

A POLICY-RELEVANT STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT  
REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
OF NEW YORK

By

Charles H. Webb

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1982

Copyright by  
CHARLES H. WEBB

1982



Both public and private educational insitutions are confronted with serious questions concerning their financial stability. These institutions are considering alternative sources of funds. Therefore, it is important to investigate and analyze methods of increasing philanthropy to American higher education.

The purposes of this study were (a) to identify the main criteria or characteristics of an ideal development program, and (b) to conduct a policy-relevant analysis of these ideal criteria by comparisons among representative units of the State University of New York. This has been accomplished through analysis of surveys and interviews with experts in the field of development and chief development officers of SUNY institutions.

Seven research questions guided this investigation from conception to conclusions. The following conclusions were drawn from the results of this investigation.

First, twenty-four policy-relevant criteria for an "ideal" development program were established by the expert panel.

Second, in addition to gift income, the gift income potential was predicted for each institution from

- (1) market value of endowment
- (2) cost of attendance

Using potential income, institutions were classified as under-productive or overproductive.

Third, none of the SUNY institutions included in this study met all the criteria established by the expert panel. There was considerable variation by type of institution when measured against the "ideal" criteria.

Fourth, the use of predicted gift income when compared to gift income alone allowed for finer discrimination among institutions with reference to program development capability.

Fifth, in the area of Organizational Structure and Program Resources, eighty-one percent of questionnaire items had higher overproductive averages (i.e., were closer to the ideal) than underproductive averages. In the area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques, fifty-three percent of questionnaire items had higher overproductive averages than underproductive averages. In the area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituences, thirty-nine percent had higher overproductive averages than underproductive averages.

Sixth, the tentative characteristics of an "ideal" development program were specified.

Seventh, a set of policy-relevant criteria is available for use by SUNY institutions. SUNY institutions can study their responses to each criterion and compare their responses to other overproductive and underproductive institutions.

To my wife, Philippa  
and sons, David and Jason



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my personal gratitude to the many individuals who helped bring this research effort to fruition:

Dr. Richard L. Featherstone, Chairman of the Dissertation Committee, who encouraged exploration in this area of study. Dr. Featherstone gave freely of his time, energy and expertise, providing the guidance necessary to make this study possible.

Dr. Walter F. Johnson, Dr. Ted Ward and Dr. Rollin H. Simonds, Committee Members, who freely provided advice and counsel throughout the doctoral program. Many hours were spent critiquing and providing faithful support for the study.

Chancellor Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., who has repeatedly provided me with professional opportunities in higher education. Chancellor Wharton encouraged and supported this project through his time and efforts.

Mr. Robert Perrin, Vice Chancellor for University Affairs and Development, who has been most supportive in my professional aspirations and has given his time and expertise in support of this study.

Mrs. Edwina A. Jensen, my secretary, who has been most supportive, patiently typing the many drafts and always doing it cooperatively.

My many professional colleagues within SUNY, who willingly participated in this study. Each of them has made my work and this study most enjoyable.

The members of the expert panel and reviewers who gave most generously of their time and expert advice.

Dr. Steven J. Kidder, Associate in Education Research for the New York State Education Department who sacrificially spent many long hours in the design and interpretive stages of this study. Dr. Kidder always encouraged and challenged me for needed clarifications, and his statistical expertise and knowledge of technical writing made the completion of this work much easier and better.

My parents, Mr. & Mrs. Howard Webb, and parents-in-law, Dr. & Mrs. R. Ainsley Barnwell, all of whom aided in ways too numerous to mention during the long process toward this end. A more loving and encouraging family would be difficult to imagine.

Finally, to my wonderful wife, Philippa, and two vivacious sons, David and Jason. They endured the many evenings and weekends alone, always having words of encouragement. Without Philippa's love, unfailing confidence, and assistance, this research would never had been accomplished. Her sacrifices and the boys youthful energy made this project a joy.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
CHAPTER	
I	INTRODUCTION..... 1
	The Problem..... 2
	Significance..... 10
	Purpose of the Study..... 10
	Limitations of the Study..... 12
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... 13
	Introduction..... 13
	Historical Perspective of Educational Fund Raising in the United States..... 13
	Twentieth Century Philanthropy..... 20
	Policy-Related Studies of Development Programs.... 31
	Organization and Management..... 31
	Sources and Constituencies..... 34
	Methods and Techniques..... 35
	Record Keeping and Gift Processing..... 37
	Summary..... 39



## CHAPTER

III	METHODOLOGY.....	39
	Research Questions.....	41
	Population and Sample.....	42
	Criteria of the Ideal Development Program.....	43
	Final Questionnaire Development.....	44
	Additional Data Base.....	46
	Data Collection Procedure.....	48
	Data Treatment and Analysis.....	49