4) satisfaction with fundraising performance (Deegan, 1992; Koelkebeck,
measures of how well an institution realizes its full potential based upon models of effectiveness that account for institutional and service area characteristics and conditions (Duronio & Loessin, 1993; Gatewood, 1994). However, most fundraisers will agree that simply creating a financial goal and achieving it is a logical way to gauge success. Jenner (1987) also found that the integration of fundraising with institutional planning activities contributes to success.

Examples of Successful Community College Fundraising

There are a number of reasons why institutions plan fundraising ventures. Valencia Community College engaged in comprehensive planning out of a lack of resources (Hooks & Kelley, 1990). The college’s first step was to scrutinize current and suspected future economic climates, trends, and investments of similar colleges and harnessed the best opportunities “for growth, development, and renewal” (Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p.727). Because a lack of resources prompted the strategic planning at Valencia, outcomes and success were associated with the resource development effort and their outcomes (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). This endeavor resulted in Valencia capitalizing on a $250,000 gift from IBM and over $1 million in other funds to furnish a robotics laboratory to prepare employees for companies that utilized technology in targeted local communities (Hooks & Kelley, 1990). This echoes the importance of cooperative partnerships between local businesses and advancement offices at community colleges (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Geraldine Gallagher, president and CEO of the Valencia Foundation of Valencia Community College explained that visibility is a major issue for community colleges. After more than doubling her college’s endowment in five years from $15.6 million to $38.1 million, her achievement went unnoticed by major higher education associations. She had to call the
National Association of College and University Business Officers, and they had to explain how to report their tremendous achievement (Angelo, 2005).

One of the most innovative fundraising campaigns was a joint venture among Kentucky’s 14 community colleges. It was the first statewide campaign by a two-year college system raised $31.6 million in private donations alone (Burcham, 1996). According to Glass and Jackson (1998b), four-year models recommend beginning with an “annual fund or alumni giving” (p. 728). However, Kentucky began soliciting major gifts without a specific financial goal, although the community served by the college recognized a necessity of $40-$50 million to meet certain needs. Although these successes reiterate the importance of setting goals for the community as well as the college, they also express the importance of the relationship between community and local institution and how communities value education and improving the lives of its citizens (p. 728).

Another example comes from Wilkes Community College in North Carolina. Over an eight-year period, their college raised more than $10 million in external funds, including $2.2 million to construct a community center. The resource development office used the college's long-range plan to explore goals and match them with available outside resources (Bender & Daniel, 1986). This reiterates the importance of merging advancement, mission statement, and administrative vision.

A number of colleges are implementing new strategies and initiatives to college fundraising. Brenda Babitz, foundation president at Monroe Community College in Rochester, New York, promotes internal fundraising which auctions off the skills of faculty: web page development, French lessons, even lessons on fly fishing to the community (Rivard, 2002).
Miami-Dade's Endowed Teaching Chair Program illustrates an excellent example of a model which evolved out of excellent planning and the setting of long and short term goals (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Aware that one third of the faculty would soon retire, with a directive to be an institution focused on teaching, the college sought funding to attract outstanding instructors. The college developed an endowed teaching program that raised $2.5 million dollars in program support and scholarships. The campaign attracted and helped recruit outstanding community members to the foundation board and provided a means for donors to support the institutional mission (Traylor, Katsinas, & Herrmann, 1989).

In September of 2001, Cape Cod Community College began an initiative to undertake its first capital-construction campaign ever. It eventually secured $4 million dollars with additional government funding for a new Applied Technology Center and key renovations throughout the college (Grant, Schatzberg, & Northcross, 2005). The college was already involved in important philanthropies and was seen as a worthwhile investment for local professional and civic organizations and local companies. Because of its own advancement endeavors and reputation, the institution was seen as a viable fundraising entity (Grant, Schatzberg, & Northcross, 2005). These examples show that successful fundraising should help make stakeholders content. This idea is echoed by Wharton (1997) who explained that effective community colleges “delight, the key stakeholders they serve, which include students, faculty, staff, and the community” (p. 15).

Oftentimes, this idea is grounded in the institutional philosophy and later implemented by the college president (Glass & Jackson, 1998a). In addition, Duronio and Loessin (1991) interviewed a number of presidents who completed excellent fundraising campaigns. One president explained that his new fundraising approach involved capitalizing on the services that they provided to the community. This president provided numerous examples where the college
allowed community access to a theater, library, and fitness center for little to no cost. College presidents foster local relationships to procure funding (Hall, 2002).

One president explained that when speaking about gifts with donors, he mentioned what their previous gifts had done for the college and what opportunities existed for future investments. Another president acknowledged that he spent most of his time fundraising (Duronio & Loessin, 1991). However, each of these presidents described a relationship between the college and key members of the community. Each president “implied that strengthening the relationship between the college and key members of the community would increase private financial support” even if relationships varied (Hall, 2002, p. 48).

Roles of Athletics in Fundraising

One entity that can affix the community to the college is athletics. Fundraising for athletics programs has become an increasingly important aspect to institutional fundraising efforts especially with the rising costs of athletic programs: insurance, utilities, food, and travel costs are serious fiscal hindrances to an institution’s operating budgets (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

However, if utilized correctly, athletics can be a means to grow a college. Stinson and Howard (2010) found that at an early age, strong emotional attachments can be developed between an institution and an individual through athletics at a college. During one interview, an interviewee proclaimed that a relationship was created with that young person when an athletic pennant was purchased and hung in his or her bedroom. Eventually, that person attended the same college. This relationship eventually evolved into significant financial contributions to that college’s athletic and academic programs. Many times this personal relationship generated between collegiate athletic programs and young people is fostered by parents, family members,
and role models. Overall, this study suggests that donors zealously support the institution and athletic program to which they exhibit the strongest emotional ties. This creates a sense of loyalty that is difficult for other institutions to break, infiltrate, or usurp.

Stinson and Howard (2010) also contended that alumni status has little to do with significant financial contributions associated with athletics, and almost three-fourths of the donors studied made their first gift to athletics instead of an academic program. However, many donors use athletics as a window of giving to the institution. One donor proclaimed that athletics made the donor aware of institutional programs and their needs. In addition, one pair of donors stated that every time they make financial gifts to the institution, they learn something additionally positive about that institution. However, 70% of all athletic donors give close to the lowest level of giving, near the price of tickets (Gladden, Mahoney, & Apostolopoulou, 2005). Additionally, scholars suggest that donors are more interested in commercial benefits, and that oftentimes this generally outweighs the philanthropic benefits in attracting gifts (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; Stinson & Howard, 2004, 2007). Athletic donors want special access to events and athletic participants. Continued work is necessary to explore transitioning donors from commercially motivated to philanthropically-motivated giving (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

In addition, there is continued controversy over whether or not athletes, or their athletic programs, should be able to make money from sports collectibles signed by college athletes. Schneider and McMillen (2002) explained that these funds could help struggling athletic departments, student athletes who have received catastrophic or career ending injuries, or to provide additional scholarships for collegiate athletes up to the cost of attending the university. The funds generated for this memorabilia could be used to counter the commercial aspects of athletic fundraising (Schneider & McMillen, 2002).
Similarly, in a partially qualitative study, Gladden, Mahoney, and Apostolopoulou (2005) found that commercial value, through tickets and social access, is a motive for charitable gifts directed toward athletic programs. This study suggested that donors give when there is a social or commercial reward like buying tickets that help create additional student scholarships (Stinson & Howard, 2010). This type of donation serves two purposes: it grants the donor access to a social event and makes the donor feel that his or her contribution harnesses special merit and meaning (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

One of the best examples of donating for event access is exhibited by purchasing tickets to high profile seating and special access at competitive and tradition based sporting events including collegiate rivalries. Moreover, donors who purchase tickets to Southeastern Conference football rivalries like The University of Alabama versus Auburn University may not realize that they are making donations to an institution or athletic program when they purchase tickets to these games. Another lucrative method of athletics funding is achieved through licensing. In the 1990s, Nike and the University of Michigan signed a $1 million dollar a year contract for seven years that equipped every team in the entire athletic department and gave $75,000 to athletics (Falls & Gerard, 1994; Schneider & McMillen, 2002).

Although some researchers have focused on increased funding to athletics compared to decreased donations to some academic programs (Stinson & Howard, 2010), other scholars have noticed a positive correlation between both academic and athletic gift giving. McCormick and Tinsley (1990) observed slight increases in academic gifts compared to a more pronounced growth in athletic gifts at Clemson University (as cited in Stinson & Howard, 2010). In addition, many authors have noticed connections between institutional fundraising and athletic success.
(Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Grimes & Chressanthis, 1994; Rhoads & Gerking, 2000; Stinson & Howard, 2008, 2010).

Some well-organized joint efforts in fundraising have proven successful. In one example, an athletics department supported fundraising for a new library. Stinson and Howard (2010) have contended this became possible due to an integrated structure that made “cross-cultivation efforts both possible and more efficient” (p. 327). Structure is imperative in goal oriented fundraising projects that utilize links between academia and athletics and oftentimes, these ventures produce increases in gift transitions and donor growth (Stinson & Howard, 2010). This is important because results from this study displayed that only about 2% of donors who had previously made athletic gifts transitioned into making academic gifts (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Moreover, there has been sustained and abundant research scrutinizing the relationships between athletics and academics (Duderstadt, 2000; Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Toma, 1999, 2003). Some of this scholarship has focused on the idea that sports offer a portal, a means in which “external constituencies can relate to and interact with the institution” (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 318). This study looks at the role that athletics play as a catalyst for producing interest in the college’s mission and its plans to attract donors both with and without previous institutional relationships (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

In addition, some studies have tried to link athletic performance with fundraising achievement. This is most often associated with the win/loss ratio of football and men’s basketball teams compared with the rate and amount of giving (Goff, 2000; Grimes & Chressanthis, 1994; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; McCormick & Tinsley, 1990; Stinson & Howard, 2007). Many of the findings have been conflicting and erratic; moreover, most of the
data suggest that these numbers revolve around athletic ticket demand. In addition, Stinson and Howard (2008) found that “70% of athletic donors giving $5,000 or less annually gave only the amount necessary to secure the ticket and parking benefits associated with the gift” (as cited in Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 322).

However, additional data suggests that college athletics programs can be successful in attracting new donors to an institution (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Donating to athletics is the preferred giving method at for lower and middle class donors. In addition, donors receive benefits that are usually unrivaled in the academic world. Academic programs should take a long-term approach to “cultivating relationships that are meaningful to the donor” (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 326)

In a University of Oregon case study, Stinson and Howard (2004) witnessed profound increases in private giving to athletics compared with noticeable decreases in private giving to academic programs within the college over a nine-year period. In a 2007 study that observed similar trends, the same scholars assessed trends in donor giving to NCAA Division IA institutions. This study exhibited significant results showing that institutions that were suffering fundraising losses in academics due to athletics were falling out of the upper echelon of prestigious academic ratings (Stinson & Howard, 2007). Conversely, schools ruled as academically elite by *U.S. News and World Report* rankings showed significant gains in overall donations (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Fundraising through college athletics can be a lucrative means of obtaining resources for an institution. Fulks (2005) explained that “By 2003, athletics donations contributed 26% of the total institutional gifts, up from 14.7% on average in 1998” (as cited in Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 327). The annual average revenue of NCAA division 1-A schools’ in 2003 was $18,600,000.
Eighteen percent of those revenues are accounted for by private donations, including ticket revenues, and parking fees (Fulks, 2005; Stinson & Howard, 2010). However, “the overall percentage of donors making major gifts to both athletic and academic programs remains small (about 27% of all donors making annual gifts of $1,000 or more give to both athletic and academic programs). These numbers exhibit the tremendous potential that exists to cross cultivate donors” (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 327).

In 2009, 55 of the 73 colleges in the six major athletic conferences responded to a Chronicle of Higher Education survey conducted over a three-month period. The colleges provided information that showed they raised a total of $1.1 billion in cash donations for athletics (Fundraising for Athletics in Six Major Conferences, January 23, 2009). To make major donors feel important, colleges will often allow them access to practices, athletic events, coaches, and to student athletes. Donors often view these as major benefits for their gifts. These benefits reaffirm the donors’ gifts and reinforce the bond between donor and institution. They strengthen relationships and increase the chances that donors will “sustain high levels of giving” (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 324).

This method of personal attention to donors in athletics could be replicated in some ways by academic programs if colleges allow a full range of academic access to the programs that are of great interest to potential donors. In this way, athletics can instruct academics into a new means of fostering relationships with potential donors. In the Stinson and Howard (2010) study, not one alumnus had witnessed similar donor cultivation methods by any academic entity. They had not even been contacted by a representative from a “program area from which they had received their degree” (p. 326). “Research has also shown that major donors who support both athletic and academic programs at an institution give more total dollars to the institution than any
other donors and are retained at higher rates” (p. 312). Inspiring athletic donors to be generous to academic fundraisers is a major interest of administrators and researchers. Furthermore, Stinson and Howard (2004, 2008) explained that this may be the single determining factor in whether or not an institution will experience symbiotic growth of both programs or one program will crowd out the other. In addition, donors who give to both programs have a higher potential to become long-term institutional donors (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Understanding the motivations of these donors is imperative. If donors make their first contributions through commercial motivations with possible limitations, then “universities have a strong need to leverage the emotional connection generated by athletic teams into a broader relationship between donors and the institution that will allow for the development of philanthropically-motivated gifts (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 323). The majority of these donors explained that their largest gifts would contribute to a part of the institution that would make a more philanthropic or meaningful impact to society than athletics. For example, donors who made a gift that created or maintained a scholarship reported taking pride in a gift that helped support a student-athlete (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 324).

Schervish (1997) has suggested that donors display a strong desire “to participate in adoptive philanthropy” to become a part of the entity they are supporting and to improve the lives of others (as cited in Stinson & Howard, 2010, p. 322-3). Therefore, any theory associated with donations in higher education must scrutinize and investigate the limits of commercial philanthropy (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Bowen and Levin (2005), as well as Shulman and Bowen (2001), made it clear that athletics affects nearly every facet of campus life at four-year colleges. This is not always the case at two-year schools. Most people enrolled in community colleges commute to and from the
institution; however, athletes may prove to be one of the few groups that enjoy a full social collegiate experience. If a two-year college can have success transforming their collegiate culture into a microcosm of one of its four-year counterparts, it can possibly be successful in a great deal of the fundraising techniques that four year schools have been utilizing (Catanzaro & Miller, 1994).

College Research

States use varying methods and measures in determining how/where they gather revenue to fund education; research provides examples that other states can utilize to their advantage. Kenton, Huba, Schuh, and Shelley II (2005) found that, in a study of 11 states, two-year institutions in Ohio obtained the highest percentage of revenue from tuition and fees. Schools in Kansas, Nebraska, Wisconsin, and Illinois received a much smaller percentage of income from these sources. This finding mirrors that of Katsinas, Johnson, and Snider (1999), who studied reliance on tuition and fees in five states from 1995 to 1996. They found that community college students in Ohio were charged the most for tuition and fees; those in Illinois were charged the least. The data suggests that states differ in philosophy about whether or not the individual or society benefits more from higher education, and who should fund it. Income from grants, private gifts, and endowments was extremely modest at the institutions in this study, contributing very little to their revenue. This contrasts with the findings of Keener, Carrier, and Meaders (2002) who concluded that the community college advancement efforts with grants and foundation offices result in substantial funding for America’s two-year colleges. Research suggests that the policies that govern the funding of higher education differ among the states (Kenton et al., 2005).
Traditionally, state and local dollars have funded community colleges. The American Association of Community Colleges suggests that the means of funding for community colleges has drastically changed. Originally, money from state and local entities funded these institutions. However, Angelo (2005) suggests that 44% of community college funding comes from the state; local funds contribute 20%; tuition and fees account for another 20%; the federal government provides 5%, and the remaining amount is provided by endowments and fundraising (p. 63).

Prior to 2003, a few public universities and colleges were sued by news organizations citing federal and state Freedom of Information Acts (Ryan, 2003). These media outlets could not gather information about fundraising activities performed by foundations and donors. The lawsuit contends that because foundations receive public support, their records should be available for public scrutiny. Roha (2000) explained that for an institution to remain protected, they must severely limit the sharing of resources between college and their external foundations. Ryan (2003) proclaimed the outcome of these lawsuits changed the way foundations raise funds, manage resources, and maintain donor privacy.

Two-Year College Theory and Models

In the past few decades, new models and theories have been developed that could possibly withstand the oftentimes volatile and fragile fundraising atmosphere of the community college (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). These theories help add perspective to those interested in studying private fundraising and to those who practice in higher education.

One social organizational theory that supplies structure for scrutinizing community college resources that focuses “on the role of external constraints in organizations” is known as resource dependency theory (Kenton et al., 2005, p. 113). According to the theory, when organizations’ decisions are influenced by uncontrollable external limitations, administrators
attempt to manage their resources in a way to alleviate strains and to maintain freedom from these obstacles. It is essential for institutions to overcome financial obstacles in order to survive (Pfeffer, 1982). Resource dependency theory attempts to explain how colleges attempt to manage necessary critical resources in order to exist and prosper (Johnson, 1995). Like private business, when environments change, colleges can adapt or erode (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978).

Administrators at colleges may borrow theory and practice from the private sector including highly structured and complex management models oftentimes based on goal setting (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Oftentimes, these models are inefficient in a community college atmosphere because community colleges can suffer radical and emergent change due to internal and external politics and financing (Hockaday & Puyear, 1989).

Although utilizing four-year models at community colleges is often impractical, presenting an effective advancement office complete with a well-trained staff, and a great rapport with alumni, community donors, and local businesses is integral to the continued success of that department. The means by which the development office is organized can elevate the fundraising success of an institution. Smith (1989) prescribed four possible means of organization based on where the chief developmental officer is placed in the organizational model. In the staff model, the chief development officer takes the place of the president if he or she is unavailable. In the line model, the development officer is under the president but is on a similar administrative tier as academic and student affairs deans and the Chief Financial Officer (CFO). This line model allows liberated communication from the Chief Development Officer (CDO) with other administrative leaders, allowing that office’s integration with all institutional affairs (Luck & Tolle, 1978; Smith, 1989). Moreover, it allows the function of the resource development office to be integrated with the college’s mission, planning, and management.
(Glass & Jackson, 1998b). This organizational structure increases communication amongst separate entities. According to these scholars, successful fundraising begins with good coordination and communication (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Coordination and communication are especially important for members of the resource development office. Resource development offices must instill policies which tie in sharply to institutional vision and the planned direction of leadership (Ryan, 1994) and these offices must have access to strategic planning, institutional research, and information from college databases in order to be successful (Keener et al., 1991; Rasmussen & Anderson, 1990; Smith, 1991).

There are two very common types of fundraising that occur in the community college setting. “Goals-based” fundraising is used when fundraising activities are implemented to meet a financial goal. Success occurs when this goal is reached. The alternative this is “dollars-in-the-door” fundraising, (which could be at odds with institutional priorities), where resource officers risk stealing resources from top priority projects invested in by administrative leadership (Hall, 1993; 2002). This type of fundraising involves grasping for any funds at the time in which they are offered in order to ensure that the opportunity is not missed (Hall, 2002).

**College Policy**

The policies of community college fundraising are guided by the values of the state and local community. If funding education is a priority of government, then one can surmise that the government feels that education is for the greater good of society. If individuals pay the extra expenses, tuition raises etc., then that state feels that education should be valued more by the individual than society. As state appropriations and funding diminish, community colleges have to rely more heavily on tuition and fee raises to provide basic services to their student population and the community (Angelo, 2005).
Reductions in state and federal funding has forced community colleges to use the fundraising models of successful institutions, similar in size and socioeconomic climate, not the formal, rigidly structured models of fundraising utilized by universities (Dempsey, 1992; Miller, 1994; Glass & Jackson, 1998b). One major reason why community colleges utilize different fundraising models than four-year colleges is that community colleges do not have a comparable size of staff and/or resources (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

However, there are some states that place a high value on community college funding. According to one study, during the economic rebound later half of the 1990s, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, North Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri, and Michigan increased financial support to community colleges. This additional support reduced reliance on student fees and tuition (Kenton et al., 2005). If the climate at these institutions included fundraising previous to this economic upturn, then these additional funds were used to increase advancement endeavors (Kenton et al., 2005).

Traditionally, four-year colleges have strictly organized fundraising as a highly centralized function under the control of an advancement office although recently, there has been a move to offer incentives to recruit deans and departments into a fundraising role (Hall, 1993). This scholar suggests that this may cause a power struggle among departments, shifting institutional power and allegiances, and creating a competition for resources that “may affect the university's ability to set priorities” (as cited in Glass & Jackson, 1998b, p. 723).

Other Factors of Successful Fundraising

Ryan and Palmer (2005) declared that leadership is pivotal in the fundraising process and its success depends on “the institution’s overall community relations effort, the ways that fundraising tasks are assigned and coordinated, and the strategies used to ensure returns on
investment in fundraising campaigns” (p. 43). The president is the key to establishing these relationships because he is the “living logo” and the college’s institutional visionary (McGee, 2003).

However, there are additional factors that contribute to the success of fundraising activities. Keener, Carrier, and Meaders (2002) found that large suburban colleges have the largest fundraising staffs. This capacity for fundraising drastically improves chances for success. Therefore, colleges that have unequal donor prospects and unequal resources have a poor chance of easily acquiring additional funding (Dowd & Grant, 2007). For example, HBCU advancement staffs are often small, and in many cases, those assigned to undertake these tasks are inexperienced when it comes to formal fundraising (Gasman & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003). Finally, “colleges serving higher proportions of students of color are also expected to be at a disadvantage in fundraising due to historic economic discrimination against people of color in the United States” (Dowd & Grant, 2007, p. 234).

Chapter Summary

This chapter presented an overview of the history of collegiate fundraising and a review of the literature concerning fundraising at two and four-year colleges; in addition, the review included an assessment of (a) current practices in fundraising and advancement; (b) an overview of the roles of institutional leaders in the process; (c) how and where funds are being raised; and (d) policy and theory.

The findings of this review illustrated that community colleges have to depend upon fundraising to maintain growth and key services. Furthermore, research displayed that relationship management is integral to profiting from short and long term fundraising. In addition, fundraising depended somewhat upon resource management, investment in institutional
goals and vision, planning/organization, and focus. The literature also showed vast opportunities in the role of athletics in fundraising. In addition, technology was oftentimes found as a means in which colleges could battle declining state funding by gaining more attention and outreach for less overall dollars. Chapter III displays the research methodology and design for the study. Chapter IV presents the data analysis with a discussion of the emerging themes. Finally, Chapter V includes the findings of the research and recommendations for practice.
CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory multiple case study was to assess the nature of non-grant, institutional fundraising structure and practice at three large rural community colleges in North Alabama. Research in the area of community college fundraising is significant to administrators who could benefit from additional understanding of fundraising practices that positively affect large rural associate colleges. This study added to the knowledge base in the field of fundraising for Associate’s Colleges.

An additional factor that motivated this study was the lack of qualitative research on community college fundraising in a southeastern state. This new research should help administrators determine the necessity of their office of institutional advancement and if their institution is utilizing the most effective means of fundraising available. In addition, this research may provide a means for administrators to better foster relationships amongst their own institutional fundraisers and with external stakeholders and constituents. Finally, the researcher was concerned that many community college administrators are under an inordinate amount of pressure to achieve insurmountable objectives in many facets of their profession with an ever-dwindling amount of resources. External fundraising may be one of the few tools that can help achieve these lofty goals or even keep these colleges open.
Research Questions

The overarching research question this study attempted to answer was, how do large rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state develop fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding?

Topical sub-questions related to this overarching research question included the following:

1. What are the role, scope, and goals of private, corporate, and foundation fundraising at large rural community colleges in a southeastern state;
2. What philosophies, structures, policies, and practices are in place to support fundraising efforts within the colleges;
3. Who decides what resources are provided to support the colleges’ fundraising efforts;
4. What are the obstacles, challenges, effectiveness, and productivity of the fundraising efforts at the two-year colleges studied;
5. How do the fundraising practices identified within the literature review compare to those at large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state;
6. Where do the primary fundraising functions lie at each institution;
7. What techniques are utilized in wooing potential donors; and
8. What factors help determine who approaches potential givers?

The researcher’s objective was to endeavor to document the roles of institutional actors in the fundraising process, their training, background, organization, and how their tactics differ when approaching corporations and individuals. Using observations, document analysis, and interviews, the researcher probed institutional fundraising philosophy while investigating
perspectives of how fundraising efforts were organized, managed, staffed, and carried out. During structured interviews, quotes and themes were harnessed from the participants’ words in order to provide evidence of meaning. In addition, the study scrutinized organizational structure of foundations and fundraising staff specifics (job descriptions, student use, size related to funds generated). This included the roles of governance, resources, methods of procuring funds, and reporting. This qualitative multiple case study displayed differences in fundraising practices at large rural Associate’s Colleges in a southeastern state and described the settings in which those events took place.

**Multiple Case Study Design**

Yin (1994) pointed out that multiple case studies are especially useful in attempting to explain “the causal links within phenomena that are too complex for other experimental strategies” (p. 15). Yin has also illustrated that the explanations produced through the research should display a link between program implementation and the recorded results.

Case study research is also used to describe an event and the context in which it occurred (Yin, 1994). It can also more clearly illustrate topics within an evaluation, in a “descriptive mode”, or from a “journalistic perspective” (Yin, 1994, p. 15). A case study also helps to explore circumstances in which the intervention being evaluated has an indistinguishable single set of outcomes or in a “meta-evaluation,” a “study of an evaluation study” (as cited in N. Smith 1990, p. 15). This multicase research design has become a useful method of examining either several cases linked together or those that have no programmatic link (Stake, 2006, p. v).

According to Yin (1994), in order to accurately understand a phenomenon it is imperative to choose the cases well. Furthermore, Miles and Huberman (1994) have declared that it is integral to obtain an excellent number of representative samples where the phenomenon of
interest must be prominent. A researcher’s aim is to scrutinize each case, its activity, its contexts, and functioning through observations, gather artifacts, and perform interviews (Yin, 1994, p. 13). During interviews, some documents or artifacts will be used as catalysts to ignite additional perspective from interviewees (Stake, 2006, p. 31). The evidence that emerges from case studies should suggest similarities in theme and benefit from previous developments of theoretical proposals “to guide data collection and analysis” (Yin, 1994, p. 13). Good case study research scrutinizes resolutions and conclusions, why they were implemented, and/or the result (Schramm, 1971).

**Research Approach**

Qualitative researchers attempt to comprehend meaning that pertains to an observed or perceived phenomenon (Merriam, 1998). It is inductive rather than deductive. From a participant’s perspective, induction begins with a personal experience. This is followed by generalizing a rule based on found outcomes. Deduction involves stating a rule and then applying it to a new situation. Inductive research builds upon abstractions and conceptions and does not employ the deductive thinking one would use in assessing an existing theory (Merriam, 1998).

Recently, qualitative methods have become increasingly complex and effective in means in which to capture the social contexts that engage, surround, and infiltrate the human condition (Boyd, 2011, p. 59-60). Qualitative research utilizes the perspectives of a relatively small number of participants within a phenomenon, wherein the researcher is oftentimes the primary data-gathering instrument. This is an atypical occasion in science wherein the researcher is required to be spontaneous and responsive (Hatch, 2002). Furthermore, the design of qualitative study is emergent and flexible to adjust for new understandings (Merriam, 1998). The researcher
must recognize that social settings and contexts are unique and that they should be studied as an entire entity rather than separate variables (Merriam, 1998).

Oftentimes qualitative research seeks developing theory from interviews, observations, artifacts, and intuitive knowledge gained from fieldwork (Merriam, 1998). It is undertaken when there is a lack of theory, or when existing theory does not provide an adequate explanation of a phenomenon. The researcher attempts to understand and illustrate the participants’ viewpoint of this observed phenomenon (Merriam, 1998).

Merriam (1998) has outlined four characteristics of qualitative research: the researcher is an analytical instrument, researchers must do work in the phenomenon’s habitat, inductive research strategies are used, and rich-thick descriptions are utilized. Unlike the use of numbers to represent the product in quantitative research, qualitative research uses words and pictures to communicate the observations and interpret the phenomenon. In addition, rich, comprehensive description allows for the inclusion of passages from a variety of mediums (e.g., books, records, historical documents, excerpts of videotapes) (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). Because qualitative research focuses on a phenomenon’s process and its contextual meanings, the end product of a qualitative study is rich, thick description that attempts to capture the motivations, customs, and belief systems of the participants (Merriam, 1998).

**Participation Identification and Selection**

Creswell (2007) explained the importance of purposeful sampling in qualitative research. In this process, the researcher chooses specific sites and individuals to study because they can “purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (p. 125). Purposeful sampling is integral in the process of choosing participants for this study.
In addition, the literature review identifies a number of institutional participants central in the fundraising process at many community colleges. They include president of the foundation board, president of the community college, head of advancement or development, chief financial officer, deans over academics and student affairs, and athletic director. In order to get permission for this study, the researcher contacted the president by email or telephone to explain the purpose and benefits of the study and asked for permission to continue. The researcher notified the president of intentions to contact each potential participant via phone to communicate the details of the study and request their participation. After initial correspondence, the researcher sent a follow-up e-mail containing additional information about the researcher and the study to the participants. This e-mail reiterated the request for participation, provided necessary contact information, and included an attachment containing the consent form. In addition, this email asked the participants to sign and return the informed consent form prior to any interviews, observations, or document analysis. Following the participants’ responses, the researcher began scheduling times to conduct the study.

**Context of the Study**

Three large rural associate’s colleges within a southern state’s community college system (ACCS) made up the setting for this study, and it serves a large number of students. By the 2010 fall semester, the number of for-credit students reached more than 100,000; just over 40,000 are male (ACCS, 2010). Although a slight increase in male student enrollment occurred, those of color represent only 34% of the total enrollment during this period. However, the total unduplicated number of students enrolled in 2010-2011 reached nearly 148,000. In addition, almost 70% of Alabama’s two-year college students qualify for some type of financial aid, and
more than 25,000 system-wide institutional scholarships were awarded during 2010-11 (ACCS, 2010).

The ACCS declares that its strength is in its ability to quickly adapt and respond to the workforce needs of industry and business, and that it is the premiere provider of workforce training to the state (ACCS, 2010). During this year, the ACCS trained and served over 106,000 people in order to ready them for the job market (ACCS, 2010). The ACCS also acknowledges that its pipeline between its community colleges and Alabama industry, business, and technology are major means of its successes (ACCS, 2010).

Three colleges from this southeastern community college system were chosen as research sites for this study. In addition, the state in which these colleges reside is one of only four states which have a single statewide governing board (Tollefson, 1999) and no local governing body. Research from this study would most likely benefit one of these four states. Furthermore, to establish context for the study, the subsequent paragraphs offer a description of each community college that will act as a research location.

**College A**

College A is classified as a large, public, rural-serving Associate’s institution by Carnegie. It is a rural college located in mountainous foothills and mostly serves students from the northeastern section of the state. The college began as an early trade school funded and administrated by that state in 1925 (College A, 2012a). Throughout the 1960s, two trade schools served this area (College A, 2012a). In 1965, College A was created, and in 1973, the titles of the two trade schools were changed to technical colleges (College A, 2012a). In 2003, the state board of education consolidated the two colleges into a multiple-campus college (College A, 2012a). As of fall 2011, the total enrollment of students was 6,733 (ACHE, 2011). Currently, the
college has two foundations that have not yet dissolved from the merger over a decade ago and a new foundation which has not yet reached non-profit status by the federal government. One legacy foundation holds endowment assets totaling $93,000. The other legacy foundation holds endowment assets totaling $82,000.

Although College A’s main site is located in a small city, the college has a total of six instructional sites in its service area: four sites are in that same city, two sites exist in neighboring towns. In addition, the college serves students at three local high schools and at a correctional facility (College A, 2012a). College A offers 25 short-term certificate programs including electrical technology, welding technology, and civil engineering (College A, 2012b). They offer 25 associate degree programs in applied sciences including accounting technology and air conditioning and refrigeration. Furthermore, there are 35 programs in the transfer guide for associate degrees and 14 certificate programs (College A, 2012b).

The campuses of College A offer proximity to local industry and to an important river that acts as a hub for commerce. This makes College A’s location excellent for workforce training. In addition, females make up 62% of total enrollment (ACHE, 2011). While 71% of all students are white; 22% are African American; 7% are Hispanic or of other descent (ACHE, 2011). Of these enrolled students, 42% were considered part-time, and 58% were considered full-time (ACHE, 2011). Additionally, this college is near a university, a regional institution that provides an opportunity for students to transfer credits.

**College B**

College B is classified as a large, public, rural-serving associate’s institution by Carnegie. It is a rural college located on a river and mostly serves students from the north central and northwestern section of the state. The college was established in 1947 (College B, 2012b). It
became a technical college in 1965 and was designated a community college by the state’s board of education in 1973 (College B, 2012b). It had an enrollment of over 12,000 credit-hour students during the Fall 201 semester (College B Fact Book, 2011). From 2007 to 2010, the college has had record enrollment. However, in 2011, enrollment stagnated (College B Fact Book, 2011). The college holds endowment assets totaling approximately $9 million.

College B’s central campus is located in the northwest of this state. However, the college has an additional campus located within a research park at a major city and two instructional sites in surrounding cities. College B is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and offers almost 50 associate’s degree programs and over 50 workforce training or certificate programs (College B’s Fact Book, 2011). The college houses an aerospace technology program and a robotics center, through a partnership with an industrial training institute (College B, 2012b).

The campuses of College B grants proximity and opportunities for students to work closely with industry and business in order to meet the workforce development needs of the surrounding area. From the students in that state who chose to attend public college in fall 2007, a substantial percentage enrolled at College B (College B, 2012a). Forty-one percent of College B’s students are considered full-time (College B Fact Book, 2011). Females make up 58% of total enrollment and the number of male enrollment decreased over 5% since 2010. Seventy-one percent of all students are White. Twenty percent are African American, and only 3% are Hispanic (CCC Fact Book, 2011). Additionally, College B is near two universities that provide opportunities for students to transfer credits.
College C

College C enrolls approximately 6,000 students (College C, 2008). Originally, the college was established as a trade school in 1963 (College C, 2012). Classes began in 1966 (College C, 2012). College C is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and primarily serves the north central portion of that state (College C, 2012). The college currently holds endowment assets totaling $2.1 million.

In 2002, the college re-organized and a new Institutional Advancement Division was created (College C, 2012). “An ambitious technology initiative provided state-of-the-art technological infrastructure and learning environments” (College C, 2012). Today, this college offers more than 50 programs of study in health, technical, and academic programs in addition to a number of options for students to transfer credits to four-year colleges and universities (College C, 2008).

Females make up 64% of total enrollment. Ninety percent of all students are White. Five percent are Black, and 5% are Hispanic or of other cultural origin (College C, 2011). Furthermore, 57% of all students are enrolled full-time. College C is centrally located less than 50 miles from state colleges in two major metropolitan areas (College C, 2008).

Despite differences, these colleges are comparable and similar in several areas including student demographics, programs of study, course offerings, ties to workforce development and region served. In addition, they are all located in close proximity to four-year colleges and universities.

Research Perspective

In conducting the study, the researcher approached the study from the postpositivist perspective. Postpositivism acts as an effective research paradigm for the current study because
it seeks to determine the role, scope, goals, structures, policies, and practices of private, corporate, and foundation fundraising at large rural Associate’s Colleges in a southeastern state. Postpositivist researchers believe that reality and a perfect truth can never be found and “the inherent order of the universe can never be known completely” (Hatch, 2002, p. 14). Because of this philosophy, even though evidence is fallible, the researcher must obtain an objective position, in order to “capture close approximations of reality” (Hatch, 2002, p. 14). Postpositivist researchers do not prove that a hypothesis is true but prove that a hypothesis cannot be proven false (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Furthermore, postpositivist researchers believe that one can find an approximation of the truth by relying on multiple sources from multiple perspectives, utilizing inquiries founded in logic and incorporating rigorous means of collecting data and techniques for analyzing data (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002).

In postpositivist research, the researcher acts as a data collection instrument that discovers and determines patterns in data through analyzing interviews, observations, and document analysis and applies them to themes through a process called coding. These codes help to determine the perceived truths from the study (Creswell, 2007).

Data Collection and Instrumentation

The research methodology included an exploratory multiple case study approach, utilizing three different means of data collection: interview, observation, and document analysis. This data was coded in order to help aid in the perception of the roles of collegiate members and administrative leaders in order to help determine potentially promising fundraising practices, organizational strategies, and habits. After this data was analyzed and coded for recurring or emergent themes, the researcher presented sufficient findings and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.
Researchers suggest collecting and analyzing multiple forms of data when conducting a case study (Yin, 2003; Creswell, 2007). Using different types of data aids the researcher in determining a more complete “picture of the case” (Creswell, 2007). The researcher conducted an interview with a number of each college’s fundraisers, an observation of a fundraising event or meeting, and an examination of documents closely associated with fundraising.

During the approximately one and a half hour long interviews with three participants, four in the case of Community College A, the researcher recorded field notes with word-processor software on a laptop computer in order to record verbal responses and non-verbal cues or mannerisms while audio-recording interviews in order to create transcripts of each interview to review the data more completely at a later time. According to Corbin and Morse (2003), data dense interviews are oftentimes productive when questions about the phenomenon are general and vague. These questions are sometimes catalysts for additional participant interpretation. Later, I will attempt to interpret these participants’ translations of meanings acknowledging my own biases, experiences, and perspectives (Creswell, 2007).

An identical protocol was utilized for every administrative position interviewed (see Appendix A). Questions focused on the interviewee’s perspectives on fundraising at their institutions. Although the majority of each interview consisted of a predetermined list of questions, the researcher encouraged interview participants to provide detailed and candid responses or to speak about additional fundraising perspectives or events that may have occurred.

At the end of the interview, the researcher worked with each participant to schedule an observation of a fundraising meeting or a fundraising event. By observing the fundraising participant in these environments, the researcher was able to personally view the fundraiser’s interaction with potential donors and other fundraisers, and the methods and
practices of the institutional representatives and compared them to those mentioned in interviews. In addition, the researcher used an observational protocol and documented important activities during the observation as well. This fostered a clearer portrait of a phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Observational protocol was also established for this purpose (see Appendix B).

At the beginning of each interview, the researcher asked each interviewee for any documents that made record of fundraising practices, organization, or philosophy. In addition to the data found in interviews and observations, documents are oftentimes collected, evaluated, and coded in case studies to supplement the information gathered (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). Hatch (2002) declares that these documents offer a unique perception of the phenomenon studied and supplies excellent evidence for use in triangulation. After scrutinizing the documents, the researcher used a rubric (see Appendix C) to annotate and decipher them. Next, the researcher compared the data sets from the observations and interviews, using the document analyses to help determine themes. Documents, observations, and interviews offered detailed information for future analysis and permitted the researcher to identify and code recurring and/or emerging themes from all data acquired.

Data Analysis

The researcher collected information from personal interviews, fundraising observations, and document analysis. The data was analyzed using standard qualitative techniques accepted by scholars (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). After the interviews, data collection, and transcribing, the researcher began analyzing and sorting the information into categories while looking for recurring and emerging themes through the process of coding. Throughout the research process, the researcher returned to the data, gathered, and repeated reading in order to
reduce the material and make better sense of the meanings from the data (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 1998). The researcher scrutinized the data from the interviews in order to develop the final themes and descriptions during data analysis. Likewise, the researcher analyzed and coded the documents retrieved in order to establish similar themes using a rubric (see Appendix C).

Once all the data was collected and analyzed per institution, a cross case analysis was performed in which each college’s data was compared and contrasted in order to find similarities across institutions. This analysis was used to show “what is common across the cases” (Stake, 2006, p. 39). After this analysis, the researcher attempted to describe how a large rural Associate’s College in Alabama develops fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding. The researcher employed the emerging themes and descriptions as a foundation for interpretation and report research findings in Chapter IV.

Data Security and Participant Confidentiality

During spring 2013, the researcher collected data by conducting interviews, participating in observations, and inspecting documents related to collegiate fundraising. During each interview, the researcher used a digital audio recorder to create a digital audio transcript. After the interview, the researcher transcribed the audio copy using a word processor developed by Microsoft on a laptop computer; immediately after deciphering the audio copy, the digital recording was erased.

The Microsoft Word transcript files were digitally stored on the researcher’s personal computer and flash drive, which, along with any hard copies, were kept in a locked closet in the researcher’s home along with the field notes composed during interviews and any additional documents pertaining to the study. To maintain privacy and anonymity, the researcher used pseudonyms for both institutions’ names and individuals’ names when reporting the findings of
the study. Finally, the researcher promised to eliminate all means of (electronic, written, and audio) records from the study once completed.

**Researcher Positionality**

Creswell (2007) explains that the assumptions and worldviews of the researcher are pivotal in the developmental process of qualitative research. Because the researcher is an integral instrument in the collection of data, its analysis and interpretation, it is important for the researcher to acknowledge his or her own assumptions. This gives the reader additional perspective of the work (p. 61).

Moreover, the researcher acknowledged that the outcome of this research will be seriously molded by perceptions of the participants and the researcher. The researcher’s epistemological approach was to lesson distance between the researcher and the participants involved in the phenomena. The researcher’s (axiological) own predetermined biases were acknowledged and influenced outcomes, and the researcher attempted to marry his own interpretation of the events perceived with the perception of the participants (Creswell, 2007, p.17).

Moreover, because of the qualitative researcher’s direct involvement in the context of the study, Creswell (2007) claims that “clarifying researcher bias from the outset of the study is important so that the reader understands the researcher’s position and any biases or assumptions that impact the inquiry” (p. 208). To maintain the integrity of the research, qualitative researchers should make known their “past experiences, biases, prejudices, and orientations that have likely shaped the interpretation and approach to the study” (Creswell, 2007, p. 208).

Like the symbolic, circling buzzards in *As I Lay Dying* by William Faulkner, the multiple perspectives of researcher and participants is integral to good qualitative research and to the
attainment of verisimilitude (Faulkner, 1990). As a researcher, he believed that, in many instances, truth and reality are not easily obtained or recognized. Furthermore, it can oftentimes be distinctively perceived through a mist of varying socioeconomical contexts while previous personal experiences shape understanding. Because the researcher believed that every college’s context drastically changes due to organizational (personnel, leadership vision, and planning) and socioeconomical (political maneuvering, external and internal environmental changes, challenges and pressures) changes and environments, he wanted to fetter his own frustrating one-year experience as an understaffed and overburdened part-time athletic director that was active in fundraising and pressured to require even our part-time coaches to be active fundraisers at a small suburban community college in northeast Alabama. In addition, he is currently a coach and English teacher at a small rural public high school who still must succumb to private fundraising.

**Trustworthiness**

Qualitative researchers must design their studies to include and document certain procedures and methods in order for the results to be considered reliable and credible (Merriman, 1998; Yin, 2003; Creswell, 2007). To ensure the trustworthiness and validity of the study, the researcher followed recommended methods of a well-designed qualitative research design. Furthermore, the researcher used triangulation and peer debriefing to establish trustworthiness (Creswell, 2007). During the study, the researcher collected and analyzed multiple sources of data to achieve triangulation in order to illuminate a more complete and credible perspective of a phenomenon under a group of experienced peers (Yin, 2003; Creswell, 2007). The researcher asked experts in the field of community colleges, fundraising, and qualitative methodology to serve as peer reviewers. This lent credibility and viability to the study.
Timeline

After completing the required coursework in summer 2010, the researcher had difficulty getting an approved topic and did not begin research for a chaired topic until spring 2011. In February of 2013, the dissertation committee members gave approval to conduct the study, and in February of 2013, The University of Alabama’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the request to conduct field research. In spring of 2013, the researcher conducted the field research and began analyzing data. In the fall of 2013, the researcher completed data analysis and wrote Chapters IV and V. The researcher presented the results of the study to the committee in early spring semester of 2014.

Chapter Summary

By incorporating qualitative methods, the researcher performed a multiple case study examining the role, scope, and goals of private, corporate, and foundation fundraising at large rural community colleges in north Alabama. In addition, the multiple case study sought to illuminate the structures, policies, and practices that support these efforts within the colleges. The results of this study may help other administrators better understand fundraising in the two-year college system. This study also contributes to the existing literature regarding community college fundraising and fills a gap in the literature concerning the scope and practices of large rural two-year colleges in Alabama. Furthermore, this chapter has included information regarding the research approach, context of the study, theoretical framework, research questions, data collection, data analysis, case selection and sampling methods, philosophical assumptions, researcher positionality, and a timeframe of the study. Chapter IV will provide descriptions of the data presented from each individual case study. In addition, evidence of categories, subcategories, and thematic coding was provided within the study’s answers. In addition, rich
description was provided within the data in order to more clearly ascertain more coherent meanings from the answers. In addition, Chapter IV included a discussion of each individual case study and its emergent themes which were supported by thorough evidence.
CHAPTER IV:
EVIDENCE AND DESCRIPTIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL CASE STUDIES

Introduction

On numerous occasions during the interviews included in the segment of Chapter IV, the interviewee would not answer particular questions and chose not to respond. The reason why interviewees did not answer particular questions can only be surmised. The researcher did not ask why participants chose not to answer these questions out of fear that they might not answer further questions; therefore, segments within the narrative have few to no responses from certain interviewees. At other times, in order to remind the reader that these questions were asked, the researcher explained that a participant chose not to comment. Additionally, readers should assume that if there is no additional information, then the participants in the interviews, the documents, and the observations revealed no additional information.

In a few cases, participants agreed to an interview but meeting them in person was not possible due to scheduling or travel difficulties. In these circumstances, the researcher sent the study’s questions via email. On a number of occasions, these responses and those in person to person interviews were vague, short, inconsistent, and/or lacked concrete examples or significant information for coding or attaching themes. In which case, the researcher would send response questions asking the interview participant to please elaborate or discuss in more detail. If these answers were substantial, these responses were coded. Oftentimes, after initial coding, the researcher would send portions of the transcribed interview, along with questions, back to each
participant in order for him or her to provide additional details, or to specify, and to provide
clarity. The inconsistency of these responses will be revisited in Chapter VI.

This study was not meant to be about community college grant writers and grant writing; however, because the study was exploratory and because advancement professionals often have responsibilities that include this process, conversations about this topic became difficult to avoid and often led to how the community college's fundraising philosophy was enacted. In addition, stakeholders oftentimes valued similar traits in private fundraisers that were found in grant writers.

In Chapter IV, the researcher provided evidence from the research questions and included rich descriptions of each individual case from the categories developed from codes through no less than three rounds of the coding process, continually developing additional questions from documents, observations, and interviews, clarifying information from the participants interviewed as new codes and evidence emerged. Next, he organized the more complex categories into subcategories and then extracted themes and concepts that will be revealed at the end of this chapter. Chapter V includes a cross case analyses of individualities and commonalities in descriptions and provide an analyses of themes discovered and a discussion of where these traits overlap. Chapter VI provides findings, conclusions, and recommendations for policy, practice, and future research.

The phrases, “foundation members,” “foundation board,” and “board of directors” are all synonymous in this study. In addition, total fundraising stakeholders includes staff at an institution, foundation members, donors, student volunteers, and any other community and/or corporate support entities that provide capital or human resources to a campaign. Stake holders also include participants who communicate and resources or lead fundraisers to potential donors.
The terms “stake holders” and “participants” are synonymous. In addition the phrase, “associate’s college” is synonymous with “community college.” The researcher chose to use the term “associate’s college” in the study to more clearly describe each college in its most recent description applied by the Carnegie Foundation for the purpose of academic research. Furthermore, he also used the phrase “community college” because it is the most common term utilized in the vernacular and in research.

The case study of Community College A is important because it can provide other colleges with tips and traits associated with community college foundations that are being dismantled and/or being built. The case studies of Community Colleges B and Community College C provide two models for foundations that are profitable and growing. These can be helpful for community college foundations that are static and need to refocus their efforts and rejuvenate their foundations and/or advancement offices.

Community College A is in a unique position. During the course of this study, the president was removed from office. He represented the 6th president in as many years. This lack of security may have hindered the growth of the college’s foundation that they are still trying to create. Part of this unique story occurs because this community college was formed from a merging of two community/technical colleges. Because of this, the two original foundations are still operating. One major obstacle for the community college has been acquiring a 501c3 status from the government. Until this occurs, the old foundations cannot be dissolved, and the new foundation cannot be built and having so many changes at the college’s presidential level has not helped this process.

Furthermore, to add a sense of consistency to the study and to make connections more concrete, the researcher entitled the foundation liaison interviewed at Community College A,
Advancement Director Allenby.” She is white and 38 years old. Although her actual title is career resource specialist, and she has responsibilities in public relations and marketing and serves as the liaison for the foundation and alumni association; her job entails the same responsibilities that are included in advancement director positions at other community colleges.

Finally, to make sure the researcher received a clear picture of the foundation being built, he interviewed two foundation officers. The first participant is the second vice president of the foundation being built and is CEO of another local foundation: Foundation Vice President Adams. She is white and 55 years old.

The new foundation for Community College A utilized some of the internal policies of this foundation as guidelines for good practices but did not fully use it as a model. This is the major reason the researcher chose to interview her. The second person he interviewed was the president of the new foundation: Found Chair Alexander. He is white and 50 years old.

Advancement Director Allenby stated that these two people were instrumental in the foundation building process, and the researcher concluded that they would be the best foundation members to interview based on this information. However, neither the current foundation president nor the second vice president interviewed was affiliated with the legacy foundations even though four other legacy foundation directors serve on the new foundation board: the only returning officer from one of the legacy foundations is the treasurer who is the new foundation’s treasurer. The researcher suspected that this was done specifically to maintain the treasurer’s skillset and familiarity with state fundraising guidelines.

Foundation Chair Alexander is also known as President of the Board of Directors or foundation president. He is in his 13th month in this position. He has had no formal training or education in this field except for his experience in “many local fundraising activities, like Junior
Achievement and United Way.” He was a United Way Loan Executive, worked with a Chamber of Commerce and the Boy Scouts in three different southern states. Foundation Vice President Adams has six years of experience in foundation leadership and is president of another separate foundation. She has a bachelor’s and master’s degree in Business Administration that helped prepare her for these positions. She has over 35 years of experience in fundraising including direct mail, events, one-on-one solicitation, sponsorships, and more. College President Aristotle said he has four years of experience as a college president and two years at Community College A but has no formal training or education related to fundraising. He is white and 47 years old.

This chapter displays the profiles from each institution. After each profile, there is a discussion of its thematic elements and the codes that emerged from the data. The following narratives were developed from the questions in Appendix A, the observations, and the document review are then divided into appropriate sub-headings that fit into categories developed from the topical sub questions. This method is replicated for each case study.

First, for each individual case study, data and correlating codes about philosophy, governance, and staffing are included in the first sub heading that fit into the study’s topical sub-questions: philosophy and governance. Next, for each individual case study, data and correlating codes about education and experiences are included in the second sub heading that fit into the study’s topical sub-questions: structure and staffing (including individual experiences and education). Furthermore, for each individual case study, data and correlating codes about methods and practice and reporting and assessment are combined and included in the third sub heading that fit into the study’s topical sub-questions: methods and practices (including individual reporting and assessment). Finally, for each individual case study, data and correlating codes about internal and external factors and obstacles and challenges are combined
Community College A

Philosophy and Governance

Much of what individualizes the case of Community College A is its environment and existence within the early stages of community college fundraising. Although it has had foundations in the past, the focus and priorities of the new foundation’s members is mostly in planning and educating internal and external potential fundraising participants about the college’s mission, its role, laws, and protocol. Most of the energy and resources exuded by the current internal fundraising participants are engaged in the process of training and shaping emerging fundraising philosophies. During this study, college leadership changed; therefore, future institutional direction may differ. However, for the purpose of the study, the researcher tried to retain consistency by capturing information from the same set of participants at all colleges in the study.

At Community College A, philosophy and governance are enacted by fundraising leadership, laws and policies, procedures, and leadership including the foundation. Advancement Director Allenby stated that the foundation strictly follows postsecondary guidelines. She continued that their memorandum of agreement is a model based on the state board of education. Foundation Chair Alexander said that the foundation is governed by policies and procedures established by the board including authority and decision making. President Aristotle did declare that the foundation is governed by the Board of Directors which “consists of 20-24 members, with an Executive Committee of seven members to conduct routine business.” Although
President Aristotle did not declare that authority and decision making were directly distributed by Advancement Director Allenby and himself, who also served *ex officio*, he suggested that they are closely associated with the process. Comparatively, Foundation Vice President Adams said that authority and decision making for the foundation are distributed by the board of directors, the same group that governs those policies and procedures according to her.

Furthermore, she surmised that leadership had not been finalized on a cabinet level because the foundation needed to go through the appropriate legal and administrative steps. Finally, Advancement Director Allenby declared that the foundation is discussing organizing committees: a governance committee and an investment committee yet they were not in the process of dividing work. However, they have appointed officers: a president, two vice presidents, a treasurer, and a secretary. Foundation Chair Alexander and Foundation Vice President Adams were in agreement that the primary fundraising function of the foundation and perhaps for the whole college lies with the Foundation’s board of directors.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that bylaws and articles in development for this foundation are partially modeled after Foundation Vice President Adam’s local community foundation’s guidelines. In addition, Community College A used successful fundraising patterns exhibited by various institutions for training and organization purposes. Moreover, President Aristotle utilized a number of foundation documents created by a small neighboring community college as a model. These prototypes were used to write new documents and adjust legacy documents for Foundation A. After a process spanning years, the new documents were approved by postsecondary leadership after a thorough review during the first foundation meeting and prior to submitting them to the Judge of Probate. In addition, Advancement Director Allenby stated that as a precaution, Community College A’s Director of Diversity and Compliance, an
attorney, is in a continual process of reviewing all documents as they emerge to ensure there are no problems, especially in cases where student volunteers may be utilized.

Data from this study reinforces the belief that evolving and emerging foundations try to emulate successful fundraising models when organizing and training a new foundation, and they oftentimes depend upon previous successful models for philosophy and methods. Similarly, fundraisers learn from the positive and negative experiences of other fundraisers. This use of modeling and experiences literally and logically reflects the major theme of the study. In many cases, if the environments are similar, since relationship management is fundraising, an adequate model for one community college foundation or advancement office would be an adequate model for the other in the same state. This is proven by Euclid’s first notion of commonality: things which are equal to the same thing are also equal to each other (Fitzpatrick, 2008).

During an interview, the researcher mentioned that it surprised him that Advancement Director Allenby had not yet mentioned the college president anywhere in the leadership for the fundraising process. She replied that “He is supposed to provide the vision” in association with the institutional focus of the college, and he provides the focus on that direction. She emphasized that the bylaws echoed the same premise, and the campaign director or appropriate foundation representative will build the campaign around that, whether the focus becomes infrastructure or scholarships. After this, she mentioned that College President Aristotle attends every executive committee meeting, and “He is a driving force.” She followed with, “He has just not established whether we need infrastructure or scholarships.” Alternately, President Aristotle stated that the primary fundraising function at the college is actually held with the marketing and public relations department with Advancement Director Allenby.
Policy and foundation members. Furthermore, documents from the foundation observation illustrated that Foundation A was in the process of finalizing policies on spending, sponsorship, confidentiality, whistleblowing, distribution, and fees. The observation revealed that the foundation made many revisions in terminology to finalize policy in order to make things more broad and simplify the document in preparation of IRS approval. Additional documents revealed that the foundation agreed on a tentative foundation mission statement: the foundation “exists to support the mission” of Community College A “and provide opportunities for students.” This mission statement (or something similar) will guide the direction of the foundation and provided a basic groundwork of governance.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that their foundation is new and they were in the process of establishing new internal policies and procedures, specifically training volunteers and staff. After the interview, the researcher reviewed some additional documents. The document analysis revealed that Foundation A had completed developing policies for community members and student volunteers as well. This document was modeled from Foundation Vice President Adam’s local community foundation’s policies. She serves as the CEO and president of that organization; they have no other connections or relationship. In addition, interviews revealed that no actual training for the foundation had been conducted or planned prior to the interviews. President Aristotle said that their foundation members have only participated in an orientation of college programs and have received no other training.

Moreover, all of the foundation members were chosen by the college president based on their philanthropic participation in the community, ties to business and industry, and representation of all counties in the service area. President Aristotle did not use experience in fundraising as a factor when choosing foundation members and he illustrated that they are all
community leaders. Furthermore, a majority of the foundation’s directors have full-time employment and also participate on many other boards within the community.

Advancement Director Allenby briefly described some roles of the foundation members in their community. She explained that although the second foundation vice president has been chief executive officer and president of her own community foundation for many years, the first vice president of the foundation (not interviewed) was a previous assistant to the current foundation president and was a dean at a local university and had fundraising experience for the local community and at the college level. At the time of this interview, Community College A had 18 foundation members from all over the business community, including a small business owner, hospital administrators, managers of a large power company, members of chambers of commerce, former educators, employees at boards of education, and an accountant.

**Philosophy, mission statement, and planning.** The researcher asked Advancement Director Allenby if their community college had a fundraising philosophy or mission statement. She pointed to documents prepared for the IRS which illustrated that the foundation was “created in support of the college and the students’ education.” She said this statement was guided by researched mission statements from community college websites. However, Foundation Chair Alexander and Foundation Vice President Adams agreed that the foundation had no current fundraising philosophy. President Aristotle admitted that Community College A’s foundation did not have a fundraising philosophy because primary work in 2013 involved establishing organizational policies.

Advancement Director Allenby said that if and when they choose or create a concrete philosophy, it will be enacted through and by their mission statement. However, Advancement Director Allenby did stress the importance and idea of community in fundraising for community
colleges. She asserted, “This community here is one of the best communities I’ve seen with community support of volunteerism. I’ve lived in five states, and there is so much involvement here. It’s almost overwhelming. It’s fantastic and most people are very willing to give.” She personally believes that local stakeholders including foundation members and employees at their college selflessly give to community organizations. She said that she had built a relationship of trust for them and “their work with local charities and organizations.”

An additional philosophy of Community College A included prioritizing making ties with local businesses. They found it worthwhile to turn industry and corporate partners into college stakeholders by utilizing community support roles which are provided by the foundation members’ internal and external activities. Advancement Director Allenby and Foundation Chair Alexander recognize the resources available in their local area. Unfortunately, because Community College A was developing a new foundation and not yet in the practice of fundraising, conversations with their foundation and advancement professionals during the researcher’s observation were limited to focusing on motivating internal stakeholders’ investment and continual interest in the fundraising processes more than focusing on the investment of external participants in fundraising practices that might keep the college’s scholarships funded. This was unique for Community College A’s foundation in this study as it was in the early stages of planning and forming. However, conversations with representatives from the institution revealed an understanding of the necessity of additional resources, and they have been in constant communication with the government in getting their 501c3 status, and with their own foundation members in order for them to communicate the college’s values and positive attributes to potential donors.
Advancement Director Allenby contended that there is a momentous amount of planning and preparation in beginning the organization and management of fundraising efforts. Although they had not begun fundraising for the new foundation, they have regular meetings for planning and finance. She explained that there is an executive committee that meets once a month and makes plans. These plans go to the foundation board and are voted on by the foundation. They are discussed at quarterly board of directors’ meetings. Once the plans decisions go into effect, they are assessed, and members provide feedback of how effective and efficient the ideas have been. A new idea emerges; the process is cyclical.

Advancement Director Allenby said that it was far too early to assess how governance will provide fiscal and human resources for fundraising since they had not yet begun fundraising. Similarly, because the college has not yet engaged in a fundraising campaign, President Aristotle could not determine how Community College A would decide what fiscal and human resources would be provided for fundraising. No other participant could provide this information.

Structure and Staffing (including individual experiences and education)

Foundation and context. Although the existence of the two legacy foundations was not planned to retain permanence, currently, Community College A is the only college in this study with two existing foundations. Advancement Director Allenby mentioned that some employees still give donations through automatic deductions to these two legacy foundations. She explained that human resources asks if employees want to contribute or to continue contributions; however, Advancement Director Allenby tells employees that when the old foundations dissolve, the money will go into the new foundation. Furthermore, the timing in which these events occur, while the old foundations are still active, is an important environmental factor for community college A; additionally, communicating to all stakeholders and retaining their trust (an important
communicated factor in successful fundraising) is important to successfully navigating this unique time period.

President Aristotle noted that Community College A currently had three foundations plus an alumni association. He declared that the newest foundation was chartered in 2012 to replace the two legacy foundations that were used prior to the community college’s merger in 2003. The new foundation is awaiting IRS 501c3 certification, and will not plan its first capital campaign until that time. Although the new foundation has existed since July, 2012, (filed with the probate judge) they have still not received non-profit status from the federal government, so after almost a year and a half, their two legacy foundations are still waiting to undergo the dissolution process.

Advancement Director Allenby stated that around a decade ago, their main campuses merged, and Community College A retained two separate foundations, so when Community College President Aristotle (who left only days after this interview) came two years ago, he decided that it was more difficult to merge two foundations and change all the bylaws than to create one active foundation. Because the two legacy foundations had been relatively stagnant, and with the downturn in the economy, Community College President Aristotle decided to dissolve the old foundations and build a new one to solidify assets and increase donor activity for one college. Community College President Aristotle did acknowledge that each legacy foundation “has total assets of less than $100,000, and neither has engaged in active fundraising within known memory.”

Foundation Chair Alexander said that most of their foundation is made up of foundation members who are upper level management or owners of their business. Advancement Director Allenby added that the college consists of one college with 6 campuses in 3 counties.
Furthermore, most foundation members work in organizations within these 3 counties where their 6 campuses reside. She continued that Community College A wanted to make sure all these areas were equally represented by their foundation members. Advancement Director Allenby added that areas of discipline and backgrounds for foundation members include a retired teacher, a dean for health sciences, an assistant to the college president at one of their campuses, a certified public accountant, and numerous other members of the education and business community.

According to Foundation Vice President Adams, eventually, Foundation A should have paid staff members. The researcher asked her what foundation staff roles (including volunteers) and size would be. She replied, “This has not yet been determined. Much of it will be decided when we have money to pay staff, which of course will be after fundraising has occurred. It’s not a good idea to have volunteer staff because of labor laws. Fundraising will be done by board members.” Moreover, Advancement Director Allenby represented her institution’s only fundraiser under President Aristotle’s model.

Advancement context. When the researcher asked President Aristotle how advancement was organized, he referred to Advancement Director Allenby by supposing the “Advancement function currently has one employee within the Marketing & Public Relations department.” This indicates that no one within the old advancement office was legitimately associated with a fundraising role for the college.

Advancement Director Allenby has a year and a half of experience in her current position but has a background in social work and psychology, healthcare, human resource administration and benefits administration. In addition, because of the considerable amount of work that Advancement Director Allenby has done with building the foundation, the researcher asked her
if she thought she was in line to gain the position or title of “advancement director” or its equivalent with the previous administration before he was removed from office. She responded, “My current legal title is Career Resource Specialist. This title is affiliated with my prior position in Career Services (Nov 2007-Dec 2011). During a reorganization, I was asked by the Vice President... if I would be interested in moving to the Public Relations Department to help bring organization and leadership to the existing foundations, alumni association, and work on developing a new foundation. I was not aware of the opportunity prior to the offer.”

Advancement Director Allenby had no knowledge of final staff size for either the foundation or the advancement office although Foundation Chair Alexander asserted that the eventual goal for fundraising staff size was 24 although they currently only have 18 members. Furthermore, documents observed through email proved that they had finalized volunteer policies for employees, community members, and students; in addition, documents from the foundation observation illustrated that foundation A was in the process of finalizing policies on spending, sponsorship, confidentiality, whistleblowing, distribution, and fees. The observation revealed that the foundation made many revisions in terminology to finalize policy in order to make things more broad and simplify the document in preparation of IRS approval.

**Fundraising roles.** Advancement Director Allenby explained that so far, the primary fundraising function lies with the foundation because they put all the policies together; however, she was the primary facilitator between institution and foundation and performed most of the day to day activities for the foundation including writing, formatting, printing, and organizing documents for foundation meetings. She reiterated further by explaining, “I serve as an ex officio director and as a liaison to organize their meetings; I make sure they have a quorum, and I organize all their documents for them.” In addition, she explained that when the last president
came, he reorganized the college, eliminating the office of workforce development and government relations and filled her old position with a new employee. However, her new position is not organized under the advancement office although the banner training she received for working with the foundation occurred at another campus by a staff member who is a leader in institutional advancement and community services. Advancement Director Allenby could not speculate on the final organizational goals of the previous president nor did she care to speculate. Furthermore, she is admittedly unsure where new job descriptions or work titles will lead.

The researcher asked Foundation Vice President Adams how the current foundation president was chosen to be president. She declared, “The current president of the board was recruited by the former president of the college,” along with the current members of the board. She added that everyone on the foundation board agreed that Foundation Chair Alexander should serve as board president.

Advancement Director Allenby would not specifically comment on how advancement was organized. She did however mention that initially, one of the college’s vice presidents invited her to be a part of fundraising at the college and a figurehead in foundation activities. However, since Community College A was not actually fundraising, the final vision was never laid out by the previous president, so she could not be sure of eventual hierarchy or the staff size for fundraising either in the foundation or in the advancement office. She did mention that the current advancement office had nothing to do with the foundation except for her Banner training, nor does she know if it will be recreated, restructured, renamed, or destroyed. Advancement Director Allenby reiterated that she did not work in the advancement office. She declared that she works in the Public Relations and Marketing Department with a director, administrative assistant, a part-time assistant, and a clerk. Moreover, she is the only person responsible for the
foundation’s activities and alumni association activities, and she reports to the Director of Public Relations and Marketing Department for the duties of her position, and she communicates with the two legacy foundation boards, the new foundation board, and the alumni association board without any official training.

Foundation Vice President Adams said that they have not developed job descriptions for foundation members; however, Advancement Director Allenby expressed that fundraising responsibilities were not included in her current job description because she was transferred into that position; however, the foundation members have job descriptions in their bylaws that describe what each specific office entails. In addition, Advancement Director Allenby explained that her job roles have been an evolving process that has been an incredible change in the merging of responsibilities from counseling to career services. The new work included creating policies and writing: bylaws, memos, and articles of incorporation. She also had to perform hours of online research in order to find and understand the proper steps in creating a non-profit organization for the IRS and find training that has escalated into organizing board meetings and creating internal policies. Foundation Chair Alexander said that the foundation was not planning on using students actively, perhaps in just promotional videos and pamphlets or in observations by prospective donors on campus tours. Advancement Director Allenby suggested that the use of students in fundraising will be widespread. She asserted, “We have a lot of student organizations; ambassadors, SGA; then you have all your honors associations. We do have a lot of students that we can utilize as volunteers. We encourage them because it looks good on a resume.” The researcher asked if students would be used due to a lack of continued funding from state and local government. She replied, “Absolutely.” Because the college has not yet engaged in a fundraising campaign, President Aristotle could not comment on how widespread students would
be used in fundraising activities, but former students are important part of fundraising for their college.

**Alumni association.** Advancement Director Allenby explained Community College A’s has an alumni association, one association for both large (and originally separate) campuses. It has had 501-3(c) status for years and its structure and success provides some hope for the foundation’s future. Although helping administrate this organization was a large additional responsibility added to Advancement Director Allenby’s workload when she accepted the role in aiding the new foundation’s creation, it has provided prior training and experience for her in organizing, staffing, and performing fundraising events.

Advancement Director Allenby briefly described her role with the alumni association. “We just got our new board of directors established in January. I am there to bring some organization and make sure they are meeting regularly and put documents together for them.” She continued that there are 25 voting members to the alumni board, comprised of college staff and community members. She serves as liaison for the foundation and alumni association, acts as ex officio in both organizations, and she pays dues to be a member of the alumni board of directors. Furthermore, Community College A received $2,000 in new membership fees alone from just this past spring, so it is prospering. This organization helps shape philosophy and participants to aid in the success of the new foundation and future advancement endeavors. The traits necessary in managing the relationships of the foundation and alumni echo the traits of successful fundraising. However, Advancement Director Allenby must be able to manage the college’s human resources in order for them to eventually gather financial resources.

President Aristotle declared that “The alumni association is a membership dues funded organization that engages in minimal fundraising.” Advancement Director Allenby explained
that previously, the alumni association was barely utilized. She argued, “There wasn’t a lot going
on before, and when that happens, people lose interest. We had a t-shirt fundraiser. They never
had a brochure, so I made one. We bought an Alumni Association table cloth for a couple
hundred dollars. They weren’t at any events whatsoever.” She said that now the alumni
association has a presence at “Get on Board Day, Freshman Focus,” and “commencement.” Her
actions reiterated her philosophy that organizations gain recognition by being seen at events, a
type of marketing and brand awareness. If a college’s representatives are noticed and recognized
at events throughout local communities, then potential fundraising participants will have some
perspective on the college’s philosophies and priorities. These experiences create a local
environment conducive to supporting donor solicitation.

Methods and Practices (including individual reporting and assessment)

The methods and practices of Community College A are actualized by the policy
implemented by Advancement Director Allenby. She suggested that this concept begins within
their actual meetings, where she provides an agenda “that the president goes by and everybody
discusses.” Furthermore, the foundation votes by quorum, where half plus one wins, whether by
executive committee or by the entire board of directors. Foundation Chair Alexander said that in
the future, the foundation will be organized and governed through committees, but this has not
been finalized. Furthermore, Foundation Vice President Adams said that they had not made any
concrete fundraising plans until receipt of the 501c3 letter of determination from the IRS
confirming their not-for-profit status, although President Aristotle perceived that fundraising
efforts are organized and managed under “a primary mechanism which consists of building a
friend network throughout the community and identifying potential income sources.”
Advancement Director Allenby had some advice for people building new foundations for community colleges: “For those who haven’t worked at the state level and have been in the private sector, they need to learn what we can and cannot do.” She declared that many people have tried to give the foundation ideas, direction, and advice; however, many times these people do not know of state laws or the amount of resources associated with complex ideas, so Foundation A has to educate foundation members and plan because they cannot fundraise yet, and they have plenty of time for that.

None of the other participants in the study at Community College A or Foundation A chose to comment on any correlation that exists between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising because they have not yet begun fundraising efforts. However, Advancement Director Allenby acknowledged that it has been her general experience that events well-planned were of a higher quality than those that were organized quickly. Nevertheless, she admitted that she had very little actual fundraising experience and none whatsoever in a leadership role until now. President Aristotle previously had no experience with a major campaign in fundraising as well.

Factors and methods. Foundation Chair Alexander did illustrate that personal relationships are the most important factor that determines who confronts a prospective donor. When I asked Advancement Director Allenby about factors which help determine which employee confronts prospective donors, she reminded me that “Employees would not because state employees cannot solicit.” She reiterated that it was her understanding that state employees could not solicit donations; however, it seemed to be a common practice of college advancement professionals to solicit donations on behalf of their college’s foundations. However, the
researcher did not recall any advancement professional directly discussing soliciting donations for their colleges.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that fundraising techniques for potential donors could not be identified until policies were finished. However, Foundation Chair Alexander acknowledged that the foundation would hold an upscale dinner as the beginning technique to woo prospective donors. From then, they will use person to person contact to solicit gifts. Advancement Director Allenby said that she wanted Community College A’s first event to be a dinner in order “to invite people in the area and showcase the college’s students and the products they make in class and silent auction the items.” She provided examples: carpentry might build a doll house; welding could make silhouettes; cosmetology could provide manicures, pedicures, and/or haircuts. In addition, Community College A could give out gift certificates for their massage therapy department. Finally, she concluded the college should showcase its technical side (use of students). She wants the dinner to show what the college can and does give back to the community.

Advancement Director Allenby described some technology that the college and foundation would use for fundraising. First, she illustrated that she was recently and extensively trained in Banner (a program used for fundraising organization and communication which creates constituents, processes gifts, and categorizes students and potential donors for mass emails); she expected utilizing it to be a part of her future function: to enter and track data and complete reports. She explained that this was a technological advancement in software because they previously used Microsoft Excel. However, she contended that although the foundation has yet to discuss a means of mass communication, the college produced an internal video for foundation members to communicate to potential donors much of what the college does for the
community. This video was put on flash drives and given to each foundation member to take with them when they go to educate community organizations about Community College A. This video presentation includes college teachers lecturing about their programs. She informed that this technology may act as an engine for future fundraising endeavors. Foundation Chair Alexander said that additional technology used will include social media and a foundation web site with a “Donate Now” button. Foundation Vice President Adams thought that the foundation would still be utilizing an Excel spreadsheet to track fundraising.

Advancement Director Allenby suggested that fundraising tactics differed from corporate to individual. She stated that personal relationships are important when approaching an individual even though they may work for a corporation. She also explained that this is a reason why volunteerism and community support is such an important role for foundation members. This increases their sphere of influence and allows them to confront what might be a stranger who runs a business to an acquaintance or a friend who just happens to be in a leadership role in business or industry. Foundation Chair Alexander said that individual gifts will be driven more by personal relationships than by corporate giving.

Advancement Director Allenby said that many factors play a role in initiatives for fundraising, many of which come from the college president. Everything will build on that. Advancement Director Allenby explained that the college holds a gala for United Way every year, and the college’s foundation will have to be careful to have the college’s gala at a different time. I asked if she thought that helping other groups fund raise was of fiscal benefit to her college, and she was adamant that this event was specifically to help promote the community and Community College A’s mission of community involvement and not to promote fiscal gain for the college or its foundation. She did add that these events provided a critical fundraising service:
getting the college’s name in the community. She asserted, “You have these events; business leaders are involved; they have kids; those kids will need . . . college.” She continued “Everything is about marketing and an exchange of services,” and even having your college’s name on a table helps exhibit the presence of your institution. President Aristotle stated that the foundation anticipated conducting an “internal” campaign with college employees prior to a community-wide “external” campaign to promote internal investment and a connectivity of trust with the new foundation. Foundation Chair Alexander chose not to comment on the factors that play a role in initiatives for fundraising because their foundation is not yet at that point.

Advancement Director Allenby expected relationship and experience with the potential donor as the major conditions which facilitate who will be asked to fundraise. Other important attributes that are ideal in the person making the ask are passion and motivation. Additionally, she identified her current foundation president as someone who has a remarkable personality and tireless momentum. He is in pharmaceutical sales and is well connected with people in the community. She said he is very passionate about people and they like him and trust him; furthermore, “people want to be around him and do for him.” His personality and position makes him a good candidate for soliciting future donations. However, Foundation Chair Alexander chose not to comment on the conditions that facilitate those who are asked to fundraise. President Aristotle noted that substantial planning will be necessary to align campaign goals with prevailing economic and cultural conditions when preparing for the request of donation. This may help determine what resources to attribute to campaign events. Moreover, this planning may prove essential to future successful fundraising.

**Staffing and responsibilities.** Advancement Director Allenby suggested that a relationship existed between size of staff and funds generated. She said, “the more staff, the more
volunteers,” implying that if a staff is highly involved at an event, the higher the probability of that staff’s ability to get others involved. However, Foundation Chair Alexander declared that there might not be a concrete relationship between size of staff and funds generated. He asserted that “Quantity doesn't always equal quality.”

Foundation Vice President Adams did display that there was a relationship that existed between size of staff and funds generated. She declared “There is a sweet spot between too small and too large that is just right. Too small and there is not enough bodies to do all the work effectively, too large and it can be a waste of money.” Furthermore, President Aristotle believed that a relationship existed between size of staff and funds generated. He continued by declaring that “Current staffing is minimal for an internal campaign and insufficient to conduct an external campaign.”

Although President Aristotle stated that roughly only 5% of his responsibility was fundraising, he expected a “substantial increase once foundation organization has matured and campaign planning begins.” Advancement Director Allenby declared that over 95% of her responsibility is fundraising. She works with the alumni association, is liaison for the legacy foundations, aids in their dissolution process, and keeps them up to date with the building of the new foundation which she guides. Foundation Chair Alexander could not yet comment on the percentage of how much of his responsibility is fundraising yet.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that they could not yet describe different entities that they contact regarding fundraising. However, when they determine campaign goals and reach their 501c3 status, then the foundation will decide who to contact as potential donors. Advancement Director Allenby declared “as state employees, we cannot solicit to external entities. I can have a table set up at an event on behalf of the foundation, but I cannot go out and
solicit.” However, this is precisely what community college presidents and advancement directors within the literature and that the researcher interviewed admitted to oftentimes doing. College staff oftentimes solicits funds in the United States on behalf of their foundations.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that although the foundation is not allowed to fundraise yet, foundation members would soon be making presentations from flash drives provided by the foundation at the organizations in which they are personally affiliated to inform these organizations of what Community College A does for the community, its students, and the nation. Furthermore, because high wage/high demand careers are a major focus of the college and dual enrollment is often intermingled with that educational effort, the foundation president contacted Community College A’s technical dean of workforce education development in order to develop potential partnerships and fundraising opportunities with automotive groups once the foundation receives its 501c3 status.

**Factors for success.** However, Advancement Director Allenby believed that fostering these types of relationships begins with first having an internal campaign to ensure investment from stakeholders within the college and foundation. However, she did not emphasize how she would inspire these stakeholders nor specify how to maintain that motivation through campaigns. She continued that college staff and foundation members must be educated about processes before they can sell the institution’s ideals and vision to the community. She declared, “Buy-in is absolutely important,” and said that she will use college events to ensure this as well. For example, during fall convocation there is a segment of professional development before fall semester begins in which the foundation president will provide an update even though the foundation cannot yet fundraise. She informed the researcher that last year he introduced himself and explained that the foundation was in the first phases of forming. The foundation will
continue to do this in order to maintain communication with the college and establish a firm and reliable reputation. Advancement Director Allenby specified that Foundation Chair Alexander will provide a foundation update this year that describes what the foundation has done, is doing, and will do throughout the year. Following that, Advancement Director Allenby will present a PowerPoint that further illustrates all the activities that the foundation has done, from social networking at a quarterly board meeting, to taking foundation members on college program tours. She concluded that the community college has to establish trust with people inside and outside of the college before these potential stakeholders will fully invest in the foundation and college.

Although communication will be a key factor in the success of Community College A, Foundation Chair Alexander said that he cannot describe different entities they will contact regarding fundraising barring IRS approval; therefore, no partnerships are being forged with business and industry as well. However, he does expect to foster all of these future relationships with personal contact. Additionally, he projected that relationship building with the board members and prospective donors will be a fundamental necessity. Foundation Vice President Adams said the foundation had not yet formally contacted different entities regarding fundraising because until they receive the official IRS approval, they cannot receive tax deductible contributions and if they are not approved, “everything is a moot point.” According to President Aristotle, the board of directors was considering hiring a professional consultant to assist with the initial capital campaign. However, this decision deferred pending IRS certification. President Aristotle said until then, the foundation must foster communication with the college based upon “relationship building centered on establishing a cohesive Board of Directors.”
The researcher asked Foundation Chair Alexander what his perspective was on how Community College A’s advancement office was trained, but the researcher later realized that Advancement Director Allenby was not part of the advancement office and has no connection with Community College A’s advancement office; therefore, Foundation Chair Alexander had no experience with that office at all. However, he responded, “The college will not necessarily train anyone, because they will all be volunteers.” President Aristotle stated that no formal program existed for training advancement officers at the college.

Advancement Director Allenby acknowledged that foundation members and people in the community need to be made aware of what the college has to offer. She provided an example where this was done for the college’s foundation members. Advancement Director Allenby illustrated that in one of their quarterly board of directors’ (foundation) meetings, the community college drove two vans on campus tours, taking a number of foundation members on a three hour tour to seventeen different programs on three different campuses: electrical technology, electrical engineering, industrial automation, welding, nursing, massage therapy, and aqua culture (a program where they perform medical research in conjunction with Harvard University).

Programs like this are precisely the types of programs that Community College A wants to use to gain attention from potential donors. She made it clear that the foundation must be adept with knowledge of their community college in order to persuade donors and foster those relationships. This event received some positive feedback. Advancement Director Allenby explained that an associate dean was at a function one evening and came to work the next day talking about how they saw some foundation members at an event and they were raving about the tour in which they participated.
Community College A’s focus in educating its foundation members in these endeavors provides a glimpse of a community college in the early stages of foundation development. They were more involved with teaching the foundation about the college than training their members how to fundraise. Advancement Director Allenby contended that this communication was integral to fundraising success so that when foundation members “go to rotary club or the chamber of commerce, they’ll know about the college.” Additionally, although no foundation training is scheduled, Foundation Chair Alexander asserted, “There is a chance we might get an outside consulting firm to maybe give us a training session on how educational fundraising is best accomplished.”

**Assessment and reporting.** Advancement Director Allenby stated that fundraising practices will be reported via a complicated, but necessary system: Banner. In addition, she said that foundation money raised is public knowledge, and people can request and receive that information from the foundation. “The IRS guidelines say you have to provide it,” but she continued that they have not thought of how to report generated funds yet. Furthermore, Foundation Chair Alexander only expected to report fundraising practices as required by law and IRS regulations.

Advancement Director Allenby determined that the success of fundraising activities will be decided by the college president when he or she determines an initial campaign goal and the means to achieve that goal. Additionally, Foundation Chair Alexander chose not to comment on how the foundation will assess the success of these fundraising activities.

Advancement Director Allenby said that so far planning for fundraising had been efficient; meetings were organized, and the meetings retained their agenda. She added that although meetings have proven fruitful and planning seems to be effective, there is no way of
knowing how effective fundraising for the new foundation will be. Furthermore, Advancement Director Allenby found the leadership effective and contended that the fundraising chief (their previous president) was “absolutely effective,” quite simply because “It didn’t exist until he was here.” She continued, “We’ve had five presidents in six years. As soon as he came in, this was a priority. She added that people now know they have an alumni association and a new foundation. However, Foundation Chair Alexander could not comment on how effective the fundraising chief (either President Aristotle or Advancement Director Allenby) had been.

Moreover, when I asked the study’s participants what were the most effective and ineffective means of fundraising, they would not comment; however, in Foundation Chair Alexander stated that in his experience with fundraising, “The best way to raise money is face-to-face.”

**Factors and Challenges**

Community College A faces a number of challenges. By perusing the documents provided by Advancement Director A, the researcher discovered meeting minutes from spring 2012, many months prior to the interview in early July 2013, which displayed hopes for a January 2013 campaign kick-off with fundraising activities. As of November 5, 2013, their foundation had still not received their 501c3 status for fundraising at their new foundation. This document represented their initial conversation for foundation fundraising in April 2012. They formally completed the application process in July 2012. This paper trail displays the difficult obstacles and challenges associated with starting a foundation for community college fundraising. Further documents from the November 13th foundation meeting that the researcher attended and observed revealed information from an August 21st foundation meeting in which foundation leadership contacted the IRS to question its potential 501c3 status. The IRS
responded that “They were approximately one year behind in reviewing applications.” The federal government acknowledged that they received Community College A’s application in October 2012. Therefore, it took over two months for the federal government to acknowledge the reception of the application. According to the IRS, via the foundation minutes, “Delay was caused by congress changing laws that resulted in 600,000 tax exempt organizations losing their non-profit status and were required to reapply. In addition, Congress implemented a hiring freeze through the past two years and had less staff to process applications.” In conclusion, Community College A’s foundation was informed that the 2013 government shutdown temporarily halted the process, and unfortunately, the IRS expects the foundation will have to wait at least an additional six months from the time the 501c3 status would have normally been accepted.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that Community College A battles a number of obstacles and challenges with fundraising. She contended that because the communities where these colleges exist are small and many organizations are constantly and consistently asking for money throughout the year, it is difficult for the college to compete. She remarked that the unemployment rate is stifling in their surrounding communities and the competition for jobs at the bachelor degree level is unprecedented. In addition, the same people are on boards for many similar organizations as well, so a person may be soliciting funds in a competing fashion from their own foundation members, but for a different institution.

Advancement Director Allenby said that they would avoid any practice that might eventually cause any type of immoral fundraising and always edge on safety and morality before financial gain. In addition, she acknowledged that the rules for fundraising are extensive because some institutions and/or government officials have acted in a corrupt and immoral fashion and this behavior has made the fundraising progress difficult and extensively scrutinized, especially
for community colleges within that region. Furthermore, after the interview, she informed me that she had some trepidation about being interviewed because of friction within the leadership of her institution, and she found the rules for accepting gifts in fundraising were paradoxically complex and vague. Advancement Director Allenby admitted that “Statewide there was an investigation, so the board of directors was hesitant to do anything during that time.” However, she contended there was nothing wrong with the records at Community College A. This fear may slow the progress of fundraising, but it is necessary.

**Personnel.** Furthermore, Advancement Director Allenby may be overburdened. A year and a half prior to the interview with Advancement Director Allenby, she was asked to help organize the alumni association and the new foundation. Additionally, she does public relations work for the college by taking pictures at college events and editing the college newsletter each month while she has worked with the two legacy foundations throughout the process to dissolve the foundations and transfer funds when the new foundation received its 501c3 status from the federal government. There were no signs that her burden will be lessened.

Foundation Vice President Adams said that she has no responsibility for fundraising in Foundation A. She explained that she has “a conflict of interest” in her paid position. She continued that she cannot raise funds for the new foundation without inherently having a conflict of interest. According to her, her public image is as CEO for her foundation which is “a not-for-profit organization that works with donors to make lasting charitable gifts.” She declared that because both organizations intend to work on endowment building, donors could choose to do that with her organization instead of Foundation A or become confused as to whom she represents. She contends that ethically, she cannot raise funds for both. She would not comment on whether she would stay with Foundation A, simply that she “cannot predict the future.”
Foundation Chair Alexander expected that obstacles and challenges in fundraising for their college will be the current economy and lack of a permanent college president. President Aristotle asserted that the most substantial obstacle or challenge in fundraising at Community College A was the foundation’s and college’s personnel’s lack of experience with fundraising. He proclaimed, “College funding has relied completely on state and federal allocations and student tuition.” Foundation Vice President Adams chose not to comment on obstacles and challenges in fundraising.

**Emerged Major Themes**

Table 1

*Case A Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance to Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated Philosophy</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships/External Stakeholders</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Affects Future-Experience</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of major themes emerged from the case study of Community College A. The factors of *communication* permeated the conversation and documents and the data suggests that it will have a continued grasp on future advancement discussions at the college.

Additionally, *governance* (established from leadership made up of articulated *philosophy* and participants) and its impact upon fundraising at the college will have a lasting effect on what is done in the near and distant future.
First, the participants believed in the importance of communication. They invested in the idea that communication with community members and business leaders needed to invest in the college; however, they believed that foundation members and college administrators must support the college first. Furthermore, Advancement Director Allenby understood that internal and external marketing must occur before an exchange of services would be permitted. Additionally, study participants realized technology’s role in increasing communicating and reporting. Moreover, communicating policy to those who would eventually solicit donations was imperative to the fundraising process. Her trepidation about accidentally inappropriately fundraising illustrated this theme. Evidence suggested the college will zealously train employees and communicate the danger of unethical practices or misappropriation of resources to advancement members and foundation members. The president picked foundation members based on these principles of stakeholders and partnerships. College leadership has an intense focus on community with whatever focus they choose. The college would showcase students and their abilities in early events. Although the college or its foundation could not relinquish specific fundraising ventures, they did prescribe person to person contact as being a major descriptor of their methods. This key trait of communication will be an important factor in whatever practices, processes, and methods they utilize.

Although inconsistency saturated responses involving reporting, organization, and leadership, governance emerged as an important factor to the future of fundraising at this college. There was little communication and some confusion over where fundraising power resided at the college as represented by the lack of concrete leadership and high turnover at the highest office. Moreover, the college exhibited a lack of fundraising legitimacy represented by the absence of their 5013c status. In addition, more leadership problems emerged with the
admitted conflict of interest with Foundation Vice President Adams. How effective the foundation and college’s advancement office is governed may ultimately affect the effectiveness of fund raising at Community College A. Furthermore, the leadership responses to the emerging internal and external factors including the competition for resources in their surrounding communities, bridling emergent change, and the implementation of decisions and protocol will have a lasting impact upon their institution. Finally governance also has an immediate effect upon the institution. Fundraising progress will continue to be limited until the college’s foundation is granted its 5013c status from the federal government.

One important theme that emerged from research at Community College A was that internal fundraisers (whether in advancement or the foundation) depend on partnerships with external entities and stakeholders to support student scholarships. Fostering these relationships and an environment in which this is possible, is vital in creating lasting partnerships and positive experiences for future donors.

Advancement Director Allenby explained that human resources asks if employees want to contribute or to continue contributions; however, Advancement Director Allenby tells employees that when the old foundations dissolves, the money will go into the new foundation. Ironically, in these instances, internal participants (human resources) provide resources. In addition, the college must use communication to maintain positive relationships with its own employees in order for them to continue to freely give resources to their institution.

Community College A exists in a challenging environment where the federal government is as underfunded as the state governments it is designed to aid and uphold. This is not specifically a unique challenge for Community College A except that their very existence depends upon the federal government’s ability to finish paperwork in a reasonable manner. The
future of this foundation depends upon external stakeholders at the federal level reiterating the theme that for large rural community colleges to exist and thrive, the government must be as supportive as the surrounding communities. Thematically, this shows the unique organizational factors of Community College A’s foundation: participants and environment.

Another important theme that emerged with the data was how previous events and experiences affect future endeavors in fundraising at Community College A. The investigation that occurred affected their fundraising environment even though “there was nothing wrong with the records at Community College A.” The theme that previous events and experiences affect community college fundraising and mold the environments in which they operate continued to saturate this research. This institution’s history will affect future perspectives.

Advancement Director Allenby is an integral participant in fundraising at her college, and she must be given similar support and investment to mature as a capable advancement professional, much like the potential donors that she solicits and the foundation members she tries to encourage must all receive trust and encouragement to mature. In short, fundraisers need the same supportive environment they create for others in order to build successful partnerships. It is a demanding job that demands a supportive structure. Furthermore, she represents an important human resource where administration must maintain successful communication of their needs and visions to and for her in order for her to be successful. Her effectiveness echoes the theme of relationship management. One consistent factor throughout the literature review and this study is that participants must be engaged in the fundraising process and supported by the institution (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Furthermore, she has the traits of a successful fundraiser (Ryan & Palmer, 2005) if she does not become overwhelmed. However, Advancement Director Allenby’s workload and experiences with the alumni association have
aided the new foundation’s creation because it has provided training and experience for her in organizing, staffing, and performing fundraising events. Thematically, this training and organizational experience has influenced the college’s philosophy on how to shape the new foundation as well. Moreover, previous experiences, external organizational models, and extensive research (items that form and are formed by philosophy) provide excellent training examples and worthwhile fundraising traits that will update existing organizational structures, environment, and/or philosophical perspective. Community College A’s philosophy is that successful fundraising depends on morphing existing or emerging foundations or advancement offices to fit successful models.

The alumni association of Community College A provides an excellent example of an important research theme: participants play a vital role in shaping successful fundraising environments, policy, and methods at large public rural Associate’s Colleges in a southeastern state. Here, the participants are external stakeholders that are organized to provide a vital function for the college, and Advancement Director Allenby is the participant who oversees the organization.

Community College B

Philosophy and Governance

Much of what individualizes the case of Community College B is its position as an effective fundraising community college. Its foundation’s philosophy involves a focus on procuring large gifts from individual donors, and they put very little focus on formal or typical alumni association fundraising. Major energy and resources are engaged in the fundraising process, and in doing so, these processes procure large private gifts. Community College B’s location in a technological hub aids in that development, and the advancement director’s dean
title is an important symbol that assists in fundraising. Although Community College B has two major campuses, they share one foundation.

President Baldwin’s philosophy is that fundraisers should worry about soliciting in an environment where fundraising is not common and where the person being asked has never contributed before. President Baldwin was convinced that if an advancement office wants to pursue someone for money, it is best to ask someone who has given to many other causes. Her perspective reflected that, whether the case involves a company or an individual participant, the better philosophy is to pursue entities that love giving. President Baldwin suggested that this potentially makes a relatively easy solution for fundraising when the target donor consistently gives: making your cause greater than those whom they have previously given. President Baldwin simply continued that if a fundraiser can successfully make a potential donor feel like Community College B’s role in the surrounding environment is more (or just as) important as the cause that they give to already, then Community College B will receive a gift. President Baldwin also argued that fundraisers also fear that when other institutions are out raising money, (which is constantly occurring) their own institution is less likely to get donations; she fervently opposes this perception. According to President Baldwin, this is an excellent time to solicit donors, because at this hypothetical time and place an environment and culture exists for giving in which philanthropies help persuade all potential donors into giving somewhere. To use a simple but violent natural metaphor: sharks do not leave bloody water if other sharks are eating there. President Baldwin affirmed, “The more the people in a community have been exposed to giving, the higher your chances of getting a gift is.”

President Baldwin offered that although sometimes soliciting a major gift takes years and years, occasionally it only takes one visit. The researcher will provide an example later in the
case study’s description. However, it was her philosophy that oftentimes the time it takes an interested and invested donor to offer a substantial gift depends largely on how long it has taken for the donor to earn the money he or she is giving away. According to her, the donor has to believe in what he or she is investing in, and the fund raiser has to assist them in believing it.

Advancement Director Bradley explained that her personal philosophy is to never leave a meeting “empty-handed.” If she cannot get what she came for, she gets something else. She wants to leave knowing she forged some sort of partnership, affecting that fundraising environment and shaping the philosophy of the people she comes in contact with, in order to thank the potential donor(s) for caring about the students and education. She said that this was important because, “Someone that already feels appreciated and valued is going to more likely be willing to hear you the next time you call.” The researcher asked her if she felt like that same philosophy should be reciprocated for the potential donor. She agreed and explained, “That’s where I pick up all these extra little assignments.” These include being asked to be on committees for organizations like Kiwanis and the Women’s Chamber of Commerce and attending and/or speaking at certain events and reciprocating numerous other favors. She called these events “exposures” and she determines that they are an important part of friendraising and relationship management. Her philosophy is that these events often provide experiences where Advancement Director Bradley can foster new relationships and gather new participants in future fundraising endeavors. Oftentimes, these events provide her with an outlet to communicate the necessity for resources at the college.

Community College B’s most effective friendraising occurs through “respect raising,” a high priority concept where relationships are nurtured with highly influential leaders. Building relationships with people of influence is a necessity in high stakes fundraising. Gathering and
maintaining comradery with people of little influence is far less effective according to leaders at Community College B. For example, people have friends, but few can singlehandedly financially alter the outcome of a fundraising campaign or a college’s future.

**Legitimacy.** Advancement Director Bradley explained that her title of dean was an important aspect of legitimacy and governance that supports her in fundraising tasks. She stated that being the advancement director of the college lends little credibility to her massive responsibilities, but being dean of the college keeps her from being marginalized as just a fundraiser when she tries to communicate with professional entities. When she contacts establishments or business and industry, she does not stay on hold nor does she get ignored. She declared, “Before I was named dean, when I was faced with struggles and when I would ask questions, they would automatically assume that because I was asking the question, there must be some sort of impropriety in my query, and being dean has legitimized every inquiry I make.” She adds that it has also helped her communicate community donor perspective to the college, cut red tape, fix things that are fixable, and scrutinize records. Advancement Director Bradley’s experience is that this title helps sway internal and external highly influential potential fundraising participants.

For example, one of her board members explained that her secretary’s daughter was rejected from entering the nursing program at Community College B. Advancement Director Bradley apologized, and asked, “Are you telling me this because I need to be aware because I will have to interact with her or are you asking me to do something?” This example of communication is a great illustration of proper relationship management utilizing communication. When Advancement Director Bradley is confronted with an issue like this, she always wants the person to clearly communicate what they want. In this case, the foundation
member just wanted to understand why. Advancement Director Bradley explained that FERPA prevented her from discussing this issue, but if the student would sign a release then she would be happy to discuss it further. Her board member declined but offered to help in any way possible, and said she appreciated her attention to the matter. Advancement Director Bradley asserted that this type of experience is important because it shows how, as dean, she can directly communicate with her board members and provide reciprocation. These experiences greatly affect her philosophy on relationship management, and, therefore affect the fundraising environment she creates around her. Furthermore, her dean title facilitates trust and respect and vastly increases the level of immersion and engagement in the operations of the college and produces legitimacy through increased freedom and power. Although according to Advancement Director Bradley, she did not pursue the title; it was a surprise to her; however, it provides great internal and external support from fundraising participants and she described receiving it as an “absolute honor.”

After listening to her description of the importance of the dean title, the researcher provided an analogy from his graduate history studies: one of the first things a new country does is ask to be recognized as a country. She stated, “That’s a good analogy. You’re exactly right, so I am the college and not just the foundation.” She agreed that a dean may be perceived as a person able to provide a mutual benefit not just to solicit money. This analogy reflects the amount of respect and legitimacy she hopes to raise when communicating with fundraising participants or potential donors. The dean title helps communicate the respect and trust needed for effective relationship management.

**Flexibility and fundraising direction.** President Baldwin’s perspective was that because the college operates within an unstable economic environment, especially in education, a
community college has to be flexible in order to focus on whichever areas have available resources to ascertain. This philosophy was shaped by a harsh fiscal environment. Her argument was that many times a fund raiser will ask a potential donor for a financial gift or a needed resource, but the potential donor, oftentimes from a corporate entity, may redirect the solicitor to a current priority. She provided a hypothetical: a company may say, “We need machine tool workers. Can we help you in that area?” She said that in another case, the community college may have a campaign to support the arts, and a technology company explains that they are currently supporting sciences. Even if Community College B’s campaign was for arts, they would switch their proposal to the sciences, and in that case, President Baldwin would simply inform Community College B’s administration of the change. President Baldwin explained that there are so many needs at the community college level that if a large potential donor guides you to a specific focus where money is available, then that is the area in which your college should focus, but that does not mean to sacrifice your entire advancement philosophy or vision.

Community College B’s president explained that if her college was as old as the state’s flagship university and had a long term alumni base like a four year college, she would invest more time in alumni or small donors. However, she acknowledged that for a community college to mature into an institution where alumni have disposable income takes a long time. She also believed that individual donors have to mature as well, and that is another challenge to community college alumni. Many of them obtain an associate’s degree before they reach the age of 21. Therefore, these potential donors have not matured as fundraising participants in the college’s story of fundraising. They are too young to grasp its importance and at this age, many will move on to universities.
Partnering with business is an important philosophical aim of Community College B. President Baldwin explained that for many years their community college has done workforce training for a large multinational conglomerate, a petroleum company, and a large bank chain, and partnering with companies to provide workforce training continues to expand. In addition, College B’s thirty foundation members echo the community college’s connection to these many industries reflecting all spectrums of the economy including technology, pharmaceuticals, healthcare, banking, and industrial building. Thematically, maintaining these relationships exemplify examples of successful relationship management techniques. Furthermore, they represent good fundraising.

President Baldwin contended that a very high percentage of work goes into large potential donors because small gifts require a lot more personnel. This is highly incorporated into their fundraising philosophy. This tactic is part of their philosophy that has been guided by experiences. On rare occasions, Community College B will even trade contact lists with organizations including hospitals in order to gain possible potential large gift donors.

Advancement Director Bradley acknowledged the importance of continually trying to connect with the students enrolled in the college. Her office continually finds ways to maintain communication with their students or in communicating with those that can provide resources to the college because they have potential as future donors. For example, the grandson of a million dollar donor was a student at Community College B’s city campus. Fostering relationships with students can be a worthwhile pursuit for future fundraising efforts. Community College B focuses on this pursuit in the form of soliciting private gifts from alumni or by fostering positive relationships with alumni’s acquaintances who have the potential to give, and they do it without the help of an alumni relations office or officer. Community College B does utilize grant writers
whose services are provided and organized outside of the advancement office; however, the community college does not employ an alumni person. This reflects their fundraising philosophy, to go after large potential donors who may or may not be associated with the college. However, Advancement Direct Bradley did acknowledge that tapping into the alumni of the college could provide lucrative resources, and she believes that eventually it will be a goal of the college’s advancement office. She admits it is not currently possible with the size of the advancement staff and the already insurmountable responsibilities of those within that office. Because Community College B fosters alumni relations with the advancement office and the foundation, they enact their philosophy with fewer resources.

**Factors and philosophy.** There are numerous factors of philosophy and governance that could be attributed to the college’s impressive feats in fundraising and gaining endorsements. According to President Baldwin, their community college’s private fundraising philosophy is enacted through and by foundation meetings. Moreover, Community College B’s advancement office is organized under Advancement Director Bradley who also is a member of the college’s administrative, leadership team. She explained that there is no formal training program for fundraising with the foundation although she orients her staff members by objectives or missions. However, the advancement office has a formal orientation process for board members that include a PowerPoint presentation and the eventual communication of a plethora of information. Additional training occurs though foundation meetings. During the foundation meeting that the researcher observed, Advancement Director Bradley developed a new PowerPoint presentation that she created based on training that her advancement office received from a conference utilizing fundraising software and best fundraising practices at other colleges. She also contended that whatever campaign or fundraising activity that they pursue, the
Advancement office will do a special tailored orientation training program for it. Furthermore, she had previously utilized some materials from CASE and she had occasionally travelled to their conferences for training that she could pass on to her staff. She also was involved with the Council for Resource Development (CRD) when she first came to the college but she “didn’t find it as productive as the time invested.”

Advancement Director Bradley made it clear that how fundraising efforts are organized and managed is a direct reflection of her own personality. She also admitted that is also why results are varying and inconsistent, from poor to superior. Inconsistency was commonly found by the researcher while studying fundraising; however, the college’s philosophies were secure and deliberate.

The college’s primary fundraising philosophy involved the direct support of student success through scholarships, and this had been the source of every campaign. Foundation Chair Bush stated that scholarships for students were the major initiative for fundraising. Whatever factors restricted those efforts were inconsequential because the goal was too crucial to abandon. President Baldwin was adamant that this goal and philosophy was not derived out of safe practices or security. She declared “People that know me know I don’t do things because they’re safe. We have money for facilities. We have a building fee. If we’re conservative, we can save money for facilities. What we don’t have is enough scholarships for students. It’s our major need.” She also added that in the two southeastern states she had worked, scholarships had been the primary goal of fundraising.

Advancement Director Bradley offered that they were currently in the process of writing a mission statement for their foundation, but fundamentally, she said their mission was simply to serve Community College B. According to Advancement Director Bradley, “the way we serve
the college is dependent upon the priorities of the college, so it changes, and so we have to adapt.” At the time of this interview, the college’s priorities were scholarships, the arts, and the endowment. She explained that these priorities are a direct reflection of the values and vision of Community College President Baldwin. Therefore, Advancement Director Bradley’s goal was to uphold her president’s wishes and to help her foundation board be helpful. Furthermore, Advancement Director Bradley assured the researcher that the role of the president was not to run the foundation, but to run the college, and the foundation existed to serve it.

Attributes of fundraisers. Advancement Director Bradley’s personal philosophy was that fundraising was more of an art than a science; moreover, she allowed her Christian faith to guide her actions and decisions. Her governing style and perspectives in fundraising were rooted in these principles. However, another one of Advancement Director Bradley’s personal philosophies was to always try to make the gift she solicits relevant to the mission of the person she is asking. However, Advancement Director Bradley explained that her community college does not have a fundraising philosophy. She explained that this perception made them flexible and adaptive thereby revealing that her college’s unofficial fundraising philosophy is to be flexible. She does note that this perspective is a reflection of Community College B’s president’s personal fundraising philosophies. In addition, President Baldwin’s personal philosophy is that she does not like to make small asks, but she does like to raise money for scholarships more than anything else. Foundation Chair Bush explained that his primary philosophy was to increase scholarships for students at Community College B. Foundation Chair Bush declared that this philosophy is primarily enacted by staff and individual board members’ pursuit of donations.

Advancement Director Bradley praised President Baldwin for her ability in generating exponentially high quality work from her employees. She attributed the president’s unreasonable
expectations as the motivating force behind the success of the advancement office and foundation; moreover, this factor created an important cyclical dynamic in their relationship because Advancement Director Bradley is motivated by meeting unreasonable expectations. She attributed this dynamic to their success in leadership and governance. In addition, she claimed that other people accused her of being a perfectionist; however, it was her philosophy that her willingness to do the extra things for her students has been the personal asset that has most aided her success, and courage was a key factor in her job too. She declared, “You cannot be afraid. You cannot be timid.” Characteristically, she believed that these traits were necessary for those successful in the fundraising profession.

She also argued that being able to present ideas: written, orally, and visually was imperative. In addition, she thought creativity and event management skills were necessary; she has also found basic photography and editing skills helpful. Advancement Director Bradley had trained herself to be proficient in many areas of marketing in order to advance her development staff, department, and personal skills. Advancement Director Bradley is very reluctant to spend money and tries to severely limit the amount of fiscal and human resources that she provides for fundraising. She uses volunteerism wherever possible and volunteered goods and services; moreover, she does much of the graphic design work herself: from brochures, to photography, to building logos.

**Organization and management of fundraising.** Foundation Chair Bush asserted that fundraising efforts are governed, organized, and managed by administrative staff, specifically Advancement Director Bradley. President Baldwin declared that fundraising efforts needed to be highly organized in conjunction with the foundation director and if possible, a campaign chair. She considered that a committee which supported the campaign must plan and structure while
the foundation board members needed to remove obstacles and “open the doors” for the appropriate leadership to make the case for a donation.

Foundation Chair Bush acknowledged that the primary fundraising function lies with Advancement Director Bradley and authority and decision making is distributed by the board members and Advancement Director Bradley. The researcher found it interesting that the interviews relinquished that both Community College President Baldwin and Advancement Director Bradley agreed that the primary fundraising function at their institution existed in the office of Advancement Director Bradley. However, President Baldwin asserted that she is aware that the literature suggests that the president is the key fundraising executive. According to President Baldwin, “Advancement Director Bradley does all the planning, legwork, and publication.” Although President Baldwin believed the president can be the key or key holder to fundraising, she counted on her executive director to hold that role. However, President Baldwin believed that fundraising needed to fit into the mission of the college and the college’s long range plan. That is President Baldwin’s self-appointed role.

Furthermore, President Baldwin explained that she is not a member of the foundation; she simply acts as ex officio. However, President Baldwin explained that in another southeastern state, as president, she was an active and voting member of the foundation, and her business dean was the executive secretary for the foundation. President Baldwin explained that not being a voting member of the foundation may keep community college presidents from illicit fundraising activities. Furthermore, President Baldwin invested in the philosophy that having an external foundation is an important safety precaution for colleges because it keeps the college leaders out of foundation resources; additionally, it gives the community college’s board more authority;
furthermore, it provides an important tax shelter, so the institution does not have relinquish funding from contributions.

When the researcher asked Advancement Director Baldwin how authority and decision making were distributed, she responded, “However it needs to be to get the job done.” This echoed the importance of flexibility in organizational direction, governance, and resources. However, she did reveal the foundation’s organizational structure. Advancement Director Baldwin explained that they have a president/chairman and four vice chairs from whom they get the next president/chairman. She explained that this process of electing governance allowed for some sense of succession and consistency; finally, as often as necessary, they elect new committee members.

Moreover, according to President Baldwin and Advancement Director Bradley, their foundation is governed by a volunteer board of directors, and fundraising authority and decision making is distributed by this foundation. They make decisions for what the foundation is going to do although they are complimentary to the college and established to support it. That is clearly communicated to the foundation members, and they understand it.

Foundation Chair Bush stated that the foundation is governed by the foundation and its system of rotating chairs. The foundation has a system of governance where committee chairs advance to the roles of officers. The executive committee is composed of the chairs of each sub-committee: finance, marketing, relationship management, and scholarships. Every two years, the executive committee makes recommendations for vice-chair from the committee chairs and the board votes. The vice-chair then moves into the chairperson position during the next two-year period.
Foundation Chair Bush acknowledged that different conditions facilitate those who are asked to fundraise. Overall, leadership dictated who made the proposal and provided the final solicitation for funding. President Baldwin declared that advancement leadership most often made the proposal to solicit gifts. However, sometimes prior relationships facilitated (human resources and funding) those who were asked to fundraise while people that worked in the advancement office or in the foundation assimilated to the roles in which they were given.

**Relationships.** The researcher asked President Baldwin if she believed a relationship existed between size of staff and funds generated. She admitted, “Probably so. I never had a big enough staff to know.” She continued that community colleges need an adequate advancement staff, but she did not think that any community college fundraising staff in that state had the resources in order to have an adequate full time fundraising staff. She further claimed that inconsistency existed in fundraising with “more lows than highs.”

Foundation Chair Bush and Advancement Director Bradley agreed that relationships were the major deciding factor in determining which employee confronted a prospective donor. In addition, fundraisers must become successful in learning how to build and nurture relationships in order to successfully manage relationships. President Baldwin acknowledged the importance of research in this process. She suggested that reading and utilizing fundraising methods found in recent research was important; however, researching the interests of potential donors was even more important for fundraising staff members. Research for prospective donors includes the level of resources the donor had access to, the type of donations they have made in the past, the causes they make donations to, and their passions and interests. Once this is determined, the advancement staff/foundation builds a proposal and provides it for anyone who
is going to make *the ask*. Next, the head solicitor produces a communication team and asks for an appointment, or a foundation member sets one up with the team and the potential donor.

**Structure and Staffing (including individual experiences and education)**

**Training and planning.** President Baldwin has 26 years of experience as a college president. She is white and between the ages of 70 and 75. More importantly, she is a direct and clear communicator. She holds degrees in math and math education. Furthermore, she has additional experience in teaching math and English at the community college level within three states in the southeastern United States. This community college president spent time as a department chair in teaching and eventually became a dean of development, then an academic dean for 11 years. She left her former community college to become a community college president.

Foundation Chair Bush is a lawyer who specializes in the medical field. He is white and 58 years old. He has been a member of the foundation for three years. He would not elaborate on any training that he had received except the foundation received “ongoing” training in fundraising during board meetings. Additionally, he explained that foundation members come from varying disciplines and backgrounds. Foundation Chair Bush explained that the specifics of fiscal and human resources that the foundation attributes to individual fundraising activities is determined at foundation meetings. The Foundation will also determine detailed goals and methods of oversight through policy and directives provided by leadership.

President Baldwin described her introduction to training as a fund raiser with experience as dean of development at a previous community college. “I started writing grant proposals, and my president wanted me to write more.” She eventually became dean of development and continued teaching and writing grants even as she served as dean of development for a year and a
half and later as academic dean. She also became the grant writer for this previous college. She had no real formal training, but her president performed the solicitations for private fundraising. President Baldwin previously only wrote grants. President Baldwin admitted that part of her training came from a large amount of reading that she did about college fundraising. In addition, she received a great deal of useful information from a consulting firm she hired that helped guide training for their advancement office and foundation. In addition, President Baldwin and Advancement Director Bradley occasionally attended the CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) conferences. Furthermore, Community College B’s foundation received some training with a local city’s foundation fundraising workshop in 2012. The city’s foundation brought in financial planners and did presentations with breakouts and small sessions. This event provided some preparation and helpful hints for their own foundation members.

Advancement Director Bradley is a public relations specialist who trains their advancement office and foundation. She is also scholarship administrator and executive director of the foundation. She has collectively been at the college for eight years and been the dean of the city campus for three years. Advancement Director Bradley has decades of experience in various forms of education. Furthermore, in the private healthcare industry, she was responsible for patient education, curriculum/program development, and community education for 17 years. In addition, she served on a private Christian school board for eight years. She has a master’s degree in education (student services) and as a director of marketing in health care arenas; she worked closely with fundraising, serving on a variety of nonprofit boards in pursuit of fiscal gifts before she came to Community College B.

The area of discipline and background for the foundation is varied, but it includes a pharmacist, a senator, leaders of business including oil and gas and construction, people in
healthcare, and the media. These members reside throughout the community college’s large service area. When the researcher asked the foundation chair what was the staff size for fundraising, he replied there is no specific staff attributed to fundraising efforts; however, it is understood that fundraising is a shared responsibility. He declared, “Everyone participates.” President Baldwin claimed that Community College B only had two fundraising people in its staff: one paid by the foundation, the other paid by the college. The individual paid by the foundation does financial and secretarial work. However, according to President Baldwin, Community College B has a part-time person that worked with finances, and the advancement office will sporadically use volunteers oftentimes including board members leading up to, and during, major fundraising events.

President Baldwin argued that planning determines direction, timeframe, and goals. Additionally, she added that the highest level of quality begins with the staff that an institution hires. The staff should be professionals that have the philosophy that all they do encapsulates the highest level of quality. In addition, staff should understand that wealthy people are savvy and in order to persuade potential donors, the staff must be well-informed, excellent communicators. A fundraising staff and a foundation need to be good researchers and search for the things that the potential donors are passionate about and then make quality proposals about the college’s needs tied to these passions. President Baldwin believed that a “lean” but capable staff is important in fundraising because an institution should not spend the money they raise in order to simply fund more employees unless that is their goal. President Baldwin also necessitated that the planning phase is also important to give those few hardworking fundraising employees a much-needed break between campaigns.
Advancement staff. Advancement Director Bradley explained that her advancement staff size was three and a half. She explained that the advancement office is made up of the president, the advancement director, her executive secretary, and the secretary’s assistant who is a part time employee. Advancement Director Bradley described the relationship with her secretary, stressed the importance of it, and explained how she reinforced it. She recounted and summarized an initial monologue: She told her secretary that she “wanted her working at the height of her personal potential.” In addition, she informed her pay was as much as could possibly be allowed, but she explained that after her initial pay grade was instituted, the state controlled when she would get a raise and its amount. Advancement Director Bradley continued, “If you work for me and are unhappy, I’ll fix that with everything that is within my ability if you help me accomplish these things.” She summarized that she told her that she is the one person in the world that she has chosen to help accomplish her career goals and help the students of the college. Advancement Director Bradley explained that outside of that realm, she had the freedom to enjoy her job. She could provide her own motivation and give leadership where she saw fit. She declared to her, “You have to make it possible for me to do everything that you cannot.” Additionally, Advancement Director Bradley vowed that “Everything that I can do, you should not. And everything you can do, I should not. And that is our organizational structure.” This open and clear communication has vitalized their work relationship and exhibited the type of relationship management that Advancement Director Bradley utilized within her advancement office. She believed that she had a quandary where she believed that she could achieve more with more help, but it cost much more to get that help, and it would be almost impossible to quantify which is more beneficial to the college.
During the interview with Advancement Director Bradley, the researcher asked how her advancement office was organized. She declared that advancement is organized through and by fundraising. The researcher asked her to clarify, and she replied, “I am director of advancement, and that is irrelevant. I am executive director of the foundation and that is what matters.” She suggested that by serving as the director of development, her time spent on fundraising is paid for by the college for serving as the foundation head “has a distinct and fundamentally imperative function.” She continued that her foundation board is highly motivated by the fact that they have no overhead costs, and one hundred percent of the funds raised goes to the intended purpose. Therefore, when forms are filled out, and questions are asked about how much money went to administrative purposes, the answer can always and honestly be, “zero.” This proves as an important claim to make, a motivator for foundation members that builds trust with the college and an aspect that adds legitimacy to every campaign.

Initially, the researcher included a line of questioning into the research questions about job descriptions because he suspected that advancement offices might have to pull staff from all over the community college to aid in fundraising campaigns because of suspected small advancement offices and staff size. This proved to be incorrect. Evidence suggested that Community College B only rarely pulled help from anywhere outside of the small personnel used specifically for fundraising. Additionally, President Baldwin had never hired someone to be placed in a specific department and then appointed them into fundraising tasks. Furthermore, job descriptions for advancement secretaries’ job descriptions proved very secretarial. However, President Baldwin admitted that she was not sure how foundation members’ job descriptions were described, but Advancement Director Bradley did comment on the nature of her own job. She contended that although the events she attended were time-consuming, she admitted that
they ought to be included in her job description because many of the venues she attended opened
doors for new fundraising. Advancement Director Bradley proved that although her many job
responsibilities absorbed most of her spare time, she made a heaven out of a hell by utilizing
additional public relations work that would not normally fit into her job description to build
unexpected relationships to further future fundraising initiatives.

**Students and human resources.** President Baldwin declared that students are rarely
utilized in fundraising activities. However, they do assist and help host some events.
Furthermore, she asserted that Community College B does not ask students to make asks for
funding, either by person or telephone. President Baldwin explained that “you can raise a few
dollars at a community college by doing that, but if they’ll support you and let you do it, we can
raise so much more money.” Ultimately, President Baldwin argued that a community college can
spend less time and raise more money by the appropriate collegiate or foundation leaders making
the solicitation proposal.

However, Advancement Director Bradley explained that students are somewhat involved
in the fundraising process. At times, they work for her directly. For example, she has a work
study student that was nurtured and mentored by her and by the time she was ready to attend a
four year college, Advancement Director Bradley hired her as an assistant to her executive
secretary. Advancement Director Bradley continually tries to get her clerical help to stay with
her until these workers are offered an exceptionally high paying position somewhere else or
offered a fantastic opportunity to continue their education. When her assistants do leave, “they
should have an incredible portfolio that opens doors for them.” In addition, Community College
B showcases students during certain events as living exemplars that prove the importance of
donations to the community college. Furthermore, Advancement Director Bradley uses stories about these students to inspire and motivate people, especially potential donors.

Advancement Director Bradley is very reluctant to spend money and tries to strictly limit the amount of fiscal and human resources that she provides for fundraising. She uses volunteerism wherever possible and volunteered goods and services; moreover, she does much of the graphic design work herself: from brochures, to photography, to building logos.

Advancement Director Bradley explained that because the foundation members are incredibly busy and rarely get to attend college meetings, she serves as a bridge for information from the foundation board to the college and to the college back to the board. Furthermore, her role is to continually keep the foundation motivated and educated. She declared, “My job is to keep them constantly connected to the things that are happening at the college.” She added that she was hopeful because she had a previously working relationship with the new board president where she discovered that he was candid and very frank, and she knew that they could make progress while working with him. She acknowledged how important it was to have synergy between members of the foundation and the college. Moreover, she noted the additionally significant fact that he is excited and highly motivated. Advancement Director Bradley said that this “has a ripple effect” on other board members, the advancement office, and potential donors.

**Methods and Practices (including individual reporting and assessment)**

Through observations, interviews, and document review, numerous practices, examples of those practices, and methods became illuminated. In addition, participants took the time to describe events and general methods that proved profitable. President Baldwin explained that person to person fundraising is an effective method of procuring funds, while mailing out letters and calling on telephones using students only produces marginal results and is overall
ineffective. Advancement Director Bradley logically declared that only practices that raise money are effective.

However, a practice that Advancement Director Bradley incorporated into her foundation and advancement directives was bringing donors and students to board meetings. She would alternate, bringing one of either to each board meeting. She said, “They don’t all attend. I hand pick the ones with the stories I like.” She suggested that these practices kept foundation members motivated, but Foundation Chair Bush chose to give no additional specifics about any effective practices.

Although Advancement Director Bradley made it clear that fundraising efforts were organized and managed as a direct reflection of her own personality, she also admitted that this was also a reason why results were varied and inconsistent. She pointed to a few examples. On Community College B’s 60th anniversary, their goal was to raise $3 million, and they raised around $4 million. She assessed herself as very effective in the college’s management of that campaign. She explained, “We had our target list. We divided it up effectively with who was going to make what call. We knew what we were going to ask for. We were well scripted. We dotted our i’s and crossed our t’s in our paperwork and our reporting all the way down.”

**Goals and methods.** The college hopes to foster and manage that relationship and eventually triple that donation through continual communication. She attributes that success to the college’s history of quality and matching the goals of the college with the goals of the donor. Although that endeavor was successful, she explained that she had been nurturing that relationship for a long time. People did not realize it because people did not see the continual work that occurs in the long engaged process of fostering relationships. She declared, “You just didn’t know it. You never saw it. You were not privy to it until it got close. When it got close, I
alerted you. I involved you, and you think that within a couple of months we closed a million dollar gift. No. that’s not it at all, but it’s their perspective.” This event represents Advancement Director Bradley’s efforts in fostering relationships and shaping perspectives inside and outside the college. Although participants within the college’s internal environment were unaware of the experiences shaped by the advancement director’s philosophy outside of the college, the fund raiser actualized her beliefs and made the gift a reality. Furthermore, President Baldwin revealed that her philosophy is that people want to be part of something that is a success. This idea is represented by the million dollar gift. The college’s actions have influenced its environment and private individuals and corporations want to be participants in its continued success. It is a self-propelling entity and an excellent model for other community colleges.

Community College B is committed to the method of using proposals when soliciting. No other community college in the study discussed the importance or utilization of this method. President Baldwin admitted that close to 60% of all the asks they make involve the donor ask-team preparing a written proposal. Sometimes these proposals will even be postponed by President Baldwin until they have a plethora of information actualized for soliciting the donor. President Baldwin tries to follow the consulting firm’s advice: always confront a potential donor with a well-done, very well scripted proposal, one developed just for that specific person; but rarely, if a prior relationship exists, Community College B will informally confront the potential donors about the college’s needs and propose. According to President Baldwin, in both cases, good information leads to good proposals. During these proposals, the solicitor communicates the need for resources and tries to communicate trust and respect needed to obtain gifts. Advancement Director Bradley also said that relationship was the largest factor that helped her
Foundation Chair Bush explained that the foundation was developing a new fundraising initiative for 2014 and his specific efforts would be aimed toward contacting and fostering relationships with entities of the medical field. President Baldwin and Advancement Director Bradley expounded that they contacted numerous entities regarding fundraising: business and industry; chambers of commerce; professional associations, clubs, and groups. This continual communication produced obligations in attending many events held by local businesses and organizations, but Community College B tried to avoid partnering with other organizations in order to fundraise so that funds raised did not have to be committed to both institutions; however, document analyses revealed that they did partner with a local four year college in developing a downtown arts center.

External entities. In addition, President Baldwin explained that Community College B contacted numerous companies to solicit donations for assistance with fundraisers. For Community College B’s last foundation gala, businesses provided sponsorships of $5,000, $10,000, and higher. In addition, the previous foundation president was a leading figure of a major petroleum company that aided in this process. They often asked foundation members like him to accompany them to solicit funding from companies in which they have relationships. However, college employees or foundation members did not confront a prospective donor about a donation unless it was predetermined, and they were the major contact. However, as in this case, President Baldwin contended that Community College B’s foundation would sometimes ask a contact (college staff or foundation member) to attend a meeting or a proposal. President Baldwin relinquished that people do not generally enjoy asking for money and neither does she,
but she is the person most often to do so, and she will ask other foundation members to solicit on occasion because many of them are gifted at it.

Advancement Director Bradley explained that in the past, they have focused on contacting entities associated with communicating and manufacturing companies and focused least on the service industry in regards to fundraising. Advancement Director Bradley mentioned the college planned on updating and modernizing a building for science and technology. She explained that when she did raise money on her campus for this building, she would be focusing on highly influential technology leaders and defense contractors. She intended to build relationships with these people in defense technology. Advancement Director Bradley will foster these relationships with business and industry by participating in everything she is asked to participate in and by being a visible and meaningful member of the community.

She declared, “I’ll pick out my top ones, and I’ll tell them to set the tone and to decide.” She will ask them, “What do you want to happen in your town with your college?” This echoed her projection that leaders oftentimes want to lead in order to feel invested in a process. She added that she was going to make the biggest ask that she has ever made during this particular campaign for $25 million, and she knew exactly who she would ask.

Advancement Director Bradley explained that some entities that are contacted regarding fundraising are communicated with by accident. For example, in one instance, Advancement Director Bradley was asked to participate on a panel with a chief executive officer of a company and a brigadier general to speak to a room of 80 community leaders about motivating employees. She ended up getting the highest reviews of any speaker, the highest in 15 years, and although this group added additional time constraints and responsibilities to her life, she used this event to build a relationship with the brigadier general and with the CEO. Therefore, according to her, it
did not fit her job description, and no one knew she did it, but it was well worth her time because these influential people may one day be involved in fundraising efforts at the college.

**Relationships in fundraising.** Advancement Director Bradley explained that one of the reciprocal relationships that Community College B built was a partnership with industrial maintenance. A company approached Community College B to propose that they could not find and/or maintain good maintenance people. The company complained that as soon as they found good maintenance men, a higher paying company would hire them. She got them to tell her what they wanted the college to do, and she took that story back to the dean of business and technology. She had the company send subject matter experts to the college in order to revise the curriculum. After this, the company agreed to take students who had the major before graduation if they could get four prerequisite classes, and the college and the company created co-op opportunities for those students. She declared that if soliciting a gift was unsuccessful, then she tried to do something positive for the college with the person she contacted. Advancement Director Bradley said she always took something back to the college even if it was not a financial gift.

One idea that was strongly communicated and conceptualized by all the study’s participants at Community College B is that when Advancement Director Bradley makes calls to people she has never met before and her proposal is rejected, she always asks if there is another way they can forge a relationship. This is a key to her philosophy of relationship management. In the eight years that she has worked for Community College B, two people have turned her down, and one person’s reason was that they did not like her college. She responded to them, whatever issue that person had with the college did not occur while she was there. She then apologized for it and offered to help correct it. That person was not open for it, and he or she said that they just
wanted her to know. Advancement Director Bradley informed the researcher that it was worth
going to that person just to get to apologize on behalf of the college. This experience described
by Advancement Director Bradley is integral to her fundraising philosophy that focuses on
creating a hospitable environment around her and for those that come in contact with the college.

However, many times the college is successful with obtaining major financial gifts even
if it takes a long time to finish the task. For example, the two previous fundraising campaigns for
Community College B’s advancement office took the better part of three years. One was for a
capital campaign and in the other campaign, they raised over a million dollars for art student
scholarships where they incorporated a grand opening of a downtown arts center in concert with
another college. According to documents that provided a partial description of this endeavor,
Advancement Director Bradley successfully spearheaded this fundraising effort in conjunction
with a local four year college for a fine arts center. She admitted there was far too much
leadership on that project although they raised over a million dollars. In addition, she revealed
that she worked 16 to 17 hours a day on that project. The researcher accused her of being a
perfectionist for being so critical of such an effective effort. She assured the researcher, “I don’t
let the perfect stand in the way of the possible.” She just explained that egos can get in the way
of progress in partnerships. It hinders projects into only being good instead of great.

The million dollars for the arts was raised for programs and scholarships. Some
administrators and foundation members wanted money raised for building, but Advancement
Director Bradley dislikes procuring funds then quickly losing them, so she likes to use other
funding for building purposes. She claimed that raising money for endowments and scholarships
is easier raised because people like to see their gifts in perpetuity. However, during this
particular campaign, there was an important figure in the arts community that she felt had to be a
driving force for the project to ensure its success. Unfortunately, in the early stages, his support vacillated and was not concrete. She explained that the entire venture “ebbed and flowed with him,” and she made sure he understood that support of the arts in the community depended on his absolute leadership and personal obligation. She expressed how important it is to oftentimes get donors to provide leadership and personal investment, to let them know the community is depending on their vision and stewardship.

Foundation Chair Bush chose not to comment on or assess correlations that exist between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising. However, Advancement Director Bradley explained that the correlations between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising are determined by goals. The type of fundraising goal determines human resources needed and the role of those recruited. To her, most of the process depends on the gift and the giver.

Friends of the college. President Baldwin recalled an experience with a method of fundraising that shaped her perceptions. In another southeastern community college where she claimed, “I really learned to do fundraising,” many years ago, on a Friday, her college held a reverse raffle event for a new truck the college had acquired with numerous other small fundraisers surrounding it. She explained that these events are typical in college fundraising and are often described as “friend raisers.” Toward the end of the evening, they had 25 tickets left at $125.00 per ticket. For $150.00, each participant received a ticket for the raffle and a barbeque dinner; however, one could purchase additional tickets for $125. That evening an older gentleman entered as a guest of one of their board members. He came in and exclaimed that he liked the truck and asked how many tickets were left. It was close to 30, but he bought all of them, stayed through the entire festivities, and won the truck. Few people at the event had met him before. The following Monday, he called their office and inquired about what the college
had paid for the automobile (around $22,000.00) and responded that he was going to keep the truck, but he was going to pay the college for it. That gentleman became a great friend of the college and while President Baldwin was there, he gave the college over $3 million. He came to most events throughout every year. She explained that although it is rare, sometimes small fundraisers will reveal themselves as “a friend of the college.”

President Baldwin recounted an additional story of another million dollar gift that was brokered by a local attorney for Community College B. She began that she worked with him when she got to this state and that he raised money for many different organizations around the community; he was incredibly proficient at it. He was a generous man that people loved, and he arranged for a million dollar gift from a lady when she passed away. She asked for recommendations of worthwhile organizations and institutions, and she knew about the college, but it was his recommendation that made it concrete. President Baldwin continued that it usually took a longer period of time to develop a large gift; however, its acquisition is based on the need of the donor as well as the recipient, whether there is a necessity for a tax shelter or great timing. Her argument’s summary was that the meeting and/or proposal is integral, and if the donor exists under the strain of his or her own income, then they are custom to giving away large sums of money out of habit, and they oftentimes will avoid paying extensive tax dollars for charitable contributions. Because Foundation Chair Bush is moderately new to fundraising, he offered no personal tales. He admitted that overall, he had very little experience with fundraising.

The foundation for Community College B asks that members be very involved in the entire process of fundraising. This process begins with scrutinizing a compiled list of potential donors. About every year, the individual foundation members produce a list of 10 potential donors. If a target donor is picked from the list of a foundation member, that member either helps
in confronting the donor personally or makes a phone call. Next, donor research is performed, an integral process of collecting potentially viable information, is completed before initial contact is made. Once contact is made other techniques are utilized.

President Baldwin added that they have a scholarship reception in September, and people from the college and outside the college come and participate in it, and the event produces positive experiences and shapes people’s philosophies and perspectives about the college. She says that these activities are not specifically for fundraising, but they “set us up for fundraising.” Moreover, they produce an environment that is conducive to fundraising.

**Internal dedication.** Furthermore, Advancement Director Bradley wants foundation members to be involved with numerous organizations to maintain influence and communication in order to retain relationships with potential donors. Advancement Director Bradley’s philosophy includes the belief that foundation members need to be encouraged and motivated participants that shape their environment. It has been her experience that motivated foundation members participate better and encourage others to donate time and resources. In addition, Advancement Director Bradley carefully shapes meetings and events to make her foundation members feel important and appreciated. Furthermore, when her members require her participation on other boards and her appearance at numerous events in addition to the time she spends working for the foundation and the college, she complies. Therefore, her experience as advancement director also puts her in a public relations role for the college. For example, she fundraised for a math and science building, so she was expected to attend the grand opening. She described her career choice as not just selfless, but sacrificial. Her interview exhibited that her methods of supporting reciprocal relationships require a difficult balancing act to maintain and that her experience as dean have put her in a role as a constant participant in this process. A good
environment for flourishing relationships is built upon how she and at least one other participant share in a reciprocal experience.

In addition, she proclaimed, “no one understands the amount of time that I put in and the amount of problems I fix before anyone even knows they are problems or sometimes that they never know were problems: the personalities, and relationships, that I nurture and protect.” However, she does not report it to the college or the foundation because she feels no one is interested. This philosophy has been shaped by her fundraising experiences. Time is a valuable resource that is used to gather communication from potential donors.

Advancement Director Bradley’s personal dedication produces an incredible challenge. “When the people that surround you realize that you consistently sacrifice yourself for your work, it is continually asked of you. If you are successful, people will exploit it.” Because people perceived that Advancement Director Bradley raised a million dollars unexpectedly, she is often asked to raise exorbitant amounts of money in an unrealistic period of time. This is a challenging environment that makes it difficult for even the most willing and giving fundraising participant to continue.

Advancement Director Bradley also explained that she does not mind attending events for public relations because she believes in friendraising and argues that it has an important place in relationship management. She perceives that people have to love and institution, an idea, or a person, before they will figuratively or literally invest in it. Although, she believes in this philosophy, she is personally amazed at the success that her institution has in meeting someone for the first time and getting a great deal of money from them. She argued, in spite of their great success, the college continues to put emphasis on making sure the foundation board does not get involved with the college’s administrative decisions. She satirically added that Community
College B’s unofficial mantra is “Remind them of their place!” However, when the college gets in any sort of political difficulty, Advancement Director Bradley declared, “The first phone call I get, is we need fifty letters from business and industry telling the government how important this project is to the future of the college and they need to be from CEO levels and we need to get those by the end of the week.” Ultimately she demanded that an institution cannot invent those types of relationships. They need to be continually nurtured and nourished for when they are desperately needed. She provided an example, “When I call up the CEO of a company in Florida, and he’s on vacation with his family, and he loves my college and students enough to say, ‘Sure, what do u need the letter to say?’” She continued that the CEO of that company will eventually want a professional favor from her and if she does not reciprocate that favor, then that relationship may be doomed; moreover, when other business leaders learn that she was unwilling to continue to foster that relationship, then her reputation has been tarnished and/or reduced, and she may no longer be able to receive their help in the future. Because of this, she is mortified to say “No” to any business leader or foundation member. Advancement Director Bradley’s example is a good illustration of a method guided by a philosophy where an internal participant (a fund raiser) must create and foster a fertile environment with an external participant (donor).

She continued by proclaiming that she lives in a professional environment where she feels like she cannot say “no” to anything because she does not want anyone to say “no” to her. However, she has developed a few methods to protect her precious little spare time. Because she is a preacher’s wife, she protects her Sundays and her Wednesday nights. She tells everyone that she has previous obligations existing on those dates. In addition, because she serves on so many boards, she will respond to people who approach her about serving on new boards by explaining that she has preexisting commitments; however, she offers to provide counsel and ideas, and she
has gained a reputation with influential people by being an exceptional idea person. Engaged fundraising participants have to protect their own resources in order to gain and retain potential participants.

**Techniques and methods.** A unique thing that she does to foster relationships and to help acquaintances is counseling their children. She believes that most everyone has a son, daughter, or child they care about that they are trying to help. She declared that she always makes time for that child, and she encourages the parent or mentor to come and sit down while they discuss whatever pertinent issues exist. She asks the student to “Tell me what you want to do and I’ll tell you how to get there.” Most often the discussion leads to life planning and career coaching. Advancement Director Bradley implores their parent or mentor to continue the conversation at home. She contended that she has “built some pretty awesome relationships with some pretty awesome people in (methods that work) the community by doing that for them.” Here, her philosophy of the importance of family and stewardship shapes an experience that fosters a caring environment that could eventually motivate the parents, their children, or acquaintances to donate to the college. It is ironic that she only does this to help children and because she is an honest and professional care giver, and because that is her reputation, people want to donate.

Advancement Director Bradley’s favorite technique for prospective donors is story telling. However, her overall arrangement is research driven and relies on mixed methods of qualitative (story telling) and quantitative (statistics) presenting. She offered that her presentations are also usually personalized, and she typically says, “The reason we are asking you is . . .” and/or “What we are hoping to get from you is . . .” and “The reason we are asking is. . .” during part of her solicitation. In addition, she is certain to explain why the need is urgent,
and she provides statistics to prove it. She then uses a student story as an example. Next, Advancement Director Bradley provided the researcher with statistical examples. She claimed that over 80% of Community College B’s students have jobs and work; 70% of them hold more than one job, and 70% of those students hold 3 or more jobs. Next, she told the researcher a story of a student, a young lady who was $32 short of attending college one semester. She did not have the grades for a scholarship, and her financial aid paid for all but $32 that she did not have, and therefore, she withdrew. Advancement Director Bradley informed the researcher that she uses this example to illustrate that even a small gift can make a lasting impact. The researcher found her pseudo-presentation persuasive. She reiterated that although the presentation utilizes a mixed methods approach, story-telling is the major medium, and she always engages in prayer before confronting potential the donors.

An additional method that Advancement Director Bradley’s used is to explain to companies what competitors had done prior to them and to explain what great good it did for those corporations and the students in order to create a sense of rivalry. Furthermore, Foundation Chair Bush acknowledged that new techniques were being developed for prospective donors but he did not care to further elaborate. Community College B also relies on technology to make their techniques more effective. However, President Baldwin seemed unsure precisely what all technologies were utilized in fundraising at her institution and the foundation. She explained that they were going use to Banner to track donations and aid in fundraising, but they found it overly priced for a program that could not meet many of College B’s fundraising tracking and assessment goals. She suggested that it would not make sense to spend much of the money raised on a fundraising program. Advancement Director Bradley explained that Community College B utilized many aspects of technology for fundraising including hardware like computers and smart
phones and a software program called Donor Perfect for reporting and assessing, and it allows them to donate online. She explained that people expect them to use technology in the metropolitan community. She added that her secretaries would say they use Adobe Illustrator and Photoshop and InDesign. Furthermore, she added that the average small foundation probably did not create such sophisticated looking documents and film and edit their own informational videos like their office does. The researcher found it interesting that Advancement Director Bradley utilized very little social media, and she found it trendy. It is underutilized in their foundation office, and they seem confident in that approach. However, Foundation Chair Bush asserted that basic technological tools like the internet and Community College B’s website were instrumental in fundraising.

**Corporate and individual donors.** According to President Baldwin, Community College B’s fundraising tactics only slightly differed from corporate to individual while Foundation Chair Bush suggested that tactics do not differentiate between potential corporate and potential private donors. However, when approaching corporate entities, the college does research to determine corporate priorities. President Baldwin contended that the college’s needs must meet corporate priorities, and when approaching corporations, the college tries to relate how the college meets their needs.

Today, although corporate managers may be able to lend some verbal support to those looking for funding, almost all large corporate giving must be submitted through a computerized online process and if the philanthropy does not have a project that meets corporate priorities, there is no need for those asking to attach major resources to the proposal for donation.

When the researcher asked Advancement Director Bradley how fundraising tactics differ from corporate to individual, she explained that they differ with intent, but they usually erode
into similar approaches because all donors are people, whether corporate or private. She said that initially, she goes in thinking of how she should approach each company, but she admitted that many of her interactions mimic her personality. In her example, she explained to the person why she called and provided that she did not need everything immediately, but she asked who she needed to see to achieve this goal. She continued that she usually begins a rant and the person will often act somewhat perplexed and ask if this is how she tackles objectives, and she will honestly reply “All the time,” and she acts this way because she truly believes her students’ futures are “the most important thing in the world.” She added that it works even better if the potential donors previously attended Community College B. She declared that “At that point, it’s over with!” She realizes that she has that person’s full support. She will get a new assignment out of him or her, and he or she get an assignment out of Advancement Director Bradley. A reciprocal relationship is created.

President Baldwin asserted that varying factors including need and availability play roles in initiatives for fundraising. Sometimes the college’s focus is strategic planning: opening a new building, workforce development, science, or the arts. It varies, and according to President Baldwin, “Flexibility is the name of the game in fundraising.” She explained that even if a donor has committed to someone else, Community College B will continue the process and foster that relationship in hopes it will bring positive results at a later time. Advancement Director Bradley declared that the most essential factor that supports initiatives for fundraising is the resources necessary to achieve the vision of the president. She explained that the emergence of unexpected opportunities and being responsive to unexpected opportunities is an integral part of this process. Furthermore, Advancement Director Bradley asserted that need is the major factor that determines why her community college fund raises, but the major condition used to determine
who is asked to fund raise is the state of prior relationships. She offered that she rarely asked someone for a gift if she had not previously built a relationship with that person.

Furthermore, President Baldwin described a one million dollar gift that Community College B received from a donor who was an acquaintance of a foundation member and a stranger to the college. President Baldwin and Advancement Director Bradley were proud that the college only had to make one trip in order to receive the check for a million dollars because the donor was already pleased with the college’s quality reputation and the proposal. Thematically, the external experiences shaped by the college grew their reputation and made the donor aware of the college’s philosophy.

Advancement Director Bradley began, “I had never met him before and had a really hard time getting in to see him. He would not return my phone calls and would not give me an appointment. I went round about through another person to get the appointment. When I met him, he said ‘I guess I have to meet you to get this over with. You won’t give up,’ and I said ‘Why would I give up meeting the most important person,’ and then we laughed.” She continued that he replied, “Oh, are you one of those kind that’s gonna butter me up?” Next, she asked, “What kind do you need me to be?” She followed with “I’m a woman on a mission, and I see someone who can help me achieve my mission, and what I want to know is, do you think I’m on the right mission?” He asked her about her mission; she told him, and he wrote her a check for a million dollars. This exchange shows the importance of wit and humor when asking for funding; it is proof that it can be more art than science.

**Efficiency and requirements.** President Baldwin admitted that her college had never measured efficiency, so she assumed that their consistency mirrored their efficiency although she felt that if they had more people and more time, they could have had more success. She
acknowledged that “It’s been pretty effective based on what we’ve invested in it.” The researcher asked Advancement Director Bradley if she believed a relationship existed between size of staff and funds generated. She emphatically stated, “Yes.” When I asked if her advancement office proved that untrue, she responded, “You asked if I believed it.” The researcher asked her to elaborate. She explained that research and common sense dictated that staff size would greatly influence funds raised, but her office defied the odds and was very productive with few resources and because Foundation Chair Bush has witnessed the effective fundraising of Community College B’s small advancement staff as well, he believes that no correlation exists between size of staff and funds generated as well.

President Baldwin acknowledged that there are times when as much as 80% of her day is invested in fundraising activities or preparation; however, most often these duties take up less than 25% of her work day. This is still a significant amount of time considering a community college president’s many responsibilities. Advancement Director Bradley explained that during certain periods of campaigns, almost 100% of her time was spent on fundraising, and annually, literally half her time is attributed to fundraising in some form, and every moment of her job, inside and outside of the office, is dedicated to building relationships. Foundation Chair Bush suggested that the foundation is in a period of preparation and is not currently fundraising; however, when fundraising begins his job is to provide oversight. He did not care to provide a percentage.

Advancement Director Bradley explained the foundation scholarship process at her institution, which sustains the strictest requirements of any college in the study. She explained that “One of the most important things I do every year is my scholarship reception where the donor meets the student that they help.” The donor and recipient meet in order to create a
partnership between each participant in which they can cooperate and communicate. This event bolsters an environment where these experiences are enabled to flourish. Advancement Director B declared that in order for this event to be successful, she goes through a formidable selection process matching donor to student. Advancement Director B asserted that connecting the donor to the student in meaningful ways is critical to the process. If these students do not attend that event and are not grateful recipients and fulfill her expectations in demonstrating appropriate gratitude to their donors, she terminates their scholarships.

Community College B holstered concrete consequences for scholarship recipients who did not invest in the standards of Advancement Director B and President B. This philosophy of maintaining high standards and rigorous accountability, molds an environment of discipline where students who are participants in the scholarship process that is made possible by fundraising.

Community College B has numerous stipulations and requisites associated with maintaining a scholarship. After winning scholarships, students are expected to write a personalized thank you letter to their donor and make sure that he or she gets pictures with them. Her scholarship winning students have to initial an agreement that explains obligations and gives information. For example, this document states that students must retain full time status. It addition, it exhibits that numerous transcripts will be taken: once during the application process and again with final high school transcripts just prior to the beginning of college. She interrupted that if “you didn’t end well, you are not going to go well.” Her experiences in education have forged this philosophy.

Furthermore, potential recipients have to be willing to write an essay telling a compelling and convincing narrative explaining why they are worthy of retaining the scholarships. She
personally reads each of them in case they do not meet her standards, and they have to try again. She demanded that it is her students’ job to help raise money for the students that follow them. This environment for producing scholarships is cyclical but not self-sustaining. In addition, she and her executive secretary do additional time-consuming things like check enrollment the first week of school, and if those students do not come to class, she revokes their scholarships and gives the money to the next students in line. Her advancement office even checks midterm grades so donor money does not set idle. After checking midterm grades, if scholarship students’ grades are low, they are issued a probation warning. If grades are not improved, they lose the second portion of their awards. If the students’ grades are very close, and they have had personal turmoil, the foundation and the college have an appeals process where they can hold on to their scholarship. These rigorous standards are held in order to promote an environment where donors know that their donations will not be wasted and go to deserving students. This research suggests that external fundraising participants need to trust where there money goes, and the environment promoted by the fundraisers must reflect that philosophy.

Moreover, Advancement Director Bradley asserted that she provided scholarships to over 300 students, and she speculated that few people grasped the enormity of that task. She claimed that these practices are vital to keeping donors and students engaged, and although these additional tasks are time consuming, they hold the students accountable and connect them back to the donor. While analyzing documents from the April 5th, 2013 meeting, the researcher found that Community College B’s scholarship budget of $330,000 was exceeded despite the raised ACT qualifier that was raised from 26 to 27 in 2012. In spite of this surprisingly high academic qualifier for a community college, and the strict requirements for each scholarship recipient, the president had to raise the budget another $100,000.00 to cover the difference. The amount of
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scholarship students continue to grow at their college. Therefore the college must continue to foster their environment in order to compel participants to donate.

Advancement Director Bradley pointed to one additional successful method she utilizes in the scholarship cycle: marketing the donors that have created scholarships. She provided a scholarship agreement form which highlighted the activity of an exemplar in the petroleum industry. The document provides the name and brand of the company and what that corporation had done to better the lives of students and the college. It is used to provide positive attention for the company in a subtle manner. This document produced by the college communicates the company’s commitment to providing resources. Before printing these documents, she sends them to executives and representatives of the corporation for permission. She also asks her scholarship students to learn what the document illustrates about the company. This is a unique method of positive publicity that Community College B does for its corporate donors. This activity shapes the external participants’ perspective and philosophies involving Community College B. The college tries to produce and environment where fundraising participants feel valued, and the community college wants to leave a lasting impression with their donors and affect donors’ philosophies not only about their community college but also about the role of colleges in general.

Factors and Challenges

Representatives of Community College B elaborated on a number of factors and challenges that hindered or affected fundraising at their institution. For example, Advancement Director Bradley admitted that obstacles and challenges in fundraising at her college included a lack of manpower and because of this, an inability to get all the right people in the right place at the right time, even for meetings. She declared that it presented a phenomenal challenge to her.
Objectives often could not be met because not everyone could meet on the same day. According to her, this closes brief and various windows of opportunity. She was “absolutely astounded at how much a barrier scheduling is.” Foundation Chair Bush explained that two major obstacles that their foundation is facing are the unstable economy and exposure for their organization. The more attention their organization receives, the larger the base of potential donors, and the better chance they have in wooing them.

Some of the obstacles and challenges that President Baldwin admitted during the interview were that community colleges do not have long term alumni like universities. Another challenge that community colleges face is that the public has little knowledge of how important community colleges are to communities, the state, the region, and our nation, so college staff and foundation have to spend more time telling the community college story because this segment of higher education is not a well understood by lawmakers, business people, or the general population. Another challenge is not having adequate staff and having a small foundation. President Baldwin admitted that the downturn in the overall economy since 2008 had probably affected community college fundraising because it affected most of the population; however, she did boast that her community college raised a million dollars when people thought the economy would not support that endeavor. Furthermore, President Baldwin contended that if raising money is a goal then fundraisers cannot worry about the economy. She declared “You just have to go and do the job. I think now is a great time to raise money.”

Advancement Director Baldwin asserted that one of the major challenges that foundation boards in the postsecondary arena are challenged to understand is that being a member of the foundation gives no power whatsoever with the college. Advancement Director Baldwin claimed that “people on our boards and other boards get frustrated with wanting to be involved in other
ways besides fundraising, although the college president wants the foundation only continually fundraising,” She argued that no one enjoys strictly fundraising; it is an underappreciated role that is difficult and frightening. She declared “I see amongst my board members a strong and driving desire to be involved in the college in other ways than just fundraising, and so I spend a lot of time making them feel valued, able to participate and engaged at a non-fundraising level because if I don’t achieve that, I cannot get them motivated to go out and raise money, and that is time consuming.” She suggested that time is a valuable commodity to people in this field.

While analyzing documents for this study, the researcher found that a large construction and renovation project had been approved by the Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education. It included a new three story building for the site plus a renovation to the current building. The construction will be a $34 million project. The researcher asked where the college would procure this funding. She replied that most of the funding would come from tuition; however, they will eventually fundraise for a portion of it. Furthermore, a million dollar gift had already been promised for the naming of the facility. Surprisingly, she stated “The reality is that we have the money in the bank to build that building but politically could not get approval to build it. It was an issue of external politics in the postsecondary system.” She explained that in the postsecondary system, there are board members at the state level who “may not grasp the nature of their job as effectively as they should” or simply, they believe that Community College B is large enough and has excessive resources. She supposed that the postsecondary system wanted to make more additional progress within community colleges in the Black Belt before Community College B grows anymore, whether it seemed logical or not.

Her perspective was that it is folly to stifle growing colleges that need additional resources to be competitive in recruiting with other colleges and to facilitate a growing student
population. She declared that “when we went to the state board to ask for our building improvement, we were told no, and nothing we did could move that,” so they fund raised a major gift for that specific purpose then explained to the board that the state would not receive the money if they could not build for that purpose. Eventually, the state relented to Community College B’s proposal.

**Assessment and maintaining effectiveness.** President Baldwin asserted that success in fundraising practices can be assessed on whether goals are met. She explained that the foundation only reports fundraising successes and numbers to the foundation members although they have discussed publishing a newsletter. The foundation does not publicly report, and there is no formal process for reporting success but on occasion there are articles written about contributors. Additionally, Advancement Director Bradley does report notable gifts to the president’s staff and in appropriate state and federal paperwork. She explained, “I want to celebrate a donor’s gift to the satisfaction of the donor and to the needs of the institution which means I need that donor to feel valued and appreciated and to understand the depth of our gratitude but I don’t want to flag that gift so significantly that they become a target for every other fund raiser.” She argued that this perspective makes her cautious. However, she did assert that she has “really big celebrations in small circles” and uses those celebrations as story telling for entities and stakeholders that are potential investors in the vision of Community College B. Advancement Director Bradley stated that she works with her donors to understand what they need from a corporate level to be/feel acknowledged, but she ensures that her actions do not make that company a target for other organizations. Unfortunately, according to Advancement Director Bradley, most large donors argue that they are already often targeted. Community College B also reports what they are doing with the gift to the donor, another means of fostering
and continuing that relationship. Furthermore, Foundation Chair Bush said that much of this information including fundraising practices was reported at foundation meetings.

Foundation Chair Bush assessed the success of fundraising activities by the amount of scholarships awarded, and because Community College B awards many scholarships, he claimed that fundraising with his foundation was very efficient and very effective; however, he was adamant that they needed to raise more funds. Advancement Director Bradley illustrated that the success of fundraising activities can be measured by how effectively goals were met. Advancement Director Bradley asserted that Community College B is extremely efficient at fundraising because they accomplish much with few human and fiscal resources, and her college is becoming increasingly effective at meeting goals and procuring large donations. President Baldwin stated that her institution was effective at fundraising but could improve. When the researcher asked Advancement Director Bradley how effective was Community College B’s fundraising chief, she asserted that was her personal role, and she always needed work. However, one of her personal challenges was that she needed help in staying inspired. She explained that when it is a person’s job to be a constant source of inspiration, it is hard to refill. In addition, she described one of her weaknesses as getting tunnel vision and losing focus and track of time because she becomes enthralled by whatever assignment is in front of her.

Furthermore, she declared that her executive secretary is a good fit for her because she consistently reminds her of necessary focal points. Advancement Director Bradley claimed that she is a master of structuring and organizing other people’s activities but has difficulty retaining personal structure and organization. She recognized the irony. Advancement Director Bradley added that personal growth and professional development was necessary in that area. However, her executive secretary offered that if she was aware of time, it would diminish her skillset.
Moreover, Advancement Director Bradley acknowledged that her executive secretary valued her intensity where other secretaries have begrudged it. Advancement Director Bradley concluded that. “This makes for a good fit.” Their advancement office is a good example where coalescing and cooperating with team members is an integral attribute to effective fundraising.

President Baldwin acknowledged that the college fosters relationships with the numerous entities that they contact about fundraising by offering customized training for students at Community College B or for the organizations that share an interest with the college. In addition, Community College B offers to provide co-op/internship positions and numerous other incentives, including discussing funding requests for scholarships. Furthermore, Foundation Chair Bush explained that the foundation fosters relationships with current and new entities through education and provided constant communication with prospective donors. Furthermore, documents revealed that numerous representatives of the college recognized the importance of these connections.

According to President Baldwin, foundation meetings were also pivotal in fundraising success at the institution. Meetings were held every other month and members discussed progress made since previous meetings; furthermore, foundation members could initiate planning phases, where they introduced, discussed, and finalized any new goals. Foundation meetings also provided a setting for new fundraising campaign ideas to be deliberated or where suggested changes to existing protocol or policy could be implemented.
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Because Community College B could be considered a successfully matured fundraising college, many of its obstacles and challenges exist external to the college. This occurs partially because the staff and stakeholders within the college are invested in the process. This investment arises due to their advanced philosophical approach to teamwork and their commitment to both internal and external cooperation and communication. These ties to articulated philosophy and the use of cooperation with communication are major themes that emerged from the study of Community College B.

Articulated philosophy guides Community College B in numerous areas and provides support for one of their biggest strengths: communication and cooperation/collaboration/teamwork. Two major driving aspects of their fundraising philosophy are their commitment to flexibility and persistence. Furthermore, the college’s advancement office and foundation is guided by the idea that fundraising is more of an art than a science. This was best exhibited by the million dollar gift that the college received from a stranger.
At Community College B fundraising is a multi-tool that can be built, rebuilt, honed and revised depending on the situation in which it is needed. The governance of both the foundation and the advancement office relies on this perspective. Advancement is a Swiss Army Knife to this college, where the inconsistency and unpredictability of fundraising that occurs due to the necessary human element and human condition can be minimized. However, this element is also what makes the individuality of the stories so appealing and moving to potential donors. It cannot be quantified precisely because the difficulties and strengths differ as much as the people that exhibit them. However, Community College B’s unofficial philosophy of flexibility makes them adaptive and evolving enough to change and morph like a liquid to whatever container is needed. This can partially be attributed to Advancement Director Bradley’s philosophy that a fund raiser must always try to make the gift solicited relevant to the mission of the person solicited. In addition, Community College B enacted a philosophy of persistence where no relationship ended without an exchange of goods, promises, or services. Regardless of climate, environment, or context, no leader in fundraising at this college easily accepted “No” as an answer. Community College B’s philosophy of persistence does not allow human or environmental inconsistency to dictate their rate of progress.

The college and its foundation’s commitment to communication and cooperation/collaboration/teamwork were revealed in the data in a number of instances. Advancement leadership stressed the traits of good relationships and communication inside and outside the college. The fostering of internal relationships was made evident by Advancement Director Bradley’s relationship with the president, the foundation chair, and her own staff. Furthermore, her commitment to communication existed and was illustrated by her self-appointed task of acting as a bridge for information between the college and its foundation. In
addition, this was exhibited by the college’s concepts of relationship development and management. Advancement Director Bradley’s commitment to the development and fostering of the concepts of reciprocation provided an excellent illustration for the researcher. This existed in their relationship management portrayals both within and without the college, amongst their own team members and for potential donors. The motivational ripple effect was fueled by these endeavors and this philosophy. In addition, the college’s leadership invested heavily in the concepts of thanking their employees, team members, and donors, making a point to provide thanks up to seven times in order to provide sincere gratitude.

_Cooperation/collaboration/teamwork_ provided a spinal column of structure, strength, and support for their fundraising body. This is illustrated in President Baldwin’s assertion that fundraising efforts should be highly organized and in conjunction with the advancement director and if possible, a foundation member. External collaboration was represented by Advancement Director Bradley’s relationships fostered outside the institution like the CEO and the brigadier general. Her commitment to building external relationships and her willingness to do the extra things for student success revealed her commitment to long-term fundraising success.

Another theme that was revealed from the college’s focus on _keeping foundation members consistently engaged_ and inspired while valuing the necessity for reciprocal relationships. These reciprocal relationships exist internally and externally and provide the interchanging of communication and resources. The advancement director is vital to continuing this theme. She keeps the college’s staff active and engaged with the foundation, and she sacrifices her time in order to foster relationships with leaders in business and industry. This activity echoes a major theme that was illuminated from this research. Because of Community College B’s environment and its proximity to a progressive metropolitan area, fundraising
participants have the philosophy that shaping experiences in a positive manner for stakeholders helps guide investment into the college and its foundation, and even though technology is not an openly integral factor in the college’s success, it is utilized in mass communication efforts and in presentations at foundation meetings.

The college’s ties to business and industry with and without their foundation members represent positive relationship management with external stakeholders. Thematically, maintaining these relationships exemplify examples of successful relationship management techniques. Furthermore, they represent good fundraising. Community College B wants corporations to become participants in the college’s fundraising vision regardless of how they want to shape the donating experience. Community College B will focus on any available resources and will communicate in earnest to receive them. This feature of relationship management is integral to fundraising.

Advancement Director Bradley declared, “The more the people in a community have been exposed to giving, the higher your chances of getting a gift is.” Potential donors are potential stakeholders and investors in the college, fundraising is a competitive field where every fundraising institution wants the same participants engaged and invested as stakeholders in their institution. Whoever projects the most tempting, friendly, secure, and trusting environment, experiences and philosophy will attract the most donors and become friends of the institution. They will attract additional investors as well. Furthermore, on rare occasions, Community College B will even trade contact lists with organizations including hospitals in order to gain possible potential large gift donors. This reciprocity echoes a major theme of this research; it is methodic and part of their core philosophy of gaining new stakeholders for the college.
Furthermore, Advancement Director Bradley’s style of governance encourages advancement leadership in engaging board members to be involved with numerous organizations to maintain influence and communication in order to retain relationships with potential donors. The experiences of these fundraising participants will help guide the college’s future fundraising philosophies. In addition, Advancement Director Bradley realized that fundraisers must be encouraged and motivated participants that shape their environment. It has been her experience that motivated foundation members participate better and encourage others to donate time and resources.

Community College C

Philosophy and Governance

Defining factors of Community College C include its perceptions on and practices of philosophy and governance. However, Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that the college does not have an official fundraising philosophy; but, they are in the process of building one. She said that she liked the phrase “We believe” as a start, and she joked about using, “More money is better.” President Churchill said that the college’s fundraising philosophy was established through visioning teams, and then a strategic direction team created a plan from three to five years in scope. Therefore, fundraising philosophies are shaped around how the strategic plan is operationalized. President Churchill concluded that everything Community College C secures funds for will fit some element of that strategic plan and assists them in realizing their focus. Foundation Chair Clinton said the foundation’s overall fundraising philosophy involves serving the student first.

At Community College C, the percentage of resources that goes into cultivating large gifts is only 5%; and the rest, an incredibly large 95%, goes toward small gifts. Advancement
Director Charlemagne concluded that after five and a half years, they should be further along in practices toward soliciting large gifts. She implied that evolved or mature community college advancement offices focus on large gifts. She pointed to her staff size as a reason for this and added that she did not think that her office or foundation would ever evolve to being able to focus 50% of their time cultivating large gifts due to personnel and geography. This perspective reflects a philosophy in which focus and planning on small gift cultivation and solicitation does not necessarily occur due to environmental factors.

**Location and environment.** However, Community College C’s location and environment may be a contributing factor in their fundraising success. Advancement Director Charlemagne provided an example of a local and successful capital campaign and recently, the same hospital had a follow up campaign for its emergency room and renovations. She added that when Community College C hired a consulting firm, the firm’s research found that there were three successful entities where people would give: the hospital, the college, and the churches in that area. Advancement Director Charlemagne added that “Religion is important in this area. Lots of causes. Lots of churches.” The researcher asked Advancement Director Charlemagne if there was some fear associated with raising money for capital campaigns. She replied that fear or trepidation did not exist at their college because they are relatively small.

Foundation Chair Clinton remarked that the universities in his state had some large foundations, and outside of the state, he was aware of a number of colleges, some that are relatively small universities, that have a substantial amount of foundation money. Therefore, he surmised that a college’s size does not necessarily constitute its fundraising power or influence. This statement proves how experiences shape his philosophy and vice versa. Because he has visited numerous college campuses with a limited enrollment, he believes that his community
college foundation can raise significant resources. This shapes his vision and helps him promote a positive environment where this type of highly profitable fundraising might be possible.

However, realistically, he recognized that Community College C has a small community, and there are only 18,000 people in the largest nearby town which is less than 10 miles from the college, while the rural county contains just over 75,000 people; therefore, one of the major challenges is that the foundation has to draw funding from a small number of sources who provide a great deal of giving to a number of organizations. According to Foundation Chair Clinton, the foundation’s external potential fundraising participants who exist in the surrounding environment may have a limited ability to give.

Foundation Chair Clinton asserted that the families that have become wealthy and the businesses that support them often give back more than they get. For example, he and his wife have set up an endowment and a substantial scholarship for Community College C. Foundation Chair Clinton stated that the foundation wanted sustained funding for students going forward in their higher education. Moreover, he declared this philosophy was “part of [their] ongoing mantra.” He said one of his independent and private goals was to get a self-sustaining scholarship fund to exist after he and his wife have passed. This interview displayed the importance of internal participant investment.

President Churchill wants to continue creating a culture and environment that fosters internal investment. This is a direct reflection of her fundraising philosophy and therefore, the fundraising philosophy of Community College C. She illustrated that a good fundraising culture consisted of numerous traits, and they started with the president, his or her vision, and his or her ability to delegate authority to actualize this vision. President Churchill cited a famous management study and noted the importance of “getting the right people on the bus and the right
people in the right seats” (Collins, 2001). She added that a synergy must exist between each advancement professional and his or her organization, and if an organization is in chaos or if the college’s culture is not finely tuned, then the process is doomed. Furthermore, a dichotomy exists between a chaotic advancement office and a distorted vision with fundraising success. President Churchill’s philosophy is based on her many years of leadership experiences. The culture she tries to create includes an environment of investment on the part of all internal and external participants. This environment she envisions is ripe with good relationship management techniques and clear communication.

**Return on investment.** Community College C invests in the philosophy that fundraising for scholarship money is the most important way that others can contribute. Documents revealed the $2.3 million acquired over the life of the foundation is used almost entirely for scholarships, and tuition almost singlehandedly runs the institution; the college does almost no building, renovations, or upkeep with the money. Moreover, many board members have been with the foundation since its beginning in 2005, and the focus has always been scholarships. However, Advancement Director C acknowledged that some funds raised were used to provide operating costs and pay for the upkeep and operation of the website, but a foundation board mandate assured that this amount was below 10% of total budget every year. However, a small portion (less than 2%) of the money has also been used for some community outreach programs or to bring arts to the community. President Churchill’s college plan and personal fundraising philosophies directly dictate how resources are appropriated each year. It shapes the experience of all participants and sets the tone for the fundraising environment.

Furthermore, Advancement Director Charlemagne believes that whatever final form they choose for a fundraising philosophy, the president will ensure it is followed through legislative
measures and through the actions of the foundation. Foundation Chair Clinton said that it will be enacted through by-laws, how they conduct their meetings, and how they utilize those funds entrusted to them. Furthermore, Advancement Director Charlemagne continued that the president’s leadership philosophy is “about securing the college structurally and fiscally by gathering appropriations.” President Churchill illustrated that their philosophy and perspectives are enacted well because it is clearly articulated in policy and all excess energy is exerted in meeting the strategic plan. They are strictly devoted to very sharply “operationalize and realize strategic plans.” According to President Churchill, “It is enacted in that process.”

Advancement Director Charlemagne held the philosophy that for community colleges to keep their alumni engaged in the giving process, community colleges must pay special attention to students who received the early part of their higher education at a community college then went to a university. She illuminated that part of advancement’s goal should be to create an environment that inspires these students to return to their community college and remember the experiences that shaped their early philosophies and that these students must be motivated by the advancement office to remember the opportunities they were given, so they will give back. She declared that if a community college does not reach out to their alumni, the college will never receive their financial support. She concluded that community colleges must find a way for alumni to remember where they came from in an endearing and nostalgic way.

President Churchill believed that a common trait of community colleges is that if an alumnus completes his or her education there, and next he or she enters the workforce and becomes successful, then their allegiance is with that institution. However, most of the time, students go to a major university after getting an associate’s degree and become enthralled with the university experience and alumni giving is directed to that destination. She concluded that it
is “a lot more difficult for community colleges than four year universities. The volume is different. The capacity is different. The earnings are different.” Additionally, President Churchill mentioned giving and its association with college athletics. The researcher and administrator discussed few community members did not comprehend the ties between sports and fundraising in the southern United States and few people realize that buying tickets to athletics events is a great example of fundraising.

**Planning and participation.** President Churchill conveyed that meaningful correlations exist between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising. She declared, “They are inextricably related.” However, Foundation Chair Clinton would discuss no correlations between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising. Advancement Director Charlemagne noticed that correlations exist between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising. In addition, she is a self-described perfectionist who becomes absorbed in planning, as evident by her massive whiteboard covered with ideas and notes. She declared that her office strategizes fervently, and she literally plans every minute of an event or outreach and every board meeting from the time they drive on campus to the time they walk out the door, paying attention to the smallest details because she believes highly organized events produce greater participation and greater return. She proclaimed, “Eventually they’re gonna donate,” even if it is in a small amount.

Advancement Director Charlemagne proved that diligent planning was an important aspect of the fundraising philosophy at her institution, and her white board provided evidence for it. Advancement Director Charlemagne began that she should be doing more fundraising, but said, “It’s a balance between all my other responsibilities and what I could be doing. My internal strategic planning is on the wall behind you.” Her massive white board was filled with administrative ideas, organizational structure, and future plans in black, green, and blue erasable
marker ink. The illustrated list provided a means in which to display the fundraising goals for the college and supplied evidence of the philosophies that inspired them. Furthermore, it showed internal participant roles and external participant targets.

President Churchill acknowledged Advancement Officer Charlemagne’s white board notes, labeling it “the operationalizing of their strategic plan as it relates to her area.” President Churchill added they had scheduled a cabinet retreat the next week after our interview in order to finish operationalizing that strategic plan. The plan was driven by the college’s fundraising philosophies and would directly affect the internal and external fundraising environments and provide participant’s roles and experiences they should help create for potential donors. The planning suggested that relationship management techniques would be used in experiences provided by the college in or to possibly retain fiscal gifts.

In addition, the plan on the board exhibited a number of unique goals for their college: Community College C had never raised money for a yearly fund and never done a capital campaign. Advancement Director Charlemagne assured the researcher that these are experiences that are being planned for the college. She said that it took two years (from 2007-2009) to visualize their full fundraising philosophy and vision and to provide it with a strategy and a structure. Since then, their advancement office has been building relationships and improving advertising and public relations and building a solid environment and a concrete reputation with potential donors and fundraising participants. She declared, “In two to three years we will probably do a capital campaign” for more scholarships or improvements. In addition, they suggested possible additions to their science and technology building.

President Churchill observed that Advancement Director Charlemagne is “a visual person, a list maker, and a post it note person and . . . she keeps notebooks with folded pages in
certain ways, and she annotates.” President Churchill acknowledged that it is Advancement
Director Charlemagne’s nature to be a very organized thinker and that every administrator
accomplishes this differently. Conversations with President Churchill relinquished that
Advancement Director Charlemagne is an integral participant in fundraising for their college and
the advancement director’s philosophy positively shapes experiences for external participants.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said that Community College C’s alumni person is
great with relationship management; she is relentlessly and consistently bubbly, cheery, and
attentive. Advancement Director Charlemagne perspective was that all fundraising participants
including donors, board members, foundation members, and students enjoy that type of
personality in this role. In addition, Advancement Director Charlemagne perceived giving
scholarships as potential investment opportunities for when those students become alumni.
Advancement Director Charlemagne’s advancement philosophy included the idea that the alumni
association and college’s foundation are stronger and better organized when united. She argued
that these fundraising participants should work closely together to provide an environment that
supports a culture of giving. Both organizations exist under her direct supervision and work
together. She perceived, that together, they would be a strong and united fundraising entity.

Foundation Chair Clinton said that no special criterion exists which determines which
foundation member confronts a prospective donor. The foundation will discuss it at meetings,
but it often involves relationships. Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that conditions of
resources facilitate those who are asked to fundraise. In contrast, President Churchill added that
she did not believe that these conditions did facilitate those who are asked to fundraise. She
added that structure concretely exists around advancing the plans of the college and that although
advancement had no personnel or energy to waste, most often adequate human and financial resources existed to further the strategic vision of the college.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said that although many people believed that a relationship existed between size of staff and funds generated, she did not necessarily believe it, only because of the success of her own small staff. She provided an example, “When the president first came here, I was relatively new in my position; I had only written grants that I was a part of: student support services, talent search. I don’t think I slept for the first three years that I was here.” Although they had a healthy reserve there, President Churchill knew they needed to fervently pursue grants to support or expand programs at the college including equipment for technology and health programs. After 2003, Advancement Director Charlemagne vigorously wrote grants for any available local, state, and federal program allowed. She said that she felt an immense amount of pressure to prove that she could do the job that she was given by President Churchill.

Organization and management. President Churchill’s philosophy is based on the perspective that fundraising efforts are organized and managed aggressively. She provided an example: “We were first round recipients in the Department of Labor Tact grants, so we were very successful in securing a $9.5 million grant to capitalize on some things we were doing with 3D simulation that we did on the bond issue.” They built on previous successes and used that to further impact community college education in the state. Furthermore, she proclaimed “we not only try to cement our own successes but try to be the rising tide that floats all boats, so taking the successes we have and making them sustainable for other colleges as well because we feel like we have a responsibility to do that.” This aggressive nature was also exhibited in soliciting a gift worth close to $9 million in the arts due to private fundraising.
Foundation Chair Clinton said fundraising efforts were a high priority of the college; their advancement office was organized and managed within this philosophy. Additionally, he described the role and attributes of Advancement Director Charlemagne as a grant writer and fund raiser as “paramount.” Overall, he recognized the high level of competency in people working at the community college level in that state, and specifically, those at Community College C. He described them as “very capable.” He concluded that they “are multifaceted and they’re very nice to work with, all of them.”

Foundation Chair Clinton stated that the president is ex officio and although she does not vote at foundation meetings, she “steers it” and “guides it.” Part of this vision involves gaining trust from donors. Advancement Director Charlemagne echoed the importance of doing precisely what is promised with donations in order to build donor confidence and trust. Furthermore, Advancement Director Charlemagne proclaimed that the primary fundraising function rests with her position in the office of advancement. This shows the autonomy granted by the president and the trust she has in Advancement Director Charlemagne. There is clear investment from the top down as well as bottom up which may help establish a truly effective model for morale in fundraising. In opposition, President Churchill acknowledged that the primary fundraising function lies with her (the president at the institution). However, President Churchill noted that she and the advancement director both distribute authority and decision making, and President Churchill acknowledged that she allows Advancement Director Charlemagne much autonomy. Furthermore, President Churchill said her advancement director is a member of cabinet, and they generate ideas together about things that need to be achieved and whether or not it is possible to gather the resources to achieve them.
She provided an example, “If you can fund a position with something that you’re doing through a grant then it frees up that money to do something over here that may not be grant fundable.” Community College C has a formal structure for decision making via members of that organizational structure and the bodies that make decisions (like cabinet). Additionally, she noted there are informal processes “where ideas just bubble up and then we plug them up where they need to be.”

Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that ultimate authority, decision making, and vision rested with President Churchill. However, the president grants her autonomy, and she directly reports to the president and specifically answers to her although she co-reports to the executives of the foundation board. She additionally asserted that her relationship with the president has matured and evolved, and it was not always so secure and open. She had to build trust over years of service. Therefore, authority and decision making are distributed by either the president or the advancement director, although Foundation Chair Clinton stated that the foundation is strictly governed by the board and its officers.

The offices that exist within the foundation are president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and there are committees formed that include priorities like investment and event planning. These established governances are voted on by the board. Advancement Director Charlemagne agreed that the foundation is governed by the board of directors which started with 11 members and grew to 19. The most they can have is 21. Foundation members’ areas of discipline and background are varied. President Churchill asserted “They are connected members of the community who know how to make connections to people who have the ability to give and the willingness to do so.” The president and the vice president sit on that board as ex officio members. President Churchill said that her foundation was governed by an executive
council. Advancement Director develops the agenda in concert with Foundation Chair Clinton.
The board chair (foundation head) manages the meeting and is responsible for the entire body,and they have an executive council consisting of the foundation chair, the vice president, the
secretary, and the treasurer. They also have committees including an investment and finance
committee and other committees that may be essential to studying an issue and making a
recommendation. According to President Churchill, it is a typical organizational structure for
governance, and they are governed by a set of bylaws and a constitution.

President Churchill said that the advancement is organized under Advancement Director
Charlemagne, and she has a coordinator of alumni affairs. Furthermore, Advancement Director
Charlemagne has a grant writer and an administrative assistant. President Churchill said “It’s a
typical director organization.” Advancement Director Charlemagne described advancement’s
organizational structure: the advancement director is the head of the division and reports to the
president while all others in the department report directly to her. President Churchill informed
the researcher that if they win the $25 million grant that they have been striving for, then they
will hire someone else. Additionally, the Vice President for Learning/Students has oversight of
fundraising and has to approve fundraising forms; all fundraising requests go through her office
except for the ones from Advancement Director Charlemagne, unless these events occur on
campus. However, Advancement Director Charlemagne assured the researcher that this
organizational structure did not hinder, slow, or postpone fundraising efforts, even though they
had to periodically get permission from another office.

President Churchill admitted that although certain factors existed which help them
determine which employee confronts a prospective donor, Advancement Director Charlemagne,
President Churchill, or a foundation member will usually ask for large donations, but only after
careful discussion about how to shape that experience. Furthermore, the advancement office or the foundation may be involved in the negotiation, but overall the relationship is very important to who is chosen to personally solicit donors. President Churchill added that discussions have previously erupted for someone outside the college or foundation to perhaps make the solicitation if that willing person has a special relationship with a potential donor, but that set of circumstances has yet to arise. Furthermore, Community College C strategizes about who makes the ask: for example; one coach solicited a very successful former student athlete who gave $100,000 because he coached that player. However, those opportunities have not frequently presented themselves for the institution so they depend on the aforementioned participants in governance, although she wishes more of those opportunities existed for advancement.

Athletics and club funding. At times, athletics can also be an important fundraising participant at Community College C and was a larger focus of conversation in interviews at Community College C than at other community colleges studied. According to research, athletics programs have become an increasingly important aspect to institutional fundraising efforts (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that athletics was somewhat involved in fundraising at the institution and at times has actually been involved with major gifts. However, they often partner with the college for simple events like golf tournaments. They hold camps and print media guides to raise funds for athletics and their individual programs. In the athletics department at Community College C, every sport has an individual account that they fundraise for and there is a general athletics account. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that the advancement office was involved with the golf tournament because the alumni were involved. “A pro-golfer donated money to the foundation with no strings attached. He wanted to buy a van for the college’s golf transportation.” However, PGA
changed the rules, and it had to be used for youth involvement, and it could no longer be given to the college. After the college received the money, they were given guidelines and restrictions: they could buy clubs and bring golf to the community, but not give it to the golf team. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that the advancement office brought PGA professionals and did a free clinic the night before the event. They put the money raised from the golf tournament into an alumni account, because they have more freedom in that account. At this institution, the alumni account is actually a sub-account of the foundation. She reiterated the importance of keeping funds separated in order to spend money more freely. President Churchill stated that athletics’ fundraising is primarily done by coaches. Moreover, they have to not be in conflict with what Community College C is trying to accomplish in the advancement office. In addition, they have to communicate events being held on campus although these events often target different fundraising participant networks, and athletics often utilize students in their fundraising. Because “They use their athletes, and they do camps,” the advancement office and foundation contribute very little to the athletic programs. Advancement focuses on the needs of the entire college. Athletics focuses on their needs. She added that other student clubs and organizations throughout the campus raise funds to accomplish certain goals for themselves as well. Furthermore, no other entities are authorized to raise funds outside of the Foundation. Although not often involved in large scale advancement, athletics and clubs are special participants in fundraising at Community College C.

Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that collegiate entities including student clubs like Phi Beta Lambda fund raise on campus. These groups have club accounts. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that this fundraising done by athletics and clubs including Phi Beta Lambda are typical “fundraisers, not fundraising.” This idea conceptualizes a
very unique and important factor in the fundraising philosophy of Community College C where participants and fundraising environments are separated and categorized. It is difficult to discern whether experiences shaped this philosophy or philosophy has shaped this experience at the institution. In addition, this interview reinforced typical misconceptions of differences in small and large scale fundraising.

However, forms for these “fundraisers” must be signed by the Vice President for Learning/Students who has oversight of fundraising and must approve the forms for various student organizations including clubs and athletics; moreover, all on campus fundraising requests go through her office. This organizational structure and fundraising environment is unique to Community College C. The researcher did not interview this administrator because it was communicated to him that she was not a part of the advancement office and only signed off on fundraising documents and provided no real oversight or additional responsibility.

**Structure and Staffing (including individual experiences and education)**

Advancement Director Charlemagne is a white, 47-year-old woman who has had 12 years of experience although the title of her office has changed from the Office of Development to the Office of Advancement over her tenure. President Churchill is a white, 53-year-old woman who has ten years of experience as president. She holds a doctorate in higher education administration and holds a master’s degree in the same field; in addition, she has 27 years of experience in that state’s community colleges. She has been the dean of instruction at a technical college, a vice president and the chief academic officer at a community college in another southern state, and she has been president of Community College C since 2003. Foundation Chair Clinton is an older white gentleman who would not provide age demographics. He is a financial advisor and senior vice president of investment at a multinational banking and financial
services holding company for over two decades. His second career is being president of the board of directors and that partially occurred because he spent four years of learning the foundation practices and policies, and it is his first year as president. He described it as “more of job management, a function of managing a business then it is managing a fundraiser.”

Foundation Chair Clinton had no official training or education in this field. However, he has a bachelor’s degree in adult education and part of a master’s degree in the same field. In addition, he has had training in financial planning and financial advising. He claimed that this training has clearly assisted him in his role as foundation president especially through public speaking. In addition, his connections with people from chambers of commerce and local business organizations have made him more visible in the community. He added that he is limited to what he can do for the foundation because of his career, and he avoids conflicts of interest. He added, “In order to be compliant, I cannot ask a particular client of mine to participate in the foundation.”

**Training and skillset.** President Churchill illustrated that her experiences as a college administrator helped train her in the necessity of fundraising, not necessarily in the practices or talents required for fundraising. She expressed that, “Fundraising involves having a very personal talent for that and relationship building and the ability to create a desire to invest in the organization.” She continued that successful fundraising involves understanding the big picture not necessarily just seeking grants and private gifts aggressively but also “generating a commitment from individuals or corporations and organizations to be willing to invest in what you are doing, but you also have to be able to sell the dream.” She also acknowledged the importance of gathering investment on an internal level with building a vision and getting buy-in from your employees. Advancement Director Charlemagne said that initially she had no formal
training and agreed she had a type of baptism by fire in the field of fundraising. She has a bachelor’s degree in history and English and a master’s degree in secondary education. She said that she started at the community college in the Trio program. A counselor had passed away, and they began searching for a replacement while she was just finishing her master’s degree in May of that year. In January of the next year, Community College C hired her, and she has been there ever since and progressed. She said that soon after she started the job, their grant writer left because she was doing some private consulting. A grant needed to be written to be refunded, and she was asked to write it instead. She proclaimed “No one wakes up and says I want to be a grant writer,” but through the years, she continued to write grants, and when the current president came, and the old alumni director left, President Churchill asked Advancement Director Charlemagne to head the alumni association. After the president had been there four and a half years, President Churchill started the foundation; someone else ran it, but soon it was given to Advancement Director Charlemagne. Moreover, Advancement Director Charlemagne said that she had no mentor of formal education throughout this process.

President Churchill asserted that advancement offices are person dependent in any setting and formal training is not always necessary. These positions can be staffed by someone who has a master’s degree or a doctorate but there has to be an inherent talent in the ability to conceptualize a need and to strategize on how to meet that need. She reiterated that this involves more than training although Foundation Chair Clinton observed that the college’s advancement office goes to seminars and off campus training and workshops. Foundation Chair Clinton also stated that foundation members are not paid for any of the training they receive or funds they generate on behalf of the college. “They are not compensated or supported by the foundation,” and he said they put many extra volunteer hours into the foundation. He reiterated “Nobody on
that campus is directly compensated by the foundation.” Moreover, “nobody earns anything from it, so everything is for the foundation and the needs of the students at the college.”

President Churchill and Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that the advancement office goes through some training from the state’s Council on Resource Development. They provide professional development opportunities throughout the year, and they also have a certification series. Furthermore, they attend one two-day conference with the national Council for Resource Development (CRD). She admitted, “Most of the real training I’ve received has been with the CRD, the national organization. I have attended that annual conference every year except one since the current president was here.” According to President Churchill, Advancement Director Charlemagne has gone through that series and found it very valuable. President Churchill added that networking with professionals in that association and networking with Title III professionals at the state department of education and the department of labor through tact grants were very helpful as well. Therefore, Advancement Director Charlemagne tries to make sure that her advancement office and foundation are trained better than she was when she started. She said that she trains her own advancement office, and they work together. Advancement Director Charlemagne said her additional training has come from numerous kinds of research and experiences.

President Churchill declared that much of the talent involved in fundraising is innate: a good fund raiser must have the ability to conceptualize from ideas that float around a table and to be able to put together the intricacies of the process. Good advancement officers must have visibility in the community, the respect, the trust, and the ability to help set that stage for the president or the head of the foundation board, and to make the ask in concert with him/her. President Churchill explained that training for a good fund raiser does not only involve degrees
earned or formal training, but an uncanny ability to mold experiences into philosophy, and to create an environment of respect which demands attention from internal and external fundraising participants.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said she personally trains the foundation from a book she developed, and this occurs when the foundation gets new members. She has an orientation process that she undertakes with every new member of the foundation board. Advancement Director Charlemagne trains or orients them when new members are accepted into the board, and then there is more of an informal mentoring process to help them understand the importance of the annual student investment luncheon (an event with auctions and a meal to gather support for student scholarships) and other events. The foundation board members cooperate and coach each other into effective leadership. Furthermore, foundation training involves observing income statements and discussing profit loss. In addition, members of the advancement office explain policies and procedures to new members, specifically for scholarships. Advancement Director Charlemagne declared that it is imperative that new members understand that foundation focus is almost 100% scholarships. The foundation also has had some training through streaming/talking sessions with other foundation’s leadership. They have also had short 15 or 20 minute seminars and workshops on certain principles. The researcher asked Foundation Chair Clinton if he thought there was a need for formal training in fundraising, and he replied “If you’re running a business and you have a professional involved, and you have somebody specifically trained, fundraising is a skill, and it could be an educated skill.”

Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that foundation members have various backgrounds and areas of discipline in business and industry, and she described this as being an
important factor in success. She said foundation members are often chosen based on two basic questions: “Can they influence? Can they contribute?” Advancement Director Charlemagne also declared, “We don’t ask board members to contribute like many colleges; we just want them to bring influence and donors, not personal money.”

**Alumni affairs and providing resources.** Advancement Director Charlemagne provided an example of why the office of alumni affairs is an important aspect of their advancement office and an important attribute of the fundraising environment at their institution: they had a foundation member that was with them for two years but passed away in May of 2013. He told Advancement Director Charlemagne that he had made enough money to take care of his family for three generations. He pledged $50,000 unrestricted dollars. However, they took part of his pledge and named a scholarship for him. This fundraising participant had a varied business portfolio which included numerous of entities including cattle and deer. Advancement Director Charlemagne only knew him and his wife, but she knew he had children. His family called and said they wanted to have the memorial service at the college because there would be too many people in attendance. She wholeheartedly agreed, and later asked if her son would be willing to finish his father’s term.

At the first board meeting, he asked to speak with her after training, and he told her that he, the son, was actually an alumnus of Community College C. Although in his 30’s, he got his start at the community college because his father was not comfortable with him joining the family business until he got a college education. He wanted his son to have a four year degree to fall back on, because neither he nor his wife had a college education. However, the son was a poor student in high school, and he could not get into the four year colleges, so he began his higher education at Community College C. After finishing his story, the son was adamant that he
would have never succeeded without that community college. He was honored to be on the board, not just to finish out the term, but to continue and help young people have the same opportunity he had. This example presents a participant’s philosophy which was shaped by a meaningful experience. Furthermore, the college built and maintained a system of relationships that led to donorship and a dependable staff member for their foundation.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said her major experience with fundraising has been with small gifts, events, grants, and building relationships. She said that she has never provided the leadership on a major gift although she has been a part of three major gifts: a gentleman who gave $50,000.00 in support of the college, a small part of the $9 million dollar art gift that President Churchill facilitated, and the naming of a facility for $50,000.00. In the facility naming, the lady who gave the gift had had a vested interest in a theatre because she was Miss Senior of that county, and eventually, the state. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained the donor previously talked about things she wished the theatre could house. The advancement office believed that she would make a contribution and invest it back in the theatre. However, the donor had plans for the money and even though it was not precisely what the advancement office envisioned, they respected the donor’s wishes.

Foundation Chair Clinton said that fiscal and human resources provided for fundraising are not determined by the college. This is determined by board members who use their social network to personally fund events, and he added that they “don’t take any money out of the foundation for these kind of things.” He added that if it is documentable, they will sometimes use things as tax write-offs, but that is rare. He said it is common for him to pay for things like breakfast, lunch, and/or drinks and never get reimbursed. He declared, “There’s probably not a person on that board that doesn’t contribute at least $10,000 dollars a year, and you are not
required to do that; there’s nothing signed, no agreement.” However, he made it clear that people on the board are voted into the foundation due to scope of influence.

**Organization and staff specifics.** In addition, Foundation Chair Clinton admitted that he was not entirely privy to how advancement was organized and although the previous advancement person was dean, he mistakenly thought that Advancement Director Charlemagne was as well. However, he did know that an office assistant had recently joined in sharing responsibilities, and Advancement Director Charlemagne has become so busy that “there is a shared platform for accounting and keeping up with finances.” However, he had no knowledge of any software discussed or utilized for that, and even with all this personnel, Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that they had no yearly campaign including or involving letter drives because she did not have enough help to efficiently achieve it.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said the staff size for fundraising was two, but it actually consists of one full time and one part time person for all fundraising and grant writing; however, she explained that they do the work of two and a half people. Foundation Chair Clinton admitted there is no full time staff completely committed to foundation fundraising. “It’s a voluntary shared role.”

Furthermore, Advancement Director Charlemagne said that the use of students is not widespread in fundraising activities; however, they are typically used twice a year in their events. “Any student who receives foundation scholarship money is expected to participate in the student vestment luncheon. They greet guests at the door. They help carry packages, serve the tables, and interact with guests; they are identified as recipients of help.” She said that last year students wore shirts that said “you invested in me”. The other time they are used is at the Little
Black Dress Charity event where they set up the event and tear it down during and after the silent auction. She added that even their cheerleaders were valets for parking.

President Churchill said the staff size for fundraising was not nearly as large as it needed to be. She added that they are currently managing so many grants that if they are successful in winning the next round of Department of Labor (DOL) grants, then they will have to hire an additional full time person. President Churchill illustrated that when Advancement Director Charlemagne collaborates with other institutions, she develops teams within that collaboration to help her with managing grants as well. For example, she has project managers for the Title III grant and in the DOL grant effort; they have a collaboration with four other institutions. “There are grants management teams and project managers on each of those, so that’s how she manages her division; not everything is managed by her.” However, Advancement Director Charlemagne oversees, reports, and assesses all fundraising information on an institutional level.

President Churchill stated that advancement job descriptions illustrate position roles, staff reporting protocol, tasks, responsibilities, qualifications, and criteria for advancement. The researcher asked President Churchill if, out of a sense of urgency, staff ever had to fund raise even if it was not specifically mentioned in their job description. She said that they rarely had to activate the phrase: “all other duties as assigned by the president” within each job description. She reiterated that the phrase is included in everyone’s job description at Community College C, but the phrase is not commonly needed even though she described community college jobs as “very global” due to staff size and scope of work. In regards to job descriptions and responsibilities, Advancement Director Charlemagne suggested that “raising funds” is something done on a small scale by numerous college entities whereas large gift fundraising is a very special skill, and it is a very delicate process that is more about “friend raising” than
fundraising. For her, “fundraising” seems to have the implication of large amounts of money being involved. She concluded that “To that end, no, a sense of urgency would not require staff members to be involved in that kind of fundraising.” Therefore, no one had ever been hired and forced into an advancement role for large scale fundraising out of necessity at Community College C.

The researcher asked Advancement Director Charlemagne about job descriptions and if people not hired for fundraising roles strictly adhere to those descriptions or help aid the process. She replied that “‘Strategic plan’ is just a fancy word for ideal wishes; delusions of the greater.” She explained that the advancement office and the foundation get help where and when they need it. Advancement Director Charlemagne continued “We have to because we are a staff of two. We call in the troops, especially during a special event or a fundraising drive, anybody and everybody.” She also declared that she has a couple of people who work with her just on a Department of Labor (DOL) grant, but they cannot help with advancement tasks. She explained that because some staff is completely grant funded, specific duties cannot be set upon them; but these people step in whenever possible. However, she contended, “Our project assistant (secretary) was specifically hired 75% to 25% so we could get help with advancement tasks.” Job descriptions do state “other duties as assigned” but it also delegates authority to her working within the scope of the advancement office. She concluded that like many non-union jobs, when they hire people, they tell them there is a large scope of duties and responsibilities in the office, and although they are not hired with specific and separate tasks in mind, they may have to work on numerous unexpected tasks and keep odd hours.
Participants and personnel. Additionally, Advancement Director Charlemagne assured the researcher that students and student-athletes do not make asks for the institution including the athletics department. Similarly, Foundation Chair Charlemagne declared that the only time students are used in fundraising is during the student luncheon for the foundation. He explained that the only students who were a part of this event benefitted from a scholarship or won a scholarship. “They wait on tables, deliver food; we’re proud of them.” They are showcased, but if they do not want to be a part of it, they do not have to. It is not enforced. President Churchill said that students were sometimes used to work events: act as servers, set tables, and be visible to possible donors; overall, however, it was uncommon for students to be used in fundraising activities. She said it is important for these students to be seen at these events so that donors can witness the students or students like they are investing in. “We put students in front of board members at every foundation meeting” and “if they have a request for funding, they have to come and present it to the foundation board to voice that request.” However, they are never involved in making the asks for the advancement office.

President Churchill said cost is a concern when deciding which fiscal and human resources are provided for fundraising. Furthermore, she would add personnel to the advancement office if personnel costs were not the major budget hindrance associated with departmental funding. She declared that one cannot spend all the money raised from fundraising on fundraising efforts. Recurring costs have to be controlled, so the college is forced to continually ask more of the people that they have. President Churchill added that when Advancement Director Charlemagne has a need, she presents that to the president and generally she has a plan for how to fund it; if so, President Churchill will seriously consider funding it as
Methods and Practices (including individual reporting and assessment)

Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that fundraising efforts are only adequately organized and managed; however, one of her major objectives is to get beyond that. Foundation Chair Charlemagne said as a result of their fundraising methods, the foundation supported between 300 and 400 students with scholarships that normally would not have been able to go to college or access dual enrollment courses in high school. He declared, “We fund a lot of things that help support the community, and we give back.”

Foundation Chair Clinton explained that one of the methods that he performs is contacting private individuals and businesses who are not his existing clients, and he said that he will commonly communicate the information of possible donors to foundation members because he is unable to contact them himself, in order to avoid a conflict of interest with his job. The foundation invites these community members and potential donors to events like the student luncheon or to provide items for their fundraising auctions. Moreover, the foundation members are expected to deliver extraordinary and consistent participation including areas of sponsoring student scholarships. Members, like businesses, support each other and are expected to do so.

Advancement Director Charlemagne described different entities that her office contacted regarding fundraising for the college. These comprise several businesses that have existing scholarships with Community College C, including a local bank which gives a scholarship with preference to their customers or their customers’ dependents. At least four separate industries have scholarships established with the college or its foundation. College leadership acknowledged that their student investment luncheon centers on partnerships. People who have
existing relationships with the college come and participate in that event as a way to give back to
the institution for their partnership with them.

**Partnerships and public relations.** Advancement Director Charlemagne illustrated that
they have numerous partnerships, one with a committee action center that is a non-profit agency
which runs a number of community organizations including pre-schools. They get money
through the state’s Department for Economic and Community Affairs. They have a $35,000
scholarship established with the college that helps students with numerous costs that are not
covered through the foundation. It is set up as a grant account in order to make funding more
easily accessible.

One unique characteristic in assessment and reporting at Community College C is their
*President’s Report*. This document describes information about college events and assesses
institutional effectiveness and fundraising (2011). For this study, the researcher reviewed this
document which illustrated the college’s partnerships with corporations. However, President
Churchill illuminated that this report is not strictly related to fundraising and is an important tool
for internal and external public relations. However, she stressed the importance of developing
partnerships displayed in the report for one important reason. These relationships sometimes lead
to external investment in the college. For example, one company donated a truck for technical
students to use for training. This gift echoes the importance of cooperative partnerships between
local businesses and advancement offices at community colleges stated within the literature
review (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). President Churchill viewed this gift as resource development
from a different angle: resources directly infused into instructional programs. Overall, the college
tries to connect goals and needs of the college with companies that also have a need and see
whether alliances can be forged to help meet both of those needs. This example provides an
illustration of Community College C’s fundraising environment, a place that fosters many methods for giving, where participants do not feel stifled if they can only donate goods and services. Moreover, it is a direct reflection of their fundraising philosophy’s focus on building partnerships with technology and industry.

President Churchill provided an example to describe different entities that she has contacted regarding fundraising at Community College C. It was one of her first experiences with philanthropy as a new president and making the ask for a donation. She said,

We had finished developing our strategic plan which part of that was to have this college as the center for cultural arts in our community, a five county region, but with a larger focus here on this campus in this county. That vision landed with an elderly lady who had a rather extensive personal collection of rare porcelain and bronzes. The building over there is named after her and her husband. She decided that she wanted this college to be the beneficiary of that collection, $9.5 million dollars.

President Churchill declared that they had to carefully work through that process; however, it fit well into their goal of advancing the arts. She reminded me that the gift was within their strategic plan and if they “didn’t have that goal, there’d be no need for us to develop and receive an art collection and bear the cost of supporting it.” She declared that the gift also strengthened collaborative learning there and fit well with the college’s goals, like if a class was discussing 18th century pottery, they could come to the college’s exhibit and learn about it.

One factor that influences fundraising at Community College C is how they select their foundation members. Their foundation is made up of attorneys, bankers, insurance agents, and business owners. President Churchill argued that they have a network of people and information; they know who has an interest in giving, and they know who has the capacity to give and the reason they would be willing to give. According to her, it is the cornerstone of private philanthropy. President Churchill argued that another important aspect of fundraising is finding organizations who want to donate for certain purposes. These entities may have an interest in
scholarship opportunities for their employees, so the college approaches them about endowing scholarships to help fund students in certain educational programs that meet workforce development needs. Furthermore, one method of looking for funds involves the colleges searching information from government agencies who may have grant funds available that are of importance to Community College C. President Churchill admitted that advancement has become much more than fundraising.

Relationships in fundraising. In addition, President Churchill illustrated that partnering with colleges in fundraising tasks is not always a worthwhile method of fundraising because competition exists for the same funds. She concluded, “There might be partnerships, but there is never a stream of funds available.” However, she said that these partnerships may help leverage resources, which is an important part of resource development. She provided an example. One partnership with a major university within 60 miles of the campus has produced an arrangement with Community College C to exchange nursing students who need courses completed. They arrange a reverse referral in their health programs for students who are not accepted for some reason, if they do not meet the requirements to the university’s health program. They refer students back who are admitted to Community College C’s health program once they earn their associate degree. They are then automatically admitted to that one university with a scholarship; therefore, it leverages their scholarships for Community College C’s students to finish what they started. It also promotes a way for Community College C to tap into those alumni. They might remember the college that provided them with an opportunity to continue their education. However, she stated that her community college is in “infancy” in regard to relying wholly on the alumni association’s impact for tapping into alumni giving.
Foundation Chair Clinton explained that there is a litany of companies that call the college looking for students for job placement. “They call the college looking for somebody who has this concentration, whether its drivers, diesel mechanics, welders, machine tool lists, or nursing students.” He described it as a supportive situation.

President Churchill said that the advancement office fosters fundraising relationships using a team approach. The general approach is to “assemble people in teams who understand the importance of it, and give it the time that it needs.” President Churchill said she never tells Advancement Director Charlemagne that she needs to contact people to make sure that she maintains relationships. “She is in her position because she does that naturally.” She is granted autonomy due to her consistent success and persistent nature. President Churchill admitted that she does not cultivate relationships well all the time, and she has no drive to do so. She proclaimed, “I cultivate strategically when I’m called to do that, but I do it to a lesser degree with those relationships that are less critical like our foundation members . . . but I rely on them to cultivate those relationships continually outside the college.”

Advancement Director Charlemagne fosters these relationships through constant communication; someone in their office talks to those organizations at least quarterly, if not more, either personally or via a phone call. Scholarship sponsors get a correspondence about the student recipient which explains who they are and their progress in school (it does not give away grade information). Both the foundation and the advancement office are active in the community, so they are seen at numerous community events and are often invited to new events.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said that they decide which fiscal and human resources that are provided for fundraising by evaluations of the previous year. She asserted “Every year I specifically look at, especially when I’m doing my own personnel evaluation,
benchmarks.” The advancement director suggested that her dependence on statistics helps make up for her lack of experience.

**Prospective donors.** Advancement Director Charlemagne uses a number of techniques for prospective donors: general outreach sometimes involving an email list, meeting and greeting at college events, legacy lunches where around ten people talk with donors about opportunities to give. Recently, they have not been able to hold these luncheons because the college had significant storm damage to a number of important campus buildings, and many employees were settled in any available offices all over the campus. They plan on doing these again soon now that advancement office members have returned to their original buildings.

Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that the alumni person has a new directive to begin a donor plan on each prospective large gift donor. Each plan to engage the donor will describe the approach whether it is a home visit or phone call, and how many times they have been contacted. This is a major method of how they plan to build relationships and do outreach in future fundraising campaigns.

President Churchill stated that standard techniques for prospective donors include developing a profile of the donor (formal or informal) then providing a case for the ask, and then eventually, making it. One additional method that Foundation Chair Clinton uses is to try to get an individual or a corporation to sponsor one student for two years of college tuition. Then he informs his target that if the student does not make the grades, they do not get the money. He gave his pitch, “They have a need. You have a means to help, for your own manufacturing, or your company, or your business.” He suggested that the individual may own a company and may want to provide higher education to one of his or her own employees and possibly provide a tax write-off: a great situation for a business owner.
Foundation Chair Clinton said they do not necessarily use specific techniques for prospective donors, but a phrase that he might similarly use is “we have a need; how could you help us fill that?” and “would you be willing to talk about it?” He suggested the importance of having an open and thoughtful conversation instead of making a sale. He added, “It’s not necessarily a sale because a sale can come undone.” Instead the suggestion might be “shift some of the money that you were gonna give here, over here.” He tries to persuade potential donors to “think about helping a child” which will improve the student and society in general.

Foundation Chair Clinton does not completely agree that story telling is always viable. He called it a “trap, if you hear the same story time and time again.” He suggested that too many stories can seem insincere. Alternatively, he suggested a specific method of presentation that does not solely rely on storytelling: “Here is a story. Here is how we helped, and we have hundreds of these.”

For communicating, Community College C explained that they still use paper and mail for some older folks. However, the website allows them to do everything currently online. They have only recently been able to update information or donate online and register for events. They also utilize social media and email as well. The company that built the new foundation website, IModules, built the framework but their foundation staff maintains it. In addition, they have a Community College C alumni site that is linked into the college’s Facebook page that links into the college and foundation site; however, it is still a work in progress and has only been up since January.

**Technology.** Additionally, Foundation Chair Clinton explained that online registration, tracking of donorships, and online payment methods are three of the best ways that technology is
currently being administered by the foundation. He said technology aids efficiency and helps them discern funding that might be needed.

For example, the document review exhibited some information connected to the college’s methods of technology. The advancement meeting minutes of Oct 2, 2012 exhibited that there was an update from the advancement office where they declared that the new foundation website was launched “to student investment luncheon auction attendees directly after event.” Advancement Director Charlemagne asserted that they had been developing the website but had not officially launched it, so at the end of that event, they gathered email addresses from everyone, launched the website, and on Friday, attendees received an electronic thank you card that stated how much their contributions meant, and if they had not contributed, then it took them directly to the new webpage.

Foundation Chair Clinton stated that they are trying to grow and become more technologically efficient and establish modern book keeping and accounting techniques. He admitted that the college has relied on “an antiquated platform,” but they have been expanding. Furthermore, he admitted, “We don’t want to spend ourselves into better, and there comes a cost of technology.” The foundation does not want to outpace the resources gained from utilizing that technology. Foundation Chair Clinton pointed to online registration as a good example of a smart technological investment in which they have had some immediate success.

Foundation Chair Clinton’s new technological initiative is to purchase miniature and portable credit card swipe machines to use during fundraising events to do things like sell tickets for a drawing at foundation events. He said they will get one or two machines (many can be attached to phone or tablets) and one or two volunteers to roam around the events so that people
can purchase items, bid, or donate by credit card or debit card. He concluded that this will eliminate lines and raise efficiency and productivity.

An April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2013, a memo from the advancement office provided an update for a software conversion to Razor’s Edge/Financial Edge, a program used for fundraising/foundation management. Razor’s Edge is the software on the donor’s side; Financial Edge is on the accounting side. President Churchill admitted that even though the college and foundation have used Razor’s Edge for almost four years, she hinted that the college was fairly new to utilizing this technology in fundraising. She pointed to their new website and Razor’s Edge used by their advancement office as being slowly integrated and utilized. This technology provides access to their donor database that contains all their alumni who received degrees from the college and part of why Advancement Director Charlemagne described some fundraising aspects as “adequate.” She explained that the entire advancement office is in charge of operating, updating, and maintaining this technology, and they use Banner for that.

Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that over the last two years, they have focused on investing in technology. Previously, they used the program, Quick Books, but they had to move to Financial Edge because now they have to manage the endowment, and Quick Books is not ideal to do that. As investment money comes in, and it must be allocated to the endowed funds, an institution must have a tool that does that and gives accurate time and reporting. According to her, Quick Books is terribly difficult for trying to give reports.

Moreover, Razor’s Edge and Financial Edge communicate about endowed funds for the scholarships, so operators do not have to go between systems. In addition, it provides a department with a detailed and correct follow up. Furthermore, specific and necessary additional information can be inputted in the note category of Razor’s Edge so that if someone sends an
email to the president saying that a person donated a specific amount, she can have all the necessary information for making the thank you call or letter.

Advancement Director Charlemagne called the system “adequate” because it is barely utilized. She added that they are going to be fully utilizing these two systems of software for fundraising on the website. These were two of the three main areas of investment in technology for fundraising at the college. The final technology that the foundation invested in, at shared cost with the institution, was online scholarship applications. During the interview, she proclaimed that scholarship applications comprised of foundation scholarships and a few dual enrollment applications in the alumni office were stacked waist high and that online scholarship applications were already reducing paperwork clutter. She suggested that this paperwork was a major challenge to meeting fundraising objectives and allowing their office to achieve new goals.

Advancement Director Charlemagne remembered that when she and the president first got there, there were no computers there at all for faculty and staff. They did not even have a fax machine. She demanded, “It was nothing. It was crazy.” Even the faculty did not have technology. In 2003, they started a huge influx of technology that continued mostly through 2005, but still partially continues today especially in technical and health programs. It just so happened that the college’s directive meshed with what was being funded at the national level. She contended, “It’s being fortuitous, but it’s also listening to the community and our industry partners. I would be shocked if you spoke with one of them and they didn’t say they drove that.” Therefore, externally, the perception exists that the community and industry partners drive the president’s fundraising initiatives. President Churchill acknowledged the new and redesigned website so that people could engage in philanthropic activities online. Furthermore, she agreed that funding from the foundation goes to create, support, and provide upkeep and maintenance
for the website, and that is an expectation; additionally, she reiterated that the college may not use public funds to support activities of the foundation. For those purposes, Community College C could not outsource the work on the website. President Churchill declared the foundation had to pay for that since it is used for their purposes. However, the foundation staff upkeeps the website. They can use state money to pay foundation personnel and some operational costs, but there must be a formal MOU (Memorandum of understanding) between the college and the foundation outlining who is responsible for what. The college provides Advancement Director Charlemagne’s salary and office space in exchange for her services to the foundation. She declared that the foundation is organized to support the mission of the college and public funds cannot be used to support them. This information is all clear and coherent within the foundation’s charter.

**Corporate and individual tactics.** President Churchill stated that fundraising tactics differ from corporate to individual. She explained that when confronting an individual, it is important for the solicitor to understand the passions of the potential donor. With an individual, one has to find that person’s passion because they are not going to give up anything unless they can see a real outcome that meets their passion. She declared, “That personal relationship is so important.” However, corporations usually give through foundations, or they give for purposes in workforce development, like in the diesel program where a foundation member donated the truck. It was donated by a company which is owned by one of their foundation board members. They have had other equipment donated, but that was the first time a board member donated to a program. According to President Churchill, “Usually there is a need that has to be met with a corporation or a structure that is dictated for which they give.”
Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that typically the foundation has been successful in soliciting donations with a company if they buy a table at the student vestment luncheon, their foundation’s most successful fundraising dinner and auction event. Advancement tries to push a full scholarship for a student or start a scholarship fund at these events. She explained that they averaged two new scholarships after every student vestment luncheon from business and industry. She implied that although success has occurred with corporations at college events, in private fundraising, personal, one on one interaction has been successful. Individuals may come to an event, and the advancement office or foundation follows up utilizing personal engagement strategies.

Another special event that is unique to Community College C was described in meeting minutes from Community College C. The college holds a charitable event in the spring that benefits alumni association scholarships. The Little Black Dress Charity Bash is held off campus. Moreover, Advancement Director Charlemagne described it as a “throw down” that is fun and profitable but has the possibility to be a little out of control. She said it is an experience crafted specifically for women. This event has a disc jockey, a silent auction, and a fashion show with local celebrity waiters who work for tips. She added that the women that attend dress in clothing provided by local clothing shops. “They dress up; go with their girlfriends off campus with alcohol. That’s why I said throw down. We are revamping that because it has spiraled out of control a little bit.” Although this and the student investment luncheon take a lot of time and investment, they create remarkable returns on investment. During the Little Black Dress Charity event in 2013, they raised approximately $10,000.00 in donations; the year before that, they made almost $20,000.00. This difference in amount occurred due to tips collected and more expensive auction items. Their goal is around $15,000.00 each year. She concluded that it is
important to have a fundraising goal for every venture. Advancement Director C also added that there was alcohol at the golf tournament, but the college did not provide it. She continued that “People will tell you that people give more freely when alcohol is involved.” These methods are effective because they carefully create an experience that targets specific groups of potential fundraising participants, and environment conducing to that type of giving. It is a product of careful planning and reflects the college’s fundraising philosophy. The college provides an experience/environment where potential donors communicate with college representatives and relationships can be built that produce resources for the college.

Foundation Chair Charlemagne pronounced that fundraising methods differ somewhat from corporate to individual. Corporations are often solicited for school and student support while in cases involving individuals, the foundation might focus on endowment. He immediately provided a prototypical plea as if he has done it dozens of times. “Can you afford $500 a year? That’s $50 a month. Can you do that for five years? That’s a commitment, but in five years’ time, that’s $3,000 dollars; that’s two students. That’s all you got to commit to; if you can do more, great, but that’s two students for the next two years. That’s one complete term at a two year college, and we’ll receive the child. No grades, no money.” He concluded with, “How would you like to name your scholarship? Your late husband, late wife, your kids? It’ll be in your name forever; they’ll remember the name of the scholarship that helped them.” He suggested that it is more than a sell or an agreement.

Furthermore, Advancement Director Charlemagne asserted that internal stakeholders and participants must invest in an institution’s philosophies before the external community will participate in advancement endeavors. She said the former foundation’s perspective was that internal constituents believed the foundation simply spent money to hold special events and
when money was raised, it was used only to support athletics. In response, at convocation this year, Foundation Chair Clinton and Advancement Director Charlemagne will make a presentation to show how many students received scholarships from funds raised. Although the president’s report includes all necessary information of where funding is spent: tax returns, policies, and procedures, Advancement Director Charlemagne declared it, “wordy” and noted the average person refuses to digest that much information. She believes that something that simply and visually shows where the money goes will encourage college staff, foundation members, and external potential donors to give generously. Evidence provided during this interview pointed to the philosophy that if funds raised do not go directly to students, promoting an environment of internal investment is difficult to manage.

In addition, Advancement Director Charlemagne said there are personal attributes that help enact potential participants will to give. She elaborated “I think people give because they believe in what you’re doing.” She continued that leadership involved the donor believing the solicitor is “a good caretaker” that they trust and who is continually “building report with the community.” She said that it is very important in relationship management for people to follow through with what they say they will do, and when it is done, it must be as close to perfect as possible. An environment that supports experiences where trust can be built and maintained is critical in gaining new fundraising participants and keeping previous ones.

**Initiatives for fundraising.** President Churchill determined that factors including the use of a strategic plan and student need play major roles in initiatives for fundraising. Similarly, Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that need plays a role in initiatives for fundraising because scholarships are their major focus due to extreme changes in tuition costs, student aid. She added that “Federal financial aid has taken a beating in the past two years. What
we’ve seen as a result of that is more need from the foundation to fill gaps where there is no other option for the student.” She continued that this is a major reason why the foundation needs to focus on putting together a full strategic plan. She admits that college leadership has yet to get people entirely engaged in that process since the discussions began over a year and a half ago. She mentioned a new focus on long term goals within the next five years, like a focus on capital gains which the president would approve. Advancement Director Charlemagne mentioned a personal goal of hers: renovating the culinary building and making it into an alumni center. She admitted that many alumni do not return, but if they could create an atmosphere where alumni returned, that facility would make an excellent conference center where catering could take place, unlike the coliseum where the luncheon currently takes place, where there is no area to prepare food.

Overall, President Churchill demanded that fundraising initiatives strictly adhere to the college’s strategic plan. Advancement Director Charlemagne agreed with this perspective as a grant writer and a fund raiser. President Churchill reiterated that if funds are available from any source which does not fit into the college’s plan, they are not pursued. For example, President Churchill explained that in 2003-2005, Community College C was focused on technology, and in 2007 -2011, it was focused on workforce development, after this, the college focused on the arts, so the college did not go after money outside of these areas.

Advancement Director Charlemagne claimed that the president still partially focused on workforce development as part of their strategic plan. She also illustrated that this focus was not driven by a grant or available funding but by the local economy there. She proclaimed that even though unemployment rates increased in the downturn, the work has returned and even expanded. She said, “We should have an increase of 1,200 jobs in this community by 2014.”
These jobs are mostly in manufacturing but there is a large need for updated skills and new equipment.

**Assessment and reporting.** Advancement Director Charlemagne quantifies fundraising activities at their institution. During the research interview, the advancement director went to her computer and showed the researcher an impressive self-assessment fundraising spreadsheet showing all the grants that she has applied for and those that were met with success. In addition, the spreadsheet showed how many grants were submitted, how many were funded (75% of those applied for), how many were pending, and how many were discontinued. The data illustrated that the college successfully won 88% of new grants. Later, the document review revealed that the spreadsheets also showed items including funding by area and workforce development that would prove useful in assessing fundraising methods. Advancement Director Charlemagne included benchmarks in her evaluations. This includes return on investment. She declared, “I’m very driven by the spreadsheet. I try to bring in at least a million new dollars every year for the college, in some form or fashion, especially grants. Once I look at that I can show the president where we need new resources and we’ve been able to function with the limited amount of personnel we’ve had.” Advancement Director Charlemagne provided these statistics to prove that size of staff meant little to her college’s fundraising success. Moreover, she used the spreadsheets to assess the success of fundraising activities. She concluded that what was far more important than staff size to fundraising was how staff is used and how efforts were focused. In short, Advancement Director Charlemagne said the best advice for fundraisers was “Get the most for your money.”

Foundation Chair Clinton said that fundraising practices are reported through board meetings and the audit that they undergo every two years. Advancement Director Charlemagne
illustrated that fundraising practices are reported through the annual report, on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) website, and in an annual performance evaluation spreadsheet she completes for President Churchill utilizing her self-assessment spreadsheets. In addition, President Churchill oversees an annual report that is submitted to the chancellor of the state department of higher education. Some of the data from the advancement director’s performance evaluation are often submitted in this document to the chancellor.

President Churchill declared that these reports and the spreadsheets drive the actions and perspectives of Advancement Director Charlemagne. In addition, accounting measures, like their 990 form which is uploaded to Guidestar where people can access it. Advancement Director Charlemagne added that although the President’s Report provides information on fundraising, updates are provided at every meeting to the foundation board, and even though the college has begun to use Banner, President Churchill said that it was too early to realize whether or not that program will affect fundraising reporting at that institution.

Furthermore, President Churchill said that foundation fundraising practices are only reported to the foundation board. However, she declared that “The President Report is required to show transparency to our constituency and our stakeholders,” but beyond that, there is no further formal requirements besides reporting benchmarks to the foundation and data to IPEDS.

President Churchill stated that success of fundraising activities is assessed within their planning processes, institutional effectiveness, and outcomes assessment. It is an annually, ongoing and continuous process that occurs by virtue of accreditation. She suggested that “very good planning processes” and assessment techniques aid in that process.

Foundation Chair Clinton expressed that fundraising activities are assessed by predetermined financial goals and if they were met. “Every year we know what we did last year
and know what we need to do in the upcoming year; try to be better this year.” Another goal of theirs is to eliminate or improve on practices, techniques, or methods that did not work well in the previous year.

**Fundraising efficiency and effectiveness.** President Churchill personally noted that fundraising at her institution was at least moderately efficient, but Foundation Chair Clinton said that fundraising at the institution was only minimally efficient. He said that the foundation is in its tenth year of evolution, and he took a hiatus during the middle of it due to leadership changes. He argued, “We essentially started over. We haven’t become as proficient as we can be.” He added that because they all work on a volunteer basis, their common goals are only slowly met.

Advancement Director Charlemagne stated that fundraising efficiency is only adequate at the institution because she needs a grant manager and a reallocation of duties to improve advancement efforts. A portion of this has occurred already in the installing a part time person to take care of the finances with Financial Edge. According to Advancement Director Charlemagne, this will free the alumni person to use her skillset to build relationships and extend outreach with potential donors, outreach which Advancement Director Charlemagne described as a major need. In addition, Advancement Director Charlemagne said that she needed the alumni person to lay fundraising groundwork and schedule the next step for her and President Churchill, to “close the loop and make the ask.” However, Advancement Director Charlemagne declared that for their size, they were efficient. She also contended that fundraising at their institution was effective, but they need improvements in their financial gains.

President Churchill stated that fundraising at her institution was moderately effective, and Advancement Director Charlemagne’s spreadsheets quantified that statement. By her measures, they are highly successful in some avenues of fundraising. Furthermore, Foundation Chair
Clinton perceived the foundation as effective, considering its internal and external environment and circumstances.

Foundation Chair Clinton assessed some characteristics of their fundraising chief. He finds President Churchill as a very vocal, prominent member of the community: civically and socially, and in the university environment. “She is well respected by her peers. She is tenacious and is relentless in her pursuit of something. She is very politically astute. She has acquired those skills. It’s not about her. It’s about the kids. She exudes that.” He thinks she is one of the better community college presidents in the state.

Foundation Chair Clinton humorously viewed himself as marginally ineffective; he said, “I just manage.” His pun had three possible meanings: either he was remarking that one is defined by what they do. In which case, he views himself as effective because he manages the foundation, or he simply meant that he meanders and does not excel in that role, and he is mediocre, or his implications were that he had to do very little because the people that surrounded him were so capable and effective. The last option seems most likely based on evidence from previous comments. He did not elaborate.

President Churchill provided a self-assessment of herself. “She’s pretty dog gone good; not as effective as she’d like to be, but we do well here.” Advancement Director Charlemagne said that their fundraising chief (President Churchill) is effective although she does not like asking for money. Advancement Director Charlemagne commented on assessing effective and/or worthwhile events. She suggested that assessing the effectiveness of an event does not always include strict scrutiny of financial return on investment or contribution numbers, but successful fundraising begins with people returning to events. She continued that “people will criticize spending money on friend raisers but very few people are going to walk into an event and drop
money.” Like in the literature and previous interviews, she agreed that it took around three years to solicit most major gifts. Foundation Chair Clinton said the most effective practices are luncheons and auctions; he said the most ineffective practice that he had witnessed was telephone solicitation calls. He said that it is harder to turn someone down in person.

President Churchill declared that they do not carry out ineffective practices because if they were ineffective, they would discontinue those methods. She admitted her alumni association is not the flagship’s of our state, so if we can raise $30,000.00 a year, then I’m proud of that, and you have to understand the differences of your organization and how to benchmark internally and externally with a group of your peers and by those benchmarks, we are pretty successful.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said that the most ineffective practice involves hosting many events. She continued that whatever the college does has to be meaningful. Furthermore, she remarked that sometimes fundraisers must use trial and error. For example, before she worked there, the college had an alumni run. She said that it was a superfluous amount of work to raise only $2,000. She said that weeks ahead of time, they had to plan a course, get volunteers, prepare food, make and buy awards. She explained that it was a decent community gathering but they never got over 100 runners. Ultimately, in her perspective, it was ineffective. They did it for three years after she took over the alumni association; eventually, the college stopped it, and a student group took it over. It works well for that group because they do not need as much continuous and significant funding as the college. Community College C carefully chooses their fundraising events.

**Factors and Challenges**

Foundation Chair Clinton declared that need is the most important factor in initiatives for fundraising. He added that one major distinguishing factor of providing help is needs, “hardcore
needs.” The foundation begins the process of scrutinizing applications by removing students that just want scholarships. Next, they separate the students that severely need help from those that need some lesser or moderate help. From the students that desperately need help, they pull the applications that are realistic and plausible. These students receive financial help first. He said that sometimes they are lucky enough to help people beyond that stack. He concluded that the foundation members that scrutinize those applications are caring individuals. He added, “I believe in my heart, every single person on that board, is there to help a kid that needs help.”

President Churchill offered that she has had limited experience with making the ask in fundraising. However, she admitted that as president, it is required. President Churchill stated that if a college is going to get a gift, someone will have to make the request for it, and most often, it is the president. Before she became president of the college, she had no experience in philanthropy but it is currently an essential part of her job, and for some college presidents, it is a substantially larger role than for others, especially at large universities. However, “with declining investment at the federal and state level in higher education, fundraising is becoming a much more prominent part” of the president’s job at community colleges. She proclaimed, “If we are successful in our jobs, it should be.”

**Difficulties and problematic issues.** Foundation Chair Clinton described fundraising as a personal worry. He added, “I find what we do is very beneficial for who we do it for,” for that reason, he worried that for financial reasons, potential students might not get a chance to attend college if the foundation is not successful. He provided an example where the college’s fundraising methods made a difference. He said, “I’ve seen and heard in interviews, students that got a chance.” He cites a story that emotionally motivated him: a young African American lady who was a single mother from the county seat close to their service area. He added that, “She
was driving to school in a car that had no windows.” Foundation Chair Clinton said that she had a number of similar difficulties. He remembered that “She stood on the stage and sobbed uncontrollably thanking them for her scholarship and her education.” He declared, “I’m telling you there’s nothing bigger. We made a difference in her life.” He continued that she was a really intelligent young lady that just needed help.

Advancement Director Charlemagne described a challenging situation that arises from time to time, and she added that protocol is an important factor that determines which employee confronts a prospective donor. Generally, the president works in conjunction with the advancement office; however, she explained that on rare occasions, people have decided to make an ask on their own and then return to inform the advancement director and the president that they solicited a financial gift. This situation is problematic to fundraising leadership. She described one of the events that occurred before she worked with the foundation. “We had a gas company here that wanted to establish two scholarships: one for athletics; one for academics.” She continued, “About three years ago, the baseball coach decided he didn’t like the amount of the scholarship and went to the company himself without talking to anyone and decided he would ask for more money.” This coach approached the company and asked why a baseball player, who was sponsored by one of their scholarships, was not getting more money. Because Advancement Director Charlemagne was personal friends with the manager there and they were both on the school board together, he called her aggravated and confused. She had no idea what he was talking about, so she was livid about the coach’s solicitation, and she and the coach returned heated correspondence. She explained that she did not need to consistently solicit donations; however, he had to gain permission from President Churchill and preferably her as
well. It has only happened in rare occasions at the community college: once in athletics and once in the arts.

After the aforementioned art donor left the multi-million dollar art collection to the college, someone independently misrepresented the college in a solicitation. The art donor had already given the remarkably substantial gift and put a charitable trust in place. One of the college’s staff who was in the art department was involved with the museum and asked for additional money. His intent was to set up a scholarship for someone’s family member. He had written it out, had her sign it, and brought it to Advancement Director Charlemagne. He did not see a problem with it because he and the donor had a personal relationship. Advancement Director Charlemagne saw the solicitation as inappropriate because the donor had already been very generous, (a gift appraised at around $9 million) and he had not discussed soliciting additional gifts with administration.

**Engaging internal and external participants.** Additionally, President Churchill acknowledged the challenge of having a limited staff size. She assessed that a relationship does exist between size of staff and funds generated, and she perceived that if they had a limitless staff they could achieve more. She contended that “Universities are organized to have development professionals in their colleges, whether it is the college of education or engineering; it’s an organization within an organization. If we had that structure and personnel obviously we could do a great deal more.” Furthermore, Foundation Chair Clinton “absolutely” believes that a relationship exists between size of staff and funds generated. He declared, “I wish we had ten funded people, but I think we do well with the people we have.” He said marketing and advertising can be increased at little additional cost, most of which can be done cheaply with
automated emails and “reports by computers.” Foundation Chair Clinton perceived that less costly alternatives can help supplement human resources.

Foundation Chair Clinton said that as a percentage, close to 45% of his responsibility is fundraising. President Churchill said as a percentage 30-40% of her responsibility is fundraising. Advancement Director Charlemagne added that as a percentage only 10% of her responsibility is private fundraising. The majority of her responsibility is involved in grants and grant management and that presents a major challenge. In addition, she is paid 50% of what she makes by grants for her time which far exceeds half of her time.

President Churchill marked that the obstacles and challenges faced at her community college are more narrowly focused than those faced at many institutions of higher learning because the community they serve is small and “limited in their ability to give.” This is partially because two year degree wage earners generally make less than people that hold four year degrees. Moreover, resource development requires resources to apply to goals, and Community College C does not always have limitless resources to apply to that goal. In addition, difficult personal challenges emerge for Foundation Chair Clinton due the many restraints provided by his career including the number of clients that he serves and the time and money he spends fostering those relationships that takes time and energy away from fundraising.

Advancement Director Charlemagne said that major challenges in fundraising at her college involved engaging faculty and staff and getting them invested in the process. However, she said that on and off campus, others would say advancement was doing a good job securing funds for individual departments. For example, people in the machine tool program received new equipment, so they approve the work that she has done. She also added that much of the college
sees the improvements made by public funding, so they support soliciting those funds; however, less than 40% of the college see the benefit of private fundraising, but it is growing.

**Emerged Major Themes**

Table 3

*Case C Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to Case</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Articulated Philosophy</th>
<th>Stakeholders/Relationship Management</th>
<th>Engaging Board Members</th>
<th>Assessment and Reporting</th>
<th>Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A number of major themes emerged from the study of Community College C: their continual investment in *assessment and reporting* and their emphasis on *stakeholders/relationship management* are driving forces in their fundraising. The first theme helps improve the commitment to the second theme. The college’s advancement office and the foundation are structured from these foci. In addition, there is a focus on the adamant demand that the strategic vision of the president and her system of *governance* drives all fundraising. Efforts are never focused on directives that are not a part of the president’s leadership and vision for the college’s future.

Community College C relies on information and results produced from modern assessment techniques. Their practices and methods rely on this focus whether or not their strategic vision changes. *Technology* is a key supporting factor in their methods. It is used to
save money and minimize the necessity of human resources, streamline organizing and governance protocols, make their *assessment and reporting* techniques more efficient, and aid in mass communication and overall institutional efficiency. Specifically, document analysis and interviews revealed that online registration, updated software and websites, tracking of contributions and online payment methods are three ways that technology is being utilized by the college. Community College C strategically employs *technology* and concretely utilizes it during the entire fundraising process (from strategizing to reporting and assessing) and leadership members acknowledge its impact upon their success. It plays a substantial role in their productivity.

President Churchill has a system of *governance* which grants much autonomy to Advancement Director Charlemagne due to the advancement director’s consistent fundraising success that can be quantified. President Churchill admitted this truism and that Advancement Director Charlemagne had earned her trust partially due to her efficiency and assessment techniques. Therefore, Advancement Director Charlemagne may have inadvertently utilized self-assessment techniques to foster relationship management. This theme was more pronounced and identifiable in the study of Community College C then the other colleges studied. The researcher suspects this theme emerged because of Community College C’s *articulated philosophy* and commitment to formal assessment and reporting. In addition, this connection between Advancement Director Charlemagne and President Churchill, a relationship that has matured and evolved over years mirrors the trust that comes with the evolution of potential donors into actual donors: a process where proof and quantifiable evidence supports belief and investment. Furthermore, by studying the relationship between the president and the advancement director might illuminate an effective model for prominent morale and trust in fundraising staffs. In
addition this role establishes a concrete relationship between assessment and personal investment.

Community College C’s strength in *assessment and reporting* is recognized within the President’s Report and Advancement Director Charlemagne’s data rich spreadsheets. Gauging the success of fund raising activities is an annually, ongoing, and continuous process assessed within their planning processes, outcomes based assessment, and institutional effectiveness benchmarks. Assessment measures and reporting techniques at this institution are arguably their most effective attributes. Although seemingly complex, this consists of simple goal-oriented fundraising where solicitors measure effectiveness by gauging successes from the previous year and adding incremental successes as benchmarks for the upcoming year.

Furthermore, college fundraising leadership invests in the idea that consistent and clear *planning* eventually leads to more successful relationship management and this planning is based from the results of their many outcome based assessments. Their planning processes and organizational framework provide *governance* specifics and evidence for the application of fiscal and human resources; moreover, it is partially inspired by the benchmarks from fundraising evaluations of the previous year. However, this philosophy is fueled by the president’s strategic vision which does not stray toward resources that do not fit into her vision.

Although fundraising practices are only reported to the foundation board, these evaluations are partially included in the President’s Report. It provides a transparent, forward-thinking, preemptive analysis for their constituency and stakeholders. Furthermore, it offers a great *assessment and reporting* model for other community colleges to provide to particular stakeholders.
Community College C has an unavoidable emphasis on *stakeholders/relationship management* and *engaging board members* in contributing and facilitating their potential to contribute. Foundation aims are securely focused on student scholarships. In addition, students may become active fundraisers for foundation events or even raising money for their own clubs or sports. This attention to *stakeholders* (students in this case) continues when they are alumni as well. The college continues to put resources toward cultivating alumni.

Advancement Director Charlemagne added that if she could add a new team member, she would add a grants manager, who could manage grants so she could work with the foundation and alumni. She later proclaimed that managing gifts and grants is as equally difficult task as soliciting gifts and grants. This need for a grants manager illuminates a conundrum in their organizational structure made evident by the structures at the two other colleges. Neither Community College A nor Community College B needs to use resources to pay a grants manager. Because Community College C focuses heavily on grant and alumni fundraising, they lack resources in procuring large private gifts and grant management. The fact that they have received a handful of large gifts shows that the opportunity is available to the institution which suggests that resources should be prioritized to fit this purpose. However, this focus on alumni and grants reflect a large part of Community College C’s advancement *philosophy* and the administrative dependence on these two entities as major participants in future fundraising. Moreover, Community College C is successful in cultivating resources through grants and alumni.

Alumni, college leadership, and the foundation *board members* continually try to build relationships with workforce development entities including corporations and industry in order to broaden the donor base and forge partnerships in the hopes of future resource development.
Furthermore, all college stakeholders including the foundation whose role includes being ambassadors for the college are highly persuaded to network and communicate on behalf of the college to private individuals and companies. The multi-million dollar art gift represents the importance of foundation members at Community College C and their knowledge of people with access to giving and the willingness to do so. Community college leadership tries to foster these relationships via personal contacts including personal visits, informal and friendly meetings, and/or telephone calls. In addition, foundation members sometimes utilize sharp emotional propaganda when soliciting a potential donor in order to promote investment and create new stakeholders in the college.

Moreover, the foundation board members are expected to support each other and deliver extraordinary and consistent personal and financial participation. Foundation members are varied and diverse are chosen based on their scope of influence and their giving potential. The college has a focus on the foundation members’ personal networks and their information of others who can give and the reasons they would give. Furthermore, foundation members contribute a great deal of personal resources and this provides some challenges because some college fundraising leadership perceive there are few left in the community with the potential to substantially give.

Fundraising directives are guided by the president and her cabinet and then activities that facilitate this vision are assessed in order to improve or to remove them. This focus is not guided by available funds, simply by the perspectives of stakeholders in college leadership roles. However, President Churchill did acknowledge the role of the community college in improving the lives of community members and tax payers and being “the rising tide that floats all boats.” This reiterates Community College C’s emphasis on internal and external stakeholders.
In one previous instance, Advancement Director Charlemagne created a supportive environment for a fundraising participant who was also a friend of the college. This was a memorable experience for the donor during a difficult time; therefore, influencing his philosophy of what the college does for the community. In doing so, the college created a lasting and meaningful relationship; it is a great example of positive relationship management, and the creation of an important external stakeholder.

Advancement Director Charlemagne concluded that community colleges must find a way for alumni to become stakeholders and remember where their previous bonds with the community colleges in an endearing and nostalgic way. This environment must be carefully molded by the college in order for the alumni to remember the experiences when they were students in order to reinvent alumni’s maturing personal philosophies about the role of the community college in society and motivate alumni into becoming participants in contributing.

The college’s focus on small gifts suggested that previous advancement philosophies involving planning and prioritizing were shaped by negative experiences or the lack of experiences in receiving large donations. This resulted in a refocus of advancement priorities where cultivating alumni supersedes cultivating potential large gift donors who may have little previous experience with the college. The directions in which resources are distributed and appropriated have a large effect upon whether or not the colleges will have a flourishing fundraising environment.

Foundation Chair Clinton has an important role in engaging other board members. As a community member and as a foundation board member, he did a great deal to support the students of Community College C and the environment in which they matured. His philanthropic philosophy infiltrated the foundation’s environment, and his experiences as a philanthropist...
provided an important example to the foundation in which he operates. President Churchill implied that his example was a motivational factor for other foundation members and fundraising participants.

Chapter Summary

Chapter IV provided descriptions of the data presented from each individual case study. In addition, this chapter reorganized the study’s topical sub-questions into categories found in the interview protocol within Appendix A. Evidence of categories, subcategories, and thematic coding was provided within the study’s answers. In addition, rich description was provided within the data in order to more clearly ascertain more coherent meanings from the answers. In addition, Chapter IV included a discussion of each individual case study and its emergent themes which were supported by thorough evidence. Chapter V introduces the Multi-case themes/codes and supplies a reduction of the study’s model. In addition, Chapter V presents sets of themes from the individual case studies and a description of the commonalities between cases and the uniqueness of each college. Themes that emerged from this data are discussed and described in the multiple case study analyses in Chapter V as well as the correlations of these themes with the findings of the individual case studies of each institution emphasized by findings from the interviews, document analyses, and observations. Chapter V also exhibits findings from the cross case analysis.
CHAPTER V:

RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND MULTIPLE CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the roles of institutional actors in the fundraising process, their training, background, organization, and differing tactics when approaching corporations and individuals. Using observations, document analysis, and interviews, the researcher probed institutional fundraising philosophy while investigating perspectives of how fundraising efforts were organized, managed, staffed, and carried out. In addition, the study looked at governance of foundations and fundraising staff specifics (job descriptions, student use, size related to funds generated). This included the roles of governance, resources, methods of procuring funds, and reporting. This study displayed differences in fundraising practices at large rural two-year community colleges in the southeastern United States and described the setting in which these events take place. This research indicated the many attributes and characteristics of fundraising at these colleges. Furthermore, it scrutinized philosophies, perspectives, practices, relationships, and experiences of collegiate staff involved in institutional fundraising at large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state in order to promote prosperity in resource development in today’s harsh economic climate.

Reduction of the Researcher’s Model

In order to develop an understanding of these perspectives of and on philosophy, participants, experiences, and environment, the researcher selected ten fundraising professionals including a college president, an advancement director, and the foundation chair at each of three community colleges to interview. In the case of the foundation at Community College A, the
researcher chose an additional foundation officer to interview because of one participant’s special experiences with fundraising: Foundation Vice President Adams’s experiences as the CEO of another foundation and in forming the college’s foundation. In addition, the researcher observed three foundation meetings where most interviewee’s were present and interacted. However, in the case of Community College A, the president had been removed from office and did not attend that meeting. Furthermore, the researcher chose to do an initial document analysis prior to the interviews in order to gather additional questions for the interview process. This method proved fruitful, opening additional avenues of conversation and providing numerous examples during conversation. However, Community College A (in the process of building a foundation) would relinquish new documents, bylaws, and rules as they were created and as the researcher gathered evidence throughout the study. He retained and closely observed many of these documents; this aided in data descriptions as the researcher and the interviewee could discuss formation of documents during the interview, and the researcher could observe how that affected the final drafts post interview. In response, the researcher would oftentimes ask questions via email about the new documents and include that information in the study for coding. Overall, the researcher perceived that it made conclusions more concrete and the descriptions more accurate. This chapter presents the research data collected from the semi-structured interviews, foundation meeting observations, and fundraising related document analysis.

Demographics were not a focus of the study because it was exploratory; however, out of the 10 fundraising professionals interviewed, six were white women of varying ages. None were in their twenties and only one was of retirement age. Additionally, no men were represented in community college advancement leadership, (other than College President Aristotle that was
removed from office via a no-confidence vote). However, all foundation presidents were white middle age men or older (Foundation Chair Alexander, Foundation Chair Bush, and Foundation Chair Clinton). Out of the three community colleges studied, no single ethnic minority was in a leadership position in fundraising.

Prior to interviews, the researcher urged the participants of this study to share personal thoughts and perceptions as well as answer questions during the interview, using examples and specifics whenever possible in order to clarify their experiences as participants involved in fundraising for community/Associate’s colleges in a southeastern state. During the summer and early fall of 2013, the researcher gathered, scrutinized, analyzed, and coded documents relevant to fundraising, interview dictations, and field notes taken during foundation meeting observations.

As noted in Chapter III, the researcher conducted a thematic analysis of the data; the researcher consolidated and analyzed the vast amount of qualitative data making the research more practicable and convenient for scrutinization. Although this study was explorative in nature, the study’s format was greatly influenced by other research (Saldana, 2009). In this study, the researcher started with holistic coding and used descriptive codes that summarized the topic and In Vivo codes which were directly quoted from interviews (Saldana, 2009). In addition, as suggested by Saldana (2009), the researcher coded for patterns and put them into categories. The researcher’s philosophy was that coding is a continual process that occurs continually through the research phases, and he used Saldana’s streamlined coding examples for qualitative inquiry in each case (Saldana, 2009). Two other types of coding that were used throughout the process were axial coding and open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Axial coding involves identifying a central characteristic and making connections with other data. This often involves reassembling
or disassembling data, while open coding is a portion of analysis where information is identified and categorized (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). This coding produced themes throughout the data. The researcher employed the emerging themes and descriptions from Chapter IV as a foundation for interpretation and made connections with the themes from the individual cases studies. After, producing data from these findings, the researcher performed a separate multiple case study. The findings from this study reaffirmed data sets identified from previous. The findings of the multiple case study performed in Chapter V are reflected in the conclusions and reported as final research findings in Chapter VI where the researcher answered the study’s topical sub-questions, answered the study’s main research question, and identified traits and factors that can often be attributed to large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state.

**Discussion of Emergent Themes Derived from Individual Cases**

The individual case studies described in Chapter IV provided significant evidence for emergent themes. In some data, clear comparisons and contrasts exist in philosophy, structure, methods, and challenges. This chapter presented each set of themes from the individual case studies and a description of the commonalities between cases and the uniqueness of each college.

A number of major themes emerged from the case study of Community College A. The data suggested that this college’s future relies heavily on its future ability to communicate its worth to its community, employees, and potential donors. In addition, the nature of governance at the college will have a similar impact upon later endeavors. This occurs in three ways: how it is structured in the future in relationship to its fundraising leaders currently at the college, how it will be structured and support future presidents, and whether or not the college is granted its non-profit 501c3 status in order for it to be able to fund raise at all in the future. Governance and its impact upon fundraising at the college will have a lasting effect on what is done in the near and
distant future. Moreover, how fund raisers govern the institution and whether or not they successfully foster relationships in the surrounding communities utilizing communication, will have a lasting impact upon later results.

Major themes emerged from the case study of Community College B. Their college is driven by a strong tie to their philosophical beliefs and their strategic vision and how it is applied to the daily routines of their fundraising professionals. This emphasis on philosophy and the eloquent execution of internal and external cooperation/communication are major themes that emerged from the study of Community College B. The continuation of mastering these themes may determine the long term and continued success of fundraising at their college. The college’s dynamic of flexibility has been their successful weapon of choice during periods of harsh external fundraising environments but because of their commitment to this philosophy and their water tight infrastructure built by caring, invested internal relationships among staff and foundation members, they have succeeded and thrived in fundraising endeavors where many thought they might fail. They rely on a focused approach to highly influential potential donors and flexibility in order to gather highly coveted funding in a competitive fundraising environment. In addition, their board members are respected industry and business leaders who have international ties and foster important relationships on behalf of the college. The college and foundation are governed by interesting and charismatic individuals that care about each other and the college. Members of this college do not revel in or rely upon technology; they rely on close personal interaction to drive their fundraising initiatives. It is perceived more as something that must be done in a bureaucracy, not something done to build good relationships.

A number of major themes emerged from the study of Community College C. The college emphasizes a commitment to continual and consistent investment in outcomes-based
assessment and reporting, and they foster the productivity of all types of educational stakeholders. These are driving forces to their efficiency in their fundraising. The first theme helps improve the commitment to the second theme because it drives where and how human resources are utilized and how relationships are managed inside and outside the college.

Additionally, technology is an important factor in productivity and efficiency at Community College C. It guides their reporting and assessment and is a major factor in their planning and organization which often involves mass communication. It is utilized by most stakeholders in the fundraising process.

Relationship Management is best represented by the college’s continued investment in alumni relations and the resource output of foundation members. This strong support exhibited by their foundation members is evidence of their prioritization of engaging board members. It can also be witnessed in their ties to industry and workforce training, and it is illustrated by the large and small gifts received from private donors. In addition, they have an articulated philosophy which is presented as concretely shaped around the president.

Discussion of the Multiple Case Analyses

The researcher utilized an analysis strategy implemented by researchers to better clarify meaning and connections between unique and common themes (Stake, 2006). The researcher used a graphic organizer to better illustrate where multi-case themes existed prior to discussion. The chart has been augmented from its original source to better fit the needs of this study (Stake, 2006). Highly Important means that the theme was greatly identified as significant to what makes this case unique, and this theme was successful in describing and developing an identity for this case (Stake, 2006) (Highly Important = H. Somewhat Important = M. Limited Importance = L). The following chart gauges importance from values of 1 to 10 by themes
common to all cases have a high thematic value, themes shared by two colleges have a medium thematic value, and themes unique to single cases have a low thematic value on the chart. The emergent themes from each community college are presented along with the researcher’s sense of thematic importance.

Table 4

*Original Multicase Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance Theme 1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Theme 2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulated Philosophy Theme 3</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders/Relationship Management Theme 4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Theme 5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Board Members Theme 6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships/External Stakeholders Theme 7</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Affects Future-Experience Theme 8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation/Collaboration/Teamwork Theme 9</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility Theme 10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Reporting Theme 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Theme 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community College A and Community College B are connected in their theme of communication. Technology is used to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of communication for each case. Furthermore, in the case of Community College B, cooperation/collaboration/teamwork was considered a theme in order to signify the excellent
relationships fostered by communication that fundraising leadership has with its internal and external stakeholders and community. Furthermore, Community College A has only one advancement fund raiser and does not yet fund raise so its themes often cannot be successfully and precisely, thematically compared. However, communication will be an integral factor in their potential success.

Community College B shares some similarities with the theme of stakeholders at Community College C and the theme of partnerships/external stakeholders at Community College A. However, because the expectations are so high for direct individual giving from foundation members at Community College C, and there is less of an emphasis on what the foundation members must personally invest at Community College B, (and so far at Community College A) the themes did not directly correlate. The researcher sensed a type of pressured expectation of high productivity accompanied with a lack of reimbursement in Community College C’s foundation giving. It was not a precisely negative stress, but more of an understood role of what foundation members should accomplish for Community College C, perhaps because the external environment could sustain less giving due to the lower population of the surrounding communities at Community College C. There was also an expectation from alumni at Community College C that did not exist at Community College B although engaging board members was an important trait and goal of both institutions. Because of these important differences, the researcher chose to use the term stakeholders/relationship management as a theme as well as engaging board members for Community College C instead of cooperation/collaboration/teamwork which existed at Community College B or the theme of partnerships/external stakeholders which existed at Community College A. Community College
A placed heavy emphasis upon partnerships/external stakeholders for the future fund raising success of their institution.

The importance of alumni was a focus of discussion with all colleges in the study; however, Community College A and Community College C prioritized alumni relations high enough to provide an office, a title, and resources to cultivating it. Because Community College C places a high emphasis on relationship management in the form of alumni relations and foundation members, they are ranked in high utility within the chart. However, because Community College A does not fund raise currently and only has one advancement officer and no permanent president, it was improbable to assess how strongly the college was focused on relationship management.

One could argue that governance is an important factor for any type of success at all institutions studied. For that reason, the theme of governance at Community College A can be applied to all the institutions from the study, but it is incredibly more important to the consistent and future success of Community College A because they are in a state of stagnation. Their governance is guided by a sense of how history will affect their fund raising future. This sense of history keeps is tied in to their fund raising goals and philosophy. Similarly the theme of articulated philosophy and its connection to fundraising effectiveness at an institution could also be applied to all the colleges within the study; however, the specific philosophies of Community College B were unique, clearly articulated, and could be attributed to their success. In addition, although assessment was discussed at each college, no college had concretely implemented formal processes that that were used to test and report itemized and categorized fundraising statistics like Community College C. This college directly used its outcomes-based assessment to drive its planning. Community College B had highly effective fundraising practices but it could
not officially report its successes like Community College C. However, the data from the individual case study of Community College B showed that formal *assessment and reporting* was not a high priority of the college. In addition, each college’s success relies at least partially on its relationship with its *stakeholders*; however, the researcher was alarmed at how many resources were expected to be produced by foundation members of Community College C. However, this college also did more to serve and support the productivity of its *stakeholders*. They provided a large amount of human, financial, and technological resources to all stakeholders that either invested in the college or had some role in supporting the college including alumni.

**Leadership perspectives.** An interesting *philosophical* stance can be attributed to President Baldwin. She suggested that some fundraising professionals worry about soliciting a potential donor who gives to other charities. Advancement Director Allenby at Community College A and Foundation Chair Clinton at Community College C both described this as a worry. In contrast, President Baldwin worried about fundraising in a community where people did not give to other charities.

Additionally, the researcher informed President Baldwin that another community college President (President Churchill at Community College C) made it clear that money available from government entities, private potential donors, and corporations had little to no effect upon the strategic *planning* of that institution. President Baldwin assured the researcher that this perspective did not align with the perspectives of Community College B. They would aggressively grasp at any available, substantial, logical, and ethical funds. This shows their commitment to *flexibility*. 
The literature suggested that the community college president is head of advancement and spearheads governance. All community college presidents interviewed were aware of that information, but when the researcher asked Community College President Baldwin, “how effective is your fundraising chief?” she humbly attached that role to Advancement Director Bradley. President Baldwin declared, “She’s good; she’s a great organizer; she’s a really great writer; she’s a good PR person; she’s smart and a quick study, and she’s very highly regarded by corporate people. They really like our advancement head. That makes it much easier.” When I asked the two other community college presidents this question, they assumed the researcher was asking self-evaluations, and they responded with candid self-assessments.

For many community colleges, the president is the head fundraiser, and therefore the most important participant in shaping the fundraising vision, and his or her experiences and philosophies shape the environment, experiences, and philosophies of potential participants in giving, hopefully making that environment conducive to fundraising both inside and outside of the college campus. Community College B is unique in this study because Advancement Director Bradley is given this role, and her dean title aids in this process and makes it possible. At Community College C, the head of fundraising was President Churchill; furthermore, Advancement Director Allenby suggested that leading fundraising efforts was in no way her role at her institution.

At Community College C, the governance applied by President Churchill is better described through the descriptions of Ryan and Palmer’s research (2005). She spends time recruiting valuable foundation members, builds social networks with community organizations, joins external boards, and is a leader in numerous outside organizations while gaining visibility for their college. President Churchill provides an active leadership role in concert with
Advancement Director Charlemagne at Community College C. Both leaders provide these roles for their campuses, although Advancement Director Charlemagne spends more time developing and fostering personal relationships for fundraising for the college.

While at Community College B, the president provides oversight and provides *asks*, Advancement Director Bradley actualizes many of the presidential functions described in the research. She is the head of fund raising *governance*, and her dean title aids in this process. Hodson (2010) declared that the primary role of a president is to provide inspiration and leadership toward a well-communicated and compelling vision for the future. This is an adequate description of the role of President Baldwin, while the role of overseeing the fundraising efforts of the development office and coordinating their efforts into a cohesive meaning and presenting them to external constituencies is most often provided by Advancement Director Bradley although research suggests it is the role of the college president (Essex & Ansbach, 1993; Ryan & Palmer, 2005).

An *articulated philosophy* of Community College C’s president involved the characteristics of good fundraisers. President Churchill described a good college fund raiser as someone involved in “a constant process of developing and sustaining relationships that are in the best interests of the college and its goals.” Advancement Director Charlemagne embodies this persona at Community College C and plays a vital role in the success of that community college. She has had some additional fundraising training through CASE and CRD, but does not have a dean title.

Community College C’s advancement structure of *governance* is unique to this study because their alumni person only focuses on her given role although Advancement Director Charlemagne oversees it. At Community College A, the advancement director’s responsibilities
involve leadership and oversight with the foundation and the alumni association. At Community College B, the advancement office and the college do not formally focus on alumni as a fundraising entity. Community College C’s advancement office consists of an advancement director, her secretary, the donor relations coordinator, the alumni person, an investment manager/book keeper, and a student worker who receives a scholarship. Because Community College B does not rely on formal alumni contributions, they do not need assistance in alumni relations although formalizing an alumni office may become a future goal.

Institutional direction and organization. Each college had a unique vision for their foundation. Community College B most specifically focused on keeping foundation members motivated. Advancement Director Baldwin explained that the first pitch that she has to make is for this purpose each year. Convincing her board members to be motivated, active, and productive participants creates a gaping personal challenge for Advancement Director Baldwin: the necessity for reciprocal relationships that exacerbate the time consuming aspects of the role of liaison between the college and the foundation. However, Community College A focused on educating foundation members about their college. Advancement Director Allenby spent many hours involved in this task.

Community College B had a unique philosophy concerning the scholarships granted to students. It was the only college that holstered concrete consequences for scholarship recipients who did not invest in the standards of Advancement Director Bradley and President Baldwin. This philosophy of maintaining high standards and rigorous accountability produces a process made possible by fundraising which molds an environment of discipline for scholarship students. Community College B has more stipulations and requisites associated with maintaining a scholarship than any other college in the study.
If these strict practices were not unique to Community College B, then they were at least an important enough focus for Advancement Director B to speak of earnestly. Although Community College C had expectations set for certain scholarships, Foundation Chair Clinton said that their foundation scholarship recipients were not forced to participate in foundation or college endeavors. Community College C looked at the scholarships as gifts, and they promote the participation of scholarship recipients in fundraising endeavors; however, they felt these gifts were often based on needs and therefore, they could not expect student recipients to participate in soliciting potential donors. Unfortunately, the harsh economy in which community colleges now operate has produced an unfortunate inevitability where inventive measures of procuring funds are necessary for some colleges. This includes the direct use of students in fundraising (Muth, 2009). Research exhibits that students at some colleges make phone calls, extensively research the financial statistics and background of prospective donors, and even accompany administrators on visits to donors before meeting them in person (Muth, 2009). Although students may aid in some fundraising endeavors; fortunately, it is not a necessity at Community College C.

Neither Community College A nor its foundation discussed potential scholarship requirements. However, their representatives suggested that student participation in any facet of fundraising would be minimal. This particular philosophy on student participation in gathering scholarship funding sets an important institutional tone and is an important component to each college’s fundraising environment.

Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that the college also had a student volunteer who was a foundation specialist. Her role is provided by a foundation scholarship. The advancement director asserted, “We established a scholarship, give them $1000 a semester, and
they work in our office eight to ten hours a week.” He/she files, runs errands, helps them set up for events, and provides aid in numerous tasks. This fundraising role which is provided by a student participant reflects Advancement Director Bradley’s philosophy that involvement in advancement can be maintained by even those who receive the very gifts in which they foster.

Furthermore, research within the literature suggested that donors also display a strong desire to improve the lives of others and to improve society (Schervish, 1997). Howe (1991) found that donors would rather give for an opportunity to promote special growth (not make donations toward basic needs in order to keep a program alive). Glass and Jackson contend that “donors give to meet unique challenges” (1998a). These challenges are illustrated in the stories and example solicitations portrayed by Community College B and Community College C.

One successful event (similar to the event at Community College B) which Community College C holds every year in October of the same week is their student investment luncheon which is held on the floor in their coliseum. President Churchill said that this event has been a successful tradition for almost ten years and is something fairly unique with Community College C. It is a two hour luncheon with an auction and private and public bidding. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that when she took over in 2007, the event was held on the 12th floor of the campus’s tallest building, and around 125 people attended. Last year, in 2012, close to 600 people attended, and the advancement staff and foundation raised almost $263,000. Advancement Director Charlemagne explained that some of their auction/luncheon funding has matching funds in it from a Title III grant although it which contains an endowment. She declared, “Anyone who gave, we could match it dollar for dollar, so we could capitalize on that. We do that one fundraiser and some limited outreach for private gifts.” These events at both
colleges try to encapsulate an experience which capitalizes on an environment where numerous participants give, providing pressure on non-donors to participate.

Moreover, in all individual cases, the community college foundations in this study were external and separate fundraising entities from the colleges they represented. Roha (2000) asserted that for an institution to remain protected, they must severely limit the sharing of resources between college and their external foundations. This model provides appropriate legal protection and provides checks and balances for the fund raisers and the funds being raised.

Additional research suggests that a president should spend at least 60% of his or her time strengthening relationships associated with fundraising (Smith, 1986) and avoid getting bogged down with interior collegiate affairs when fundraising (Kaufman, 2004). Only Advancement Director Bradley was able to provide a large percentage of her time to managing relationships for fundraising. No president within the study could contribute this much time to fostering fundraising relationships.

Two possible means of advancement organization can be attributed to the colleges in this study. These organizational models are based on where the chief developmental officer is placed within governance (Smith, 1989). In the staff model, the chief development officer takes the place of the president if he or she is unavailable. This study revealed that traits of Community College B more reflected the staff model because Advancement Director Bradley was given a dean’s title and considered the head fund raiser for the college; however, her role did not directly take the place of the president if she was unavailable, unless it was for a fundraising need or in making decisions for Advancement Director’s Bradley’s city campus. Therefore, it also represented the line model because in this model the development officer is placed under the president but is on a similar administrative tier as academic and student affairs deans and the
Chief financial Officer. This line model allows liberated communication from the Chief Development Officer with other administrative leaders, allowing that office’s integration with all institutional affairs (Luck & Tolle, 1978; Smith, 1989). Moreover, it allows the function of the resource development office to be integrated with the college’s mission, planning, and management (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). In the cases of Community College A and Community College C, the roles of the advancement officers were placed below deans. However, Advancement Director Charlemagne did take part in the president’s strategic planning committee unlike Advancement Director Allenby. Therefore, these models do not directly apply to any of these colleges.

**External environment and advancement practices.** The research showed that the surrounding communities of each college play an important part in the college’s fundraising success and the gifts they receive. Community College C received a multi-million dollar art gift from a local community member. In addition, a local foundation member’s company donated a truck for technical students to use for training at the college. In addition, Advancement Director Allenby and Advancement Director Bradley discussed how earnestly loyal community members were in supporting their college. They both felt like the environment for her college was very supportive to local fundraising, and various partnerships with local business and industry might be possible. In addition, Community College B holds numerous ties with business leaders in multinational conglomerates, *technology*, and industry. According to a significant amount of research, these sympathetic environments are ideal to support these colleges and are advantages these schools hold over four-year colleges (Keener et al., 1991; Rouche, Baker, & Rose, 1989; Strickland, 2010). In addition, in provincial environments, the development staff can stay in closer physical contact with donors (Keener et al., 1991). These colleges can attract the most
influential community figures to promote the well-being of the institution and to foster new and existing external relationships (Rouche, Baker, & Rose, 1989). In addition, community colleges have the advantage of close relationships with their local business communities like in the case of the truck donation at Community College C. These ties with local businesses will become increasingly important (Ryan, 1993) as community colleges raise much of their money from corporate donors.

The practices and fundraising philosophies of Advancement Director Bradley at Community College B are exceptional. Although her practices were not as organized as those of Advancement Director Charlemagne, her methods are nothing short of prolific, and she manages to fulfill the aforementioned duties of an advancement director while acting as dean for an entire campus, and according to President Churchill, is the preeminent fundraising leader of the college.

Research regarding the practices of Advancement Director Bradley illuminated the importance of creating reciprocal relationships with potential donors. This involved a process in which the advancement officer rarely turned down helping an influential person in any request based on the fear that the influential potential donor may not provide the fund raiser with resources when approached. Although, this type of relationship provides stress to the fund raiser and puts severe strains on work schedule adding numerous additional responsibilities, it was a critical trait of successful large gift fundraising and effective relationship managers. An additional trait established by the research associated with Advancement Director Bradley illustrated the effectiveness of investing in the philosophy of never leaving a meeting without some exchange and reciprocity of promises, services, or ideas. In addition, Advancement Director Bradley discussed cultivating a supportive work environment for coworkers and
managing a relationship with superiors and their staffs as a key factor in effective fundraising. Her relationships with her secretary and assistant exemplified a healthy and nurturing professional internal fundraising culture. This may have occurred at other institutions, but they did not articulate these tactics.

She introduced the importance of story-telling as a qualitative means to communicate in a heartfelt and meaningful way to potential donors. The story-telling approach to fundraising utilizes effective aspects of propaganda and proved to be an effective practice used at least partially at other institutions in this study. This introductory method was utilized to promote emotional investment from potential donors before promoting eventual financial investment.

Additional practices were highlighted by Advancement Director Bradley. She described that a mixed methods proposal was the preferred method by advancement professionals and foundation leadership for making the ask. Furthermore, she explained that having a previous relationship was the number one factor in deciding who should make the donor proposal. Data gathered from this advancement office showed that if no prior relationship existed between solicitor and potential donor, then shared interests of the college administration, or appropriate protocol finalized who made the ask. However, President Churchill usually had the final responsibility in making that decision.

This study’s research involving effective planning, organization, and assessment techniques illustrated that the practices of Community College C were most effective. Additionally, Advancement Director Charlemagne complex spreadsheets confirmed her efficiency and consistency as a grant writer and a fund raiser. She was the only advancement director in the study who had immediate access to quantified advancement statistics and had an effective means of communicating them in a professional and scholarly way. Partially, the
existence of this assessment technique and its necessity can be attributed to the submittal of the college’s annual President’s Report where these statistics are illustrated. This report proved a valuable method of reporting and self-assessment for the advancement officers of the community college and their foundation; furthermore, internal and external stakeholders are provided access to this documentation. It is used for audits, accreditation, and tax purposes as well.

Research suggested that foundation members are oftentimes ignorant of college advancement practices, events being held at the college, and policy involving fundraising from a state and federal level. It is imperative for the advancement director to communicate appropriate information to the foundation and be a good liaison for the college. Community College A provided a good model of connecting and clearly communicating institutional information to the foundation; however, all colleges realized it was a priority and made some efforts at it.

**Findings from the Cross (Multiple) Case Analysis**

Each of the colleges struggled to raise money for scholarships in competitive environments. One social organizational theory that can supply structure for scrutinizing community colleges’ resources that focuses “on the role of external constraints in organizations” is known as resource dependency theory (Kenton et al., 2005, p. 113). According to the theory, when organizations’ decisions are influenced by uncontrollable external limitations, administrators attempt to manage their resources in a way to alleviate strains and to maintain freedom from these obstacles. This theory attempts to explain how colleges attempt to manage necessary critical resources in order to exist and prosper (Johnson, 1995). All of the colleges within the study fund raise out of necessity in competitive environments; therefore, this theory applies to each of them.
Because the study focused on large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state, the researcher felt that he should reveal how the rural environment affected the results of the study. Interviews with participants revealed that some surrounding communities provided a surprising amount of financial support to the college. However, the research also suggested that in most cases, these resources were severely limited because the same donors gave to many causes and provided this support. Moreover, in each case, although the colleges’ enrollment was considered to be large, the surrounding communities’ populations were considered small. Therefore, there were few potential donors in each college’s service areas.

Findings from this study showed that fundraisers should put a great deal of time into the preparation and organization of fundraising events because the participants in this study experienced what good preparation and organization can do for a college. This perspective has been applied to their philosophies and translated into their fundraising strategies. The preparation suggests the investment of the internal participants in fundraising, and is done to gather potential donors and foster their continued participation as donors. If preparation and organization is consistent, then it helps create an environment conducive to consistent fundraising. Preparation proved a vital aspect of accomplishment.

Few colleges discussed the importance of thanking their donors. Only one college advancement office within the study articulated a focus on thanking donors. While the researcher observed a foundation meeting, one advancement officer mentioned that fundraising consultants recommended that donors be personally thanked seven times for a gift. Their actions echo research which shows that thanking donors was important factor in retaining donors through the practice of relationship management (Glass & Jackson, 1998b; Hodson, 2010).
Few colleges spoke earnestly about utilizing athletics in fundraising. Research shows that fundraising through collegiate athletics can be a lucrative means of obtaining resources for an institution (Fulks, 2005). Partnering with an athletics department for funding, instead of at times competing against it, would possibly strengthen both fundraising entities.

Strategic Planning and long term goals were important factors to the research. Although college leadership had different perceptions of strategic planning, it was clearly exhibited as a high priority. Some colleges strictly adhered to a strategic plan while others did not. Some leadership focused on difficulties in fundraising in an unstable market where needs had to be met whenever possible; Others believed that randomly generated funds were difficult to manage and organize, and provided inconsistency in delegating resources for long term fundraising.

All community colleges and their foundations valued the opinions of professional fundraising consultants even if they had not yet hired them; therefore, the community college leadership allowed these external participants to shape the experiences that they create for their internal participants and potential donors, creating the possibility for a more successful fundraising environment that was research driven. According to Hodson (2010) having this information expressed from an outside source reduces institutional friction and galvanizes the fundraising movement behind the president.

All colleges acknowledged the importance of cultivating and maintaining feelings of trust and respect in stakeholders to prompt investment. In relationship management, trust is needed to assure that funds raised will not be treated unethically; respect is a trait that fuels trust and it is a attribute that helps build the reputation of the college. Reputation is fostered and communicated by internal and external stakeholders. Maintaining these attributes ensures that donors will consistently give future donations.
This study revealed that the term *friendraising* is a fund raising misnomer. The term “friend” implies a non-professional, non-reciprocating relationship that has little or no tie to advancement and improving an institution’s resources. No fund raising participant in this study wanted to gain “friends” for their institution that could provide no resources for their college. This researcher suggests using the term “respect raising,” as an alternate term that better describes the focus on potential large gift donors. Most people have friends, but few can sway the future of a collegiate institution. An advancement director wants his or her institution to gain the trust and respect of the potential donor in order to cultivate a major gift that reflects the strong connection earned through successful relationship management.

Research from the study showed that each college had a different philosophy which guided their organizational practices and their focus for potential donors. Some colleges put few resources in and prioritized less on alumni giving while others had alumni associations and advancement staff members who provided oversight to these organizations and the resources they produced. According to research, relationships with older, less-involved alumni, has become a key focus of many development offices (Comstock, 2009) and when institutions foster caring and long lasting relationships with alumni, they can attract donations (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Angelo (2005) suggested that community college alumni are growing participants in giving although they only account for a small percentage of funding received from giving (around 5%). Research in this study echoed this trend.

**Fundraising professionals.** In addition, this study suggested that organizational structure was more important than size (number of staff members) in advancement offices. The number of people in these advancement offices did not directly relate to success. It was their capability to do work, complete tasks, and influences others that made them successful in “goals-
based” fundraising. “Goals-based” fundraising is a good means of development because the results can often be easily assessed (Hall, 2002). Moreover, each of the advancement offices studied that were participating in fundraising had few acting fundraisers yet raised millions of dollars for their institutions and foundations. Colleges that were actively fundraising greatly utilized “goals-based” fundraising.

“Dollars-in-the-door” fundraising involves grasping for any available funds in order to ensure that an opportunity is not missed (Hall, 1993, 2002). This is the philosophy heralded by some advancement professionals within the study. They actively tackle any opportunity to capture available ethical funding, whether or not it is part of their strategic vision. This is in direct contradiction to the plans of other fundraising professionals. Traces of this philosophy can even be found within the mission statements ad informal creeds of these colleges’ advancement offices.

In addition, the researcher found that jobs in advancement were highly tied to the individual’s personality and these professionals’ ability to fund raise was often instinctive. One president eloquently described it as “having the ability to organize and conceptualize and actualize the intricacies of the process.” Good advancement officers must attract visibility, trust, and respect for themselves and the institution they represent. Moreover, training for a good fundraiser does not involve degrees earned or formal training, but an uncanny and innate ability to mold experiences into philosophy, and apply philosophy into coordinating experiences (Shaw & Shaw, 2008). Moreover, the research of Shaw and Shaw (2008) suggested that presidents should look past degrees when hiring advancement professionals. None of the advancement professionals in this study had formal education in fundraising; advancement directors at colleges in the study were chosen because of their competency, charisma, and work ethic.
Carbone’s (1986) research has shown that knowledge used by development officers is better obtained on the job and can be possessed without formal education. Whether this is done purposefully, or simply out of necessity, all advancement directors in this study, experienced this “baptism by fire,” in which they were placed in a position where they had to learn as they performed. Foundation members received some training and education; however, data received from research was too inconsistent to display concrete results about the depth and length of training.

Chapter Summary

The foundation members and advancement officers interviewed and observed for this study displayed a commitment and passion for their profession, their organizations, and the students in which they serve. During this research, the participants described the methods and philosophies which shaped their perceptions as well as the organizational structure of their institutions. The interviewees described influencing factors that helped them develop successful methods and the techniques used in order to solicit funding. Furthermore, they described challenges and obstacles they faced in their professions. This chapter provided detailed descriptions of the themes of each individual college and their connections to each other. Chapter VI will provide an introduction, a Discussion of the Research, Conclusions and Recommendations, Recommendations for Future Policy and Practices, Recommendations for Future Research, and Closing Remarks. Moreover, the chapter will answer the overarching research question: How do large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state develop fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding?
CHAPTER VI:

THE MULTIPLE CASE STUDY: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Since the late 1980s, the increasing federal budget deficit and laws supporting tax limitation have made it incredibly difficult for community colleges to maintain their core functions on their own (Roney, 1993). Furthermore, financial support from state and federal governments for higher education continues to decline even though researchers and political leaders redundantly echo the importance of education (Gaskin, 1997). This reduced support and an increase in demand has created an environment in which community colleges must introduce austerity measures and seek new means of gathering fiscal resources (Kapraun & Heard, 1993; McLeod, Atwell, & Bedics, 1995). These fiscal pressures are forcing rural community colleges into creative measures of financing (Katsinas & Hardy, 2012).

The purpose of this study was to observe the roles of institutional actors in the fundraising process, their training, background, organization, perspectives, and philosophies during this difficult economic time. An additional purpose of this research was to inspect how fundraisers’ methods differ when approaching corporations and individuals. Using observations, document analysis, and interviews, the researcher scrutinized institutional fundraising philosophy while investigating perspectives of how fundraising efforts were organized, managed, staffed, and achieved. Furthermore, the study inspected the governance of foundations as well advancement specifics: job descriptions, student use, size related to funds generated, roles of governance, resources, methods of procuring funds, and reporting. This study displayed
differences in fundraising practices at large rural two-year community colleges in the southeastern United States and described the setting in which these events take place. This research indicated the many attributes and characteristics of fundraising at these colleges and scrutinized practices, relationships, and experiences of collegiate staff involved in institutional fundraising at large rural two-year community colleges in the southeastern United States in order to promote prosperity in resource development in today’s harsh economic climate.

Because many college fundraisers lack formal training in fundraising methods and theories (Murphy, 2009), this study provides information that may prove beneficial to current and/or future fundraisers who seek to improve their personal skills and improve the fiscal health of their institutions. Furthermore, by offering a close examination of fundraising organization, practices, philosophies, and endeavors at large rural community colleges in the southeastern United States, this qualitative study contributes to and fills a gap in the existing literature concerning community college fundraising. Furthermore, the research illuminated a number of prescriptions for how a large rural two-year college in the southeastern United States can develop fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding.

Discussion of the Research

The overarching research question of this study was: How do large, rural associate’s colleges in a southeastern state develop fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding? To answer this question, the researcher had to first focus on the concept of fundraising, and within this study one idea continued to emerge: the connection between fundraising and relationship management.

According to Peters (1992), relationships are the only factor in fundraising. Based on this premise, the researcher explored traits of effective and efficient relationships and descriptors of
effective relationship management techniques within the study to develop a graphic organizer based on factors found in the multiple case study.

Three major factors for fundraising emerged from the multiple case study. Each idea is closely connected to the other and has multiple parts. The first factor is that *relationship management is fundraising*.

![Figure 1. Factors of fundraising.](Image)

Peters (1992) declares that relationships are the only factor in fundraising. Therefore, managing those relationships must be the most important factor in fundraising. *Relationship management* includes building these relationships and maintaining them. An overall philosophy of relationship management that emerged from this study was that fundraising is a door to partnership building as much as partnership building is a key to fundraising. This is especially true with the cultivation of large gifts which usually take almost three years to cultivate (Nicoson, 2010). The ability to consistently develop large gifts is a trait of successful and evolved foundations and advancement offices (Nicoson, 2010).
The most important factors that exist in, and are a part of relationship management, are contained within the second idea of the study: resources invested by each party (solicitor and donor) and the resources expected to be obtained by the receiving party and given by the donor are integral attributes of relationship management. Equally important, communication is the means by which these needs are exchanged. Therefore, resources and communication are the major factors associated with relationship management. These two ideas are placed below relationship management in the triangle to show that they are factors of relationship management. Numerous elements emerge throughout the study that fit into either factor or exhibit characteristics of them.

Excellent communication is an imperative element to relationship management. A successful fund raiser communicates the trust and respect of the college. Furthermore, relationships are built by both interested parties communicating the traits that each wants established and known, and by communicating the needs of the participants, these needs can be met. Furthermore, making donors feel that they are receiving an excellent return on their investment matters (McClure, 2009). Here, the return on the investment and the investment are resources whether concrete or abstract. Resources have an imperative place in fundraising; they must be invested to gain additional resources from the fundraising process. Like relationships, they hinge on the idea of investment. Moreover, the donors will perceive whether or not their donation was a good investment; this perception shapes and is a part of philosophy which is one part of the third factor of the study.

The third factor that was illuminated from this research is that philosophy, environment, experiences, and participants play vital roles in shaping successful fundraising at large, public rural associate’s college in a southeastern state. These four elements are factors of fundraising
and are placed underneath *fundraising* to show that they represent ideas that make up fundraising and each represents different aspects of it. The study relinquished that maximizing the community/associate’s college’s potential in each of these factors will determine the fundraising success of that community college. Previous research has echoed similar trends in community college fundraising and a focus towards leadership and relationship management (Huang, 1997; Hon & Grunig, 1999; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000). One scholar even argues that a philosophical approach that leans toward fostering relationships in fundraising has the potential to lead to monumental success (Hall, 2002) and may be the key to securing institutional prosperity in fundraising. Research suggests that *fundraising* and *relationship management* are synonymous and have similar and oftentimes identical traits (Peters, 1992; Hall, 2002). Furthermore, for this study, terms like *activities*, *events*, and *endeavors* are considered *experiences* or ideas closely associated with experiences.

The researcher considered adding a number of additional factors to the major interpretive concept of the study, but after careful consideration, he rejected the necessity of additional categories. *Communication* was almost removed as a part of factor two because communication is the medium in which philosophy and past experiences move between two or more participants and therefore, could have been considered a part of the third factor (*philosophy*, *environment*, *experiences*, and *participants* play vital roles in shaping successful fundraising). In addition *relationship management* involved every aspect of factors two and three so it was almost removed as well. Furthermore, *resources* are directly influenced by philosophy and are therefore a part of factor three. Additionally, human resources are considered *participants*. Moreover, resources are the end result of fundraising and therefore, were almost not considered a major factor. Paradoxically, if *resources* were considered both a category for itself and the goal of
resource development, the reader could have been perceived the cognitive dissonance confusing; However, because the amount of resources, both fiscal and human, play an important part of the fundraising success of an institution, it was included as part of factor 2 although the researcher did not have access to the records which concretely proved how much each advancement office or foundation invested in fundraising each year; however, how and why these resources were divided and appropriated to fuel the different aspects of fundraising at each institution was an important aspect of philosophy, and was discussed at length in this chapter, echoing why resources is an integral part of factor 2 in the multiple case study. While reading this study, it is important for the reader to notice the complex and convoluted connections within the study’s major factors; moreover, they were not separated further in order to illustrate the interwoven nature of fundraising and describe the interconnected nature of its characteristics; similar to the characteristics that exist in the historical waves of community college fundraising (Milliron, de los Santos, & Browning, 2003).

Although luck and chance play a part in fundraising, being in the right place at the right time cannot be prepared for, nor can it be quantified, and was therefore not considered as an important factor of relationship management or fundraising, even though it did play a part in the success of these colleges. Furthermore, to better describe connections from the data with the factors of relationship management/fundraising in the study, additional terms in this research are synonymous. For example, a participant is anyone involved in the fundraising process. The term is synonymous with stakeholder and investor. An internal participant can be an advancement staff member, a member of the college or foundation, including a student, who solicits a gift or helps in the process. External participants include any person outside the college who donates time, money, or resources to the colleges, or one who gathers support from others. The term
environment can mean the location of the college, the campus, the building, or the general area surrounding a fund raiser including the general vicinity of that person or the climate of emotional responses promoted by being in contact with that individual (aura). The term experiences applies to any happenings of an individual or any event in which he or she participates. The term philosophy includes the single or multiple, simple or complex beliefs of an individual, establishment, or group, or an entity’s entire collection of concepts, perceptions, and wisdom.

Resources and communication are parts of relationship management and experiences, philosophy, environment, and participants make up fundraising. In addition, resources, communication, experiences, philosophy, environment, and participants are all factors that contribute to relationship management/fundraising; however, these ideas are loosely connected and do not always exist with concrete correlations nor are all aspects always evident within an instance of either fundraising or relationship management; furthermore, they are fluid and difficult to measure.

In addition to the overarching research question, this study included eight additional sub-questions. The findings related to each of these questions will now be discussed.

What are the role, scope, and goals of private, corporate, and foundation fundraising at large rural community colleges in a southeastern state?

The role of private fundraising in this state is to support the college under the vested interest and personal passions and inspirations of the people who give. The role of corporate giving is to produce lasting partnerships and reciprocal relationships that can grow both the college and the industry or company via enlightened self-interest. The role of foundation fundraising is a mesh between private and corporate fundraising because it involves both entities. The foundation members are individuals, whose roles involve being an intermediary between the
business world and the college. Fundraising largely depends on networking, so influence is as important to foundation members as their individual ability to donate.

The scope of private fundraising at these community colleges is often local and small, perhaps involving the purchase of an auction item, a sports ticket, or on the rare occasion helping pay for an individual student’s education or in unique instances, a large financial donation of thousands to millions of dollars, naming of a building, or donation of expensive collectibles. The scope of corporate fundraising is significantly larger and may involve donating major equipment or technology with an estimated cost up to the millions of dollars; it sometimes involves a partnership that results in the construction or renovation of entire buildings or substantial self-sustaining gifts that pays for many students’ education. The scope of foundation fundraising can be a collaboration of both private and corporate giving. Community College C has had some success in foundation fund raising, gathering assets of approximately $2,100,000. Community College B’s foundation has had great success, obtaining assets of approximately $9 million. Community College A has shown some historical success in fund raising for their legacy foundations. One legacy foundation has assets of approximately $93,000. The other legacy foundation has assets of approximately $82,000. If each college can maximize their potential in soliciting funding from corporate and private entities, then they should be able to provide many scholarships for their students.

The goals of private, corporate, and foundation fundraising seem to be aligned with similar principles. Oftentimes, the goal of this fundraising is to provide enlightened self-interest to both the donor and the recipient. In the case of fundraising for scholarships, it oftentimes involves a college’s foundation receiving a large sum of money to help students pay tuition, money that will actually go directly right into the pockets of the college where they will gain
interest on the money in their endowment or trusts. To ignorant outsiders, it may seem that colleges raise money just because they want to help young people receive education. The donors, whether private or corporate, oftentimes use the giving as a tax shelter, marketing strategy, and/or public relations campaign since they would rather not pay the money to the government anyway. In return, if the donor wants publicity, the college provides news of the philanthropic and kind souls of the donating companies. The foundation’s goal is to launder the money; it is the non-profit vehicle that acts as a tax shelter for the large sums of cash.

*What philosophies, structures, policies, and practices are in place to support fundraising efforts within the colleges?*

The philosophies in place to support fundraising efforts within the college include providing some fiscal and human resources to cultivate gifts. In addition, since the literature illustrates that most colleges have already developed advancement offices and external foundations in support of developing additional resources for the college, most colleges have followed their examples (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Since colleges have acknowledged the reduction in state and federal funding to our colleges, college leadership must philosophically promote fundraising activities (Kapraun & Heard, 1993; McLeod, Atwell, & Bedics, 1995). Certain organizational structures and systems of governance were developed from business models to be utilized in our nation’s community colleges although they are not often completely applicable (Burke & Associates, 2002; Burke & Serban, 1998; Dowd & Grant, 2007; McKeown-Moak, 2000). Other structures and systems of governance in this study were modeled from local entities. In the case of Community College A, their foundation modeled some documents and policies after a local community college and, sporadically from the non-profit foundation ran by
Foundation Vice President Adams. Policies that support fundraising efforts at these institutions include governmental protocol that promotes and secures the establishment, continued staffing, and financial support of alumni offices, advancement staff, and foundation liaisons. Practices that these entities utilize to support fundraising efforts within the colleges sometimes include technologically advanced methods of applying, assessing, and reporting. In addition, these colleges held auctions and private dinners and luncheons where highly influential citizens came to support giving to the college and its students. Reciprocal relationships were also commonly established and maintained by influential members of the foundation or advancement office in order to build and promote future cyclical favors.

Who decides what resources are provided to support the colleges’ fundraising efforts?

Most often it is the role of the college president to determine what resources are provided in order to support the colleges fundraising efforts. Furthermore, the strategic vision of the college, most often provided by the president determines what resources are attributed to fundraising endeavors. In certain instances, advancement directors have some part in the strategic vision of the college either by committee or due to personal relationship with the president. Therefore, they may have some say as to what resources are attributed to certain fundraising efforts. Furthermore, in some sense, it is the role of foundation leadership members to determine what resources are attributed to fundraising efforts. In some cases, the foundation members may hold little communication with the college in these events and pay for events strictly out of their own pockets.

What are the obstacles, challenges, effectiveness, and productivity of the fundraising efforts at the two-year colleges studied?
There are a number of internal and external factors that provide obstacles and challenges for community colleges. One serious internal challenge that colleges face is having the resources to provide a large enough staff to cultivate all the sources of possible funding. College leadership must maintain a difficult balance of funding to maintain a productive staff with enough resources to put on events that inspire others to donate without spending so much that the profits are erased. Another difficulty involves getting the total cooperation of stakeholders (staff and foundation members) to help fund raise and fully support initiatives and strategic vision. Local challenges include when surrounding communities in proximity to the institution do not highly prioritize community college giving or simply do not have enough disposable income to make a significant difference through financial support. Internal challenges and obstacles involve high turnover among staff members and policy that does not support a climate conducive to successful fundraising. External challenges and environmental obstacles include a poor economy, companies and individuals already over-burdened with gift giving and support for other local organizations. Furthermore, in one southeastern state fundraising laws are difficult to understand and too burdensome to make fundraising easy. Inconsistency in reporting and assessing make research for improvements difficult. In addition, little research exists on community college fundraising, so there are few educational resources available to help administrators successfully model the structure and practices of their institution.

Effectiveness at the community college level is difficult to assess and improve for the same reasons. Little research exists on effective practices and methods because reporting is as inconsistent as the donating habits of many donors. However, effectiveness can be measured by whether or not the college has met its goals or made improvements from the previous year. Although some positive results of fundraising campaigns or events are less likely to be
quantified: the respect and relationships that each college has produced and maintained or alliances forged. Productivity including effectiveness and efficiency can be determined by keeping and categorizing benchmarks in an organized and timely manner. However, reporting this data and utilizing it to make progress is as important as gathering it. Productivity can also be informally provided by a college’s positive reputation and an increasing scope of influence. Some community colleges in the study found marketing strategies imperative to fundraising productivity.

*How do the fundraising practices identified within the literature review compare to those at large rural Associate’s Colleges in a southeastern state?*

Zeiss and Paneitz (2003) noted that successful private fundraising should be aligned with grant-writing activities and leverage ongoing business and industrial activities. For the most part, research from this study supported this perception, however since this study was not about grant writing, research questions were not devised to illustrate similar findings. Furthermore, although letter drives, dinners, auctions, and tournaments were mentioned as being a valuable means of soliciting donations, (Dowd & Grant, 2007) no colleges within the study found letter drives as being a useful long term means of gathering significant funding. However, the use of dinners, auctions, and tournaments were found at Community College C. Community College B did not mention using athletic tournaments as a fundraising measure. Community College A had plans to use dinners and auctions but had yet to begin fundraising endeavors.

In the literature, marketing campaigns were a means of soliciting donations from business and industry (Smith, 1994). No community college within this study officially embarked on marketing campaigns, yet many activities that colleges were involved in contained attributes of marketing campaigns. For example, the art center that was opened by Community College B in
association with a local four-year college closely resembled a marketing campaign although its purpose was to raise awareness for the arts and to raise funding for art scholarships. Furthermore, workforce development and making connections with local businesses (Hall, 2002) were important traits of college fundraising within the literature review. Practices involving communicating often with business leaders at Community College C and practices involving building reciprocal relationships at Community College B provided evidence of similarities in practices for recruiting business interest and partnerships at these colleges. In addition, the training of foundation members at Community College B to eventually report and communicate aspects of the college via presentations to local business leaders reflects similar goals.

Although Community College A had a formal alumni association that was recognizable in the college’s community, Community College C most reflected the research of Nazzaro (1992) who praised the structured and well-planned utilization of alumni as a powerful fundraising force for community colleges. Community College B has no alumni association or advancement person responsible for alumni giving; however, they utilize some highly influential alumni in foundation and advancement fundraising and have met some financial goals through these connections.

Where do the primary fundraising functions lie at each institution?

In all cases that the researcher reviewed, the literature declared that the primary fundraising function lies with the college president. However, if the word “primary” means “most involved and main” then in this multiple case study, the primary fund raiser at all colleges was the advancement director. At Community College A, Advancement Director Allenby was the only advancement officer and she provided oversight for alumni affairs and the foundation and served as *ex officio* for both. Furthermore, she did the majority of all research and
communication, and provided documents and objectives for meetings. Although the previous president might have provided the vision, the rest of the college would be completely blind to fundraising without her. Moreover, since there was no president to provide fundraising leadership, the evidence suggests that the bulk of the responsibility falls unto her.

At Community College B, President Baldwin openly admitted that Advancement Director Bradley was the head of fundraising. Evidence for this is symbolized by her dean title. At Community College C, President Churchill said she granted much autonomy to Advancement Director Charlemagne, and admitted that the advancement director was a part of the committee that determined institutional direction. Furthermore, all fundraising assessments, data, results, and many of the advancement recommendations emerge from the office of the advancement director, and the president uses data from the advancement director’s assessments and results in the President’s Report and the report to the chancellor; therefore, Advancement Director Charlemagne is the primary fundraiser. However, it is true that in all cases the president has final authority to provide the direction, or to create, manage, override, or stifle directives, but no evidence suggests that the presidents at these institutions would derail any objectives of these capable and effective administrators.

What techniques are utilized in wooing potential donors?

Colleges’ representatives spoke very little about specific techniques to woo potential donors. Most evidence was vague and general. Community College B used well-scripted presentations that focused on story-telling and a mixed methods approach that utilized aspects of propaganda. Community College C used a similar, less formal approach. However, each college held an event (or in the case of Community College A, discussed holding an event) that recognized the students who received financial help to attend the college. Colleges invited
donors, potential donors, and influential community and business leaders. These events had auctions and dinners and opportunities to contribute. Community College B and Community College C both utilized online donating from the websites associated with the advancement office or the foundation. Community College B focused on sincerely and personally thanking donors via phone or in person so that the donors return, building reciprocal relationships, and attending events that fundraisers are invited to or being part of outside committees. Community College C held a special gala for ladies in the community that was a moderately successful fundraiser but a highly effective friend raiser.

Furthermore, at Community College B, foundation meetings are used to woo foundation members and guests into contributing. Their facility is spacious, well decorated, and new. The lunches are catered and the dress is semi-formal. The foundation meeting impressed the researcher.

*What factors help determine who approaches potential givers?*

Institutional protocol and prior relationships are the two major factors in determining who approaches potential donors for all colleges in this study. In many cases the president makes *the ask*; however, a substantial percent of *asks* are made either by the advancement director or by the president in concert with the advancement director. At Community College B, a team is devised to solicit the gift. Hypothetically, college leadership informed the researcher that if protocol or previous relationships were not the determining factor for choosing the solicitor, then leadership would most likely pick an administrator, foundation member, or staff member who shared interests with the donor.
The overarching research question of this study was: How do large rural Associate’s Colleges in a southeastern state develop fiscal resources in a climate of reduced state and federal funding?

After reviewing the concept of relationship management and its correlation to fundraising (Peters, 1992) the researcher, observed traits and obstacles associated with the college’s contexts: being large, rural associate’s/community colleges in a southeastern state. This study’s research illustrated that successful community colleges must have a supportive local environment with potential donors who are aware of the college’s importance and value the mission of the college. Furthermore, the college must make itself known to the community and people within the community must have the means to give. Furthermore, college representatives (advancement or foundation) must find these community members. In addition, colleges must create partnerships with business and industry. The literature review indicated that there are many attributes and characteristics of successful fundraising in community colleges (Bock & Sullins, 1987; Sader, 1986; Koelkebeck, 1994; Katsinas, Herrmann, & Traylor, 1990). The colleges studied exhibited a number of those traits.

The researcher found answers to the overarching research question that contained a number of moving parts. First, there is no proven, precise way, series of methods, or philosophies that ensure that a community college will concretely be successful in fundraising enough resources for an institution to prosper and flourish (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Moreover, in the state studied, funds raised were primarily used to pay student’s tuitions, not build an illustrious and sprawling campus or keep certain programs from closing at the college.

The multiple case study illustrated that an interweaving of complex relationships existed at each institution that utilized methods of private fundraising (Milliron et al., 2003). These
relationships were internal, external, local, and communal and merged and intersected through advancement workers and foundation members. Traits of these relationships permeated almost every segment of data.

Furthermore, research suggests that if relationships between the college and the government were strengthened, private fundraising would be less necessary (Kenton et al., 2005). Additional research suggests that a president should spend at least 60% of his or her time strengthening relationships associated with fundraising (Smith, 1986) and avoid getting bogged down with interior collegiate affairs when fundraising (Kaufman, 2004). Only one advancement director was able to provide a large percentage of her time to managing relationships for fundraising. Alternately, a president should not get so absorbed in building relationships outside of the college that he or she forgets to retain the fragile balance of the institution and its other needs (Hodson, 2010).

Moreover, research illustrated that community college fundraising has evolved into a complicated arrangement of symbiotic relationships that involves mutual and protective support amongst entities, organizations, business and industry (Glass & Jackson, 1998b; Hall, 2002). This idea was represented in the multiple case study by evidence from two different community colleges. One college recognized the importance of reciprocal relationships in fundraising and utilized this type of relationships to forge partnerships in numerous present and future endeavors. Another college forged connections with business and industry as represented by the gift of a truck that the college received for workforce training.

Research suggests that stakeholders need to clearly understand and embrace institutional goals, the role of each group, the procedures by which they operate, and the relationships necessary for successful fundraising (Mixer, 1993). This idea was best presented by one
community college which focused on creating and maintaining good internal cooperation and communication. This college’s staff and leadership exhibited a positive family-like culture and clear understanding of their roles within advancement aims. One college was in the process of building policies and procedures and was just beginning to learn about relationships in fundraising; however, their preparation involved the clear explanation of many of these policies and processes. Collectively all groups were well trained in these processes and harnessed them to make decisions and fulfill policy.

Degerstedt (1985) noted that colleges that had a genuine need for funding and whose projects were fully supported and highly prioritized by both the college and the foundation were more successful in fundraising. Two colleges echoed the legitimacy of these outcomes; however, representatives of one institution described that even financially successful fundraisers are not necessarily successes because they can put friction on existing relationships, and shared leadership can hinder friendships. For example, when the community college partnered with the four-year college to open the arts center and raise money for art scholarships, their relationships was strained because there was too much leadership on that project; as a result, they raised a million dollars but will not likely partner again.

Furthermore, research showed that integrating fundraising with institutional planning activities contributed to success (Glass & Jackson, 1998b; Jenner, 1987). This research was reiterated by fundraising minutes from meetings where both advancement directors had some sway over institutional directives and influenced the outcomes of strategic vision. In addition, both of their foundation scholarship events served a number of purposes for the college including public relations and marketing advances. These events are also utilized for raising money for scholarships for students and assessment methods at both institutions have proved their success.
In addition, research shows that innovation and determination are attributes of successful fundraising institutions (Rivard, 2002). One college showed innovation with their technology and assessment methods, and determination in the $9 million art gift they eventually received. Another exhibited determination in building long term reciprocal relationships with potential donors.

Glass and Jackson (1998a) have contended that a college’s mission and core values, and a president/community’s institutional vision should be at the heart of fundraising endeavors in the stages of goal setting, planning, and implementation. This holds true for all community colleges in this study because each college used money for the premiere purpose of access to higher education. Each college endeavored to raise large amounts of money to give a large number of local students a means to improve their lives and have access to education that they may have not received without the role of the community college and its mission.

The literature review also prescribed that fundraising staffs/resource development offices must have access to institutional research and databases (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). This occurs for one college because the advancement director is a dean of her campus. She has access to all records and institutional assessments to improve fundraising at her institution. At another college, the advancement director is the head of institutional assessment for fundraising, so she creates the assessments that she would need access to in order to prescribe changes and/or new methods. At one institution, it is unknown whether or not that their advancement director will have access to the necessary records until they have concrete management, and she is given a title associated with fundraising leadership.
Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Based upon the findings of this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations for policy and practice by institution and external governance. These recommendations would be most likely more useful in the states of Virginia, Minnesota, Kentucky, and Alabama. These states have a single statewide governing board (Tollefson, 1999) and no system of local governance. In essence, these foundations act somewhat as a proxy for a local governance board, partially expressing the needs of the community since they are not directly guided by community leadership.

These recommendations aim to improve foundation fund raising at colleges similar to those in the study. Utilizing these recommendations, Community College C could surpass its assets of approximately $2,100,000. Community College B’s foundation could substantially exceed the $9 million that they currently have. Community College could drastically mature their total legacy foundation assets of approximately $175,000. The aims of these recommendations are to help large rural community colleges fundraise.

1. Institutional: related to the themes of communication and technology, develop a protocol for selecting an Ask team and a model for making multimedia presentations to high profile private donors.

In each case study, the team developed for the solicitation proposal, included the president, the advancement director, the foundation chair, and rarely a staff member of the college who held a special relationship with the potential donor. However, research recommends that the team that makes the proposal and the ask should harness more diversity. Higdon (2003) illustrated that fundraising teams that solicit donation should sometimes involve alumni and faculty, past supporters, and the friends and family of those groups. By differentiating the
proposal and using technology, the solicitors have a better chance of creating a unique and memorable experience and improving communication. Moreover, best practices for donor solicitation involved a mixed methods approach that concentrated on story-telling and statistical evidence in a formal presentation to compel the donor.

2. **Institutional**: as issues related to governance and cooperation/collaboration/teamwork were prominent, college leadership should develop a leadership plan of action to instill during difficult fundraising campaigns which delegates authority for daily presidential duties.

The role of the community college president has dynamically developed and become critical to the community college’s prosperity (Miller, 1991). In the current economy, the president’s role has expanded as ambassador between his or her institution and the legislature, while acting as a development officer who solicits resources from high profile donors (Hodson, 2010). In each case of this study, the advancement professionals and foundation leadership acknowledged the importance of the president’s role. In the special case of one college, instability in this leadership role has slowed progress and will continue to significantly slow their progress in fundraising progression. The college has went through numerous president sin the past half-decade and this uncertainty will only hurt their fundraising capacity until it is rectified.

In fact, Essex and Ansbach (1993) argued that the president is responsible for determining which institutional priorities and goals are most significant for private gifts to be solicited. It will be difficult to ascertain concrete goals until a president consistently holds office at any community college.

Research from the literature review illustrated that fundraising is the greatest risk to community college presidents because of possible scandal and numerous internal problems that
can occur (Payton, 1989). Unfortunately, if fundraising is not successful, the president is held responsible (Glass & Jackson, 1998a). This produces a job that carries an immense amount of stress. Ryan and Palmer (2005) have declared that leadership is pivotal in the fundraising success. This study revealed that community college fundraising leadership is often incredibly busy and overburdened with an increased fundraising responsibility. Collegiate leadership, especially the president, can become overwhelmed by the intricacies of the job; therefore it is imperative for presidents and advancement leadership to surround themselves with capable, supportive, and trustworthy staffs. In addition, after a significant amount of time passes, subordinates must earn additional responsibilities and trust. When this occurs, it is important to grant these capable and trusted employees additional responsibilities, institutional freedoms, and partial autonomy. This leadership strategy reduces the president’s chances of getting overwhelmed or seeming incompetent. Leadership who unsuccessfully micromanage and excessively multitask can neglect institutional responsibilities.

These administrators are rendered imperceptive and immobile by difficult fundraising campaigns. The presidential landscape can be chaotic and an incredibly busy environment during a fundraising campaign. Administrators can get overwhelmed during times preparing for or holding fundraising events with excessively high expectations. This self-inflicted prison of perception and inaction makes it difficult for administrative leadership to effectively fundraise and/or operate in leadership situations. Kaufman (2004) suggested that presidents avoid getting too invested with interior collegiate affairs. Moreover, a president should not get so absorbed in building relationships outside of the college that he or she forgets to retain the fragile balance of the institution and its other needs (Hodson, 2010).
Therefore, effective leadership must effectively delegate tasks in order to progress and be competent fundraisers and to provide oversight and oversee tasks that they normally might have individually accomplished prior to a fundraising campaign. This added stress and responsibility makes it difficult for presidents to oversee some of the normal operations of the institution or recognize new obstacles or challenges as they arise because they may be involved in planning or participating in a fundraising campaign. Administrators may be literally or figuratively away from the action; metaphorically, like a general removed from action, forced to watch his or her army from a hilltop being decimated in battle. In fundraising, internal happenings can get the president’s attention from fundraising or external fundraising activities can blind the president to problems within the institution. Moreover, a president should not get so absorbed in building relationships outside of the college that he or she forgets to retain the fragile balance of the institution and its other needs (Hodson, 2010). Proper delegating of authority can significantly reduce blinding during times of difficult fundraising.

3. **Institutional:** Because **planning** and **governance** were important themes in the research, colleges should develop a relationship management plan to instill prior to and after fundraising campaigns in order to cultivate relationships and thank donors in sincere and memorable ways.

An additional responsibility of the president is to be sure that the college is building a reputation of respect in the community with influential organizations. Community Colleges in this study must capitalize on building future relationships with business and industry in their service communities. Both businesses and their local colleges must maintain strong and mutually beneficial symbiotic relationships to ensure prosperity and keep them both flourishing during harsh economic downturns (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). Prior to making the ask, college leadership
must make sure that businesses believe that the college places private sector commercial and industrial health as a major priority of the college. Furthermore, college leadership must thank donors and make them feel sincerely appreciated (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

4. Institutional: Because communication and stakeholders/relationship management were important themes to the study, advancement offices and foundations should severely limit impersonal, long distance fundraising methods (like phone calls and email solicitations) to a minimum.

According to all research participants, proximity to the donor was the common major factor that determined whether or not fundraising methods were successful. Long range fundraising, including online auctions or phone calls were deemed partially unsuccessful at every institution. Furthermore, one foundation president found these approaches the least worthwhile of any methods. He declared that in the short term they can be marginally effective, but because the donor does not build or maintain lasting relationships with the institution, where he or she emotionally invests donor in a meaningful and lasting way, the relationship cannot flourish, and is therefore, a failure. Furthermore, although the use of technology aids in communication, organization, and transferring funds, it was not directly found to be attributed to successful fundraising endeavors in this study. In fact, the institution’s advancement director who raised the most money through private fundraising did not consistently utilize social media in her profession. Moreover, participants in this study sometimes found technology as a hindrance or a medium which increased their workloads.

5. Institutional: Related to the theme of technology, colleges should maximize the use of technology in the application process for scholarships and the donating process for donors.
However, one community college found technology helpful in a number of instances. The foundation’s website which permitted online donating and provided a means for students to upload scholarship applications were praised at and around this institution. The premise was to make applying for scholarships easier and to minimize and organize paperwork. Furthermore, it was a goal of one foundation to increase technology to ease donating difficulties at events held by that foundation.

6. Institutional: Because governance was an important theme to the study, presidential leadership should develop a plan to best utilize advancement leadership and provide them with time to recover from fundraising campaigns.

The literature review described the difficult and complicated roles of the advancement director at the community college. Community college presidents illustrated that advancement officers were proficient in the following roles: seeking available and additional fundraising sources, conducting research that prepares the president for advancement opportunities, communicating with potential donors, developing internal and external relationships, and providing valuable public relations work for the college or its foundation (Ryan & Palmer, 2005; Townsend, 1991). Furthermore, advancement directors should be able to contact foundation directors and trustees, sometimes acting as ambassadors between the president and them, addressing possible issues before they arise (Russell & Wynn, 1996). Advancement officers should focus on the methods of structuring, maintaining, improving, and enhancing the relationship of the institution with society and selected entities that can help support the institution's mission (Glass & Jackson, 1998b). In the study advancement directors often helped develop institutional policy and fundraising direction; however, they did not often speak directly for the college. These representatives need the autonomy to be productive and motivated.
7. **External:** Because issues relating to *assessment and reporting* were important, *statewide governing boards and/or coordinating boards* should collect yearly, publicly available, formal reports from each college which illustrate foundation and advancement fundraising specifics.

Consistency played an important part in this study. The lack of consistency made outcomes from the study less concrete. There was little consistency in the answers produced by all participants either because the question was impossible to answer, the participant had trepidation in answering, or simply the participant was too busy to produce a specific, data rich answer. Perhaps this inconsistency in reporting and responding might have related to overall fundraising effectiveness; however, without consistent concrete and specific answers especially in regard to questions regarding reporting and assessment, many outcomes could only be speculated and thereby were not included within the study’ results.

This inconsistency in reporting proved a difficult factor. The researcher oftentimes found difficulty in finding reliable information from each institution that quantified fundraising at each institution. It was only by the efforts of individuals at each institution that this information was available. There is no concrete formal report or necessary public report that centralizes this information or policy that currently makes strict adherence necessary. Good policy at a state, regional, or national level would involve the necessity of this policy and for those at each institution to publicly reveal its findings.

8. **External:** Because issues relating to *assessment and reporting* and *planning* were important, *statewide governing boards and/or coordinating boards* should oversee or facilitate training courses on ethical fundraising practices and philosophies for advancement officers and foundation members.
Additional good institutional policy involves giving advancement professionals the freedom to perform while enforcing strict guidelines and training on unethical fundraising and illicit techniques. Although the advancement directors within the study explained that training protocol was in place, oftentimes their procedures were not up to date; furthermore, when the researcher interviewed foundation chairs, they often describing having very little formal training or access to rules, laws, and protocols. Moreover, research shows that fundraisers lack training in ethical fundraising (Kelly, 1995). However, the researcher was surprised to find that some advancement professionals were unclear on precisely what the laws were in their state regarding fundraising. There should be a mandatory fundraising protocol or course that college and foundation professionals undergo before they are allowed to carry out responsibilities.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

A number of recommendations can be made for future research. For this study, a researcher might expand it to colleges across the country: urban and rural or take three rural community colleges of a different region and compare them. Perhaps, a researcher could use the same method with more than three cases or compare small or medium sized institutions, or compare findings between three public and three private universities instead of community colleges. A researcher could also use these findings to develop a survey for a larger regional or national study on institutional practices.

An additional suggestion for future research includes a study which describes what factors would make a college “successful” or matured as a fundraising college, advancement staff, or foundation. Research should provide descriptors that exist at these colleges so that similar colleges could be grouped to provide easier future research. A database that provided
researchers with a list of similar institutions could easier lead to a discovery of best practices. This could be useful to researchers and administrators.

Zeiss and Paneitz (2003) noted that successful private fundraising should be aligned with grant-writing activities and leverage ongoing business and industrial activities. It might be useful for a researcher to research connections between grant writing and private fundraising at a number of community colleges by region or institutional descriptors. This could be done through surveys, by conducting interviews, and analyzing documents. If the college had concrete means of assessment, the researcher could perform quantitative analysis of funds provided for grant writing and funds related to paying for private fundraising and scrutinize the data to reveal if there are connections between funds used and funds generated.

In the cases of Community College B and Community College C, each advancement director was given a great deal of autonomy, and the research suggested that Community College A’s advancement director would have been given an advancement leadership role if the president had not been relieved of his position. A study that illuminated the traits, characteristics, and best practices of advancement directors in collegiate fundraising would be helpful to professionals who want to improve their individual performance in order to elevate their position in an institution. This could be a multiple case study at three to five institutions of similar size that utilized surveys, interviews, and institutional documents.

The researcher was surprised that gender and ethnicity were not more diverse within the study. All of the participants were Caucasian; all advancement directors were white women and the only president that was not a white woman, received a vote of no confidence and was removed from office. Whether coincidence or otherwise, a study on gender and ethnicity would be interesting and illuminating and perhaps assist rural community colleges in the southeastern
United States in increasing diversity. Furthermore, all foundation chairs were white men. An alternate study on gender and ethnicity in foundation leadership might yield similar results and add perspective on the issue. Surveys could be used across sections of the nation or by two or more individual states in order to detect hiring trends or biases.

Community colleges are understaffed, so strict reporting of fundraising data is not a high priority and neither is developing the programs to do so, especially while community colleges are struggling to survive during an economic downturn (Angelo, 2005). Therefore, community college advancement offices often report very little in regards to private fundraising. Future research could look into a way to categorize colleges in IPEDS based on fundraising techniques, money received, or physical resources gained, perhaps categorizing colleges into how evolved or matured they are based on gifts received or focus. In general, very little information on fundraising was included in IPEDS for each community college, and it could not be used in this study. Research should be done to increase IPEDS usefulness in fundraising research for community colleges. This could be done by collecting data through surveys and field research to determine the amount of fundraising data actually reported to IPEDS each year and the amount of resources or personnel used in gathering this information to report it.

A study that scrutinized best organizational structures within advancement offices and foundations would prove helpful to institutions in the early stages of fundraising or that are in the phases of restructuring like Community College A. This could be a multiple case study at three to five institutions of similar size or region that utilized surveys, interviews, and institutional documents.

In addition, a study that researched connections between marketing campaigns and fundraising effectiveness might prove helpful to advancement directors who are pondering
applying new resources to public relations. This quantitative study could be done for community colleges of a certain size or region. Field research would be necessary in order to uncover resources attributed to marketing and public relations. This study would help colleges weigh the risks and rewards for investing in funding in this manner, and it might uncover which methods provided the highest outcome for the least investment.

During the research for this study, the researcher discovered that grant writing was imperative to the survival and growth of large rural community colleges in the southeastern United States. He continuously encountered information on grant writing during the literature review and interviews. A study with a similar research method that illuminated policies, philosophies, practices, and experiences in grant writing would help numerous fundraising professionals in the community college field. This could be a multiple case study at three institutions of similar size and/or region that utilized surveys, interviews, and institutional documents.

An additional study could be done to research connections between successful advancement fundraising and foundation fundraising in conjunction with alumni associations. There seems to be some debate over the effectiveness of alumni giving at community colleges (Keener, Ryan, & Smith, 1991; Dowd & Grant, 2007; Padover & Elder, 2007). There was little literature that discussed alumni giving as a growing or more profitable trend at community colleges. A mixed methods approach that utilized individual case studies might illustrate these connections and correlations. It could be done with colleges of similar size.

**Closing Remarks**

Fundraising for scholarships represents the very best practices of college fundraising; it is an excellent example of enlightened self-interest, where the college’s advancement professionals
or its foundation sincerely raises money to help students receive higher education and bettering
their lives; thereby providing a service to their community where these local citizens can reinvest
the higher wages they will earn back into their community while reducing crime rates and
improving the overall quality of life for themselves and their community. At the same time, the
community college gets a massive influx of tuition, directly feeding itself the money raised. It is
truly a great example of a situation where all participants are bettered, and in this time of reduced
state and federal funding for education, it may perhaps be the only vehicle that fuels our nation’s
community colleges’ existence for further generations. This declaration parallels what was
suggested in the literature review (Ryan, 1988).

Research shows that community colleges with few resources and small advancement
offices are supposed to have a poor chance of easily acquiring additional funding (Dowd &
Grant, 2007). Community College B and Community College C are beating the odds. Research
from this study suggests that community college foundations and advancement professionals are
getting a lot right at large rural community colleges in the southeastern United States. Sadly, they
may have to, if they want their institutions to survive and flourish.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Research Study: Interview #1
Title/position:
Time:
Date:
College:
Place:
Interviewee:
Race: Gender: Age:

Introduction: I would like to thank you again for participating in this study and for allowing me to interview you today; moreover, your identity will remain anonymous and the information you provide is confidential. As previously discussed, I am a doctoral student pursuing a degree in Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama, and my dissertation topic focuses on fundraising at large rural community colleges in the state of Alabama. The information generated from this interview will be used to complete a portion of the study. Please review the consent form now so that we can address any questions or concerns that you have about the research. When this is finished, we will begin the one and a half hour long interview.

A. Experience and Education:
   1. What is your position at the institution?
   2. How many years of experience do you have in your position?
   3. What type of training or education do you have in this field?
   4. How is your advancement office trained?
   5. How is your foundation trained?
   6. What is their area of discipline and background?

B. Philosophy
   1. What is the college’s fundraising philosophy?
   2. How do you believe that is enacted?

C. Governance and Staffing.
   1. What is your perspective of how fundraising efforts are organized and managed?
   2. Could you describe different entities that you contact regarding fundraising at your college?
   3. How do you foster those relationships?
   4. Where does the primary fundraising function lie at your institution?
   5. How are authority and decision making distributed?
   6. How is your foundation governed?
   7. How is your advancement organized?
   8. What is the staff size for fundraising?
   9. How is their role described in their job descriptions?
10. How widespread is the use of students in fundraising activities?
11. How do you decide what fiscal and human resources that you provide for fundraising?
12. What correlations exist between planning, quality, and participation in fundraising?

D. Methods and Practice
   1. What is your experience with fundraising?
   2. What factors help you determine which employee confronts a prospective donor?
   3. What techniques do you use for prospective donors?
   4. What technology does your college use for fundraising?
   5. How do your fundraising tactics differ from corporate to individual?

E. Internal and External Factors
   1. What factors play a role in initiatives for fundraising?
   2. Do conditions facilitate (human resources and funding) those who are asked to fundraise?

F. Obstacles/Challenges
   1. Do you believe a relationship exists between size of staff and funds generated?
   2. As a percentage how much of your responsibility is fundraising?
   3. What are the obstacles and challenges in fundraising at your college?

G. Reporting and Assessment
   1. How do you report fundraising practices?
   2. How do you assess the success of your fundraising activities?
   3. How efficient is the fundraising at your institution?
   4. How effective is fundraising at your institution?
   5. How effective is your fundraising chief (president or head of institutional development)?
   6. Which practices are effective, which ones are not?

Finally, I would like to schedule an observation during an upcoming fundraising meeting or during an actual fundraising event. Please contact me by phone (256) 452-0470 or by email: swabernathy@crimson.ua.edu to schedule a date and time.

Would you like a copy of my study when it is complete?

Thank you sincerely for agreeing to participate.
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THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPLICATION

Study Title: Practices and Experiences of Fundraising Leadership in Large, Rural Associate’s Colleges in a Southeastern State

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled Practices and Experiences of Fundraising Leadership in Large Rural Associate’s Colleges in a Southeastern State. This study is being conducted by Mr. Sean Abernathy, a doctoral degree candidate in the Department of Higher Education Administration at the University of Alabama. Sean Abernathy is being supervised by Dr. David E. Hardy, Associate Dean for Research and Service and Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education at The University of Alabama. Because this study is a partial fulfillment of degree requirements, Mr. Abernathy is not receiving any salary or financial aid for completing this project.

What is this study about?

The intent of this exploratory qualitative study is to examine the methods, organization, and scope of fundraising at three large rural community colleges in Alabama. This qualitative study will contribute to and fill a gap in the existing literature concerning fundraising at community colleges. As state and federal funding for colleges continue to diminish, community colleges are exhausting increasingly diverse methods of procuring funds to not only grow their institutions but to keep key functions operating. Prior research has focused on fundraising success utilizing quantitative or mixed methods research. Some qualitative research exists but there is little on recent practices in Alabama.

Since Alabama community colleges serve a very large number of college students, it is integral to study how colleges address the challenges of filling this financial gap. Most specifically, existing literature does not acceptably scrutinize fundraising at Alabama’s large rural community colleges.

Why is this study important? What good will the results do? Do headings need to be identical?

A qualitative examination of fundraising practices and organization at large rural community colleges in Alabama will add to the existing fundraising literature. In addition, this study will illuminate the governance and staffing of fundraising at community colleges, their methods and practice, internal and external factors that effect it, obstacles and challenges, reporting and assessment, philosophy, and relationship management. Because community college enrollment continues to grow, it is ever-increasingly important to study how they raise funds and cope with economic difficulty.

Why have I been asked to take part in this study?
You have been asked to take part in this study because you are an active participant in fundraising at your institution.

**How many other people will be in this study?**
Ten active fundraising administrators from Alabama community colleges will participate in this qualitative research.

**What will we be asked to do in this study?**
If you agree to participate in this study, Mr. Abernathy will conduct an interview with you at a mutually agreed upon time and location. The interview will last approximately one and a half hours. Mr. Abernathy will use a semi structured interview question protocol as a guide for the interview. It will be audio recorded and transcribed.

Additionally, Mr. Abernathy will conduct one observation at a foundation meeting. These observations will occur after the interview (approximately 1 hour). During the visits, Mr. Abernathy will use an observational protocol sheet to record his observations of your activities in the foundation meeting. Strictly an observer, he will not participate in or interrupt normal fundraising activities.

Finally, Mr. Abernathy will ask you to provide any minutes, hand outs, or notes and other documents important to the fundraising meeting or event.

**How much time will I spend in the study?**
Each of the interviews will last approximately one and a half hours. The observation will last one full meeting or event (approximately 1 hour). Your total time of involvement in this study will be approximately 2 ½ hours.

**What will this study cost?**
The only cost to you for this study is your time.

**Will I be paid for being in this study?**
There will be no financial remuneration for participating in this study.

**What are the risks (problems or dangers) for being in this study?**
There are no foreseeable risks.

**What are the benefits of being in this study?**
There are no specific benefits to anyone that participates. However, the researcher will use the personal experiences and perspectives of fundraising professionals to arrive at conclusions that may supply valuable recommendations to current and future community college professionals interested in improving the fundraising practices at their institutions.

**How will my privacy be protected?**
Participation in the study and identity will only be known by the researcher, the participant, and those involved with the observation. You may decide when and where the private interview will
be conducted with the researcher. When the researcher reports findings and/or publishes any information using this data, he will use pseudonyms to guarantee participant anonymity.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
All data collected: observational field notes, audio tapes, interview transcripts, and documents provided by participants will be kept in a locked closet in Mr. Abernathy’s office in his home. Furthermore, he will be the only person with access to these records. It will be kept in a locked closet for up to five years after the study is completed. At the end of five years, all data will be destroyed. When the researcher reports findings and/or publishes any information using this data, he will use pseudonyms to guarantee participant anonymity.

What are the alternatives to being in this study?
The only alternative to participation is choosing not to participate.

What are my rights as a participant?
Your participatory decision will not affect your current or future employment or your relationship with The University of Alabama. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time during the study without affecting any relationships. Moreover, this study is voluntary, and so you may choose not to participate. If you start the study, you may end participating at any time.

Furthermore, The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board (a committee that looks out for the ethical treatment of people in research studies) will review study records from time to time. This is to ensure that participants in research studies are being treated ethically and that the study is being carried out as initially organized.

Whom do I call if I have questions or problems?
If you have questions about this study, please ask. You may contact me by phone (256) 452-0470 at any time or via mail at:

Sean Abernathy  
1192 Poplar Trail  
Warrior, AL 35180

You may also contact the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. David E. Hardy, Associate Dean for Research and Service and Associate Professor of Higher Education in the College of Education at The University of Alabama, via phone at (205) 348-6874 or through mail at:

Dr. David E. Hardy  
Office of Research and Service  
College of Education  
The University of Alabama  
101 Carmichael Hall  
Box 870231  
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0231
If at any time you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study or become displeased with any portion of this study, you may anonymously contact Ms. Tanta Myles, The University of Alabama Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461 or toll free at 1-877-820-3066. You may also ask questions, make suggestions, or file concerns and/or complaints through the IRB Outreach Website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. In addition, you are encouraged to complete the online survey for research participants after the study, which is located at the above site. If you prefer, you may ask Mr. Abernathy for a hard copy of the survey. If you have any further questions, you may send an e-mail to participantoutreach@bama.ua.edu.

______________________________________________________________________________

I have read and understand this consent form. I have also had an opportunity to discuss and ask questions about the study. I voluntarily agree to participate in the study. After signing the consent form, I will receive a copy for my records.

_____ Yes, you have my permission to audio record the interview.

_____ No, I do not want my interview recorded.

X-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Signature of Research Participant                   Date

X-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------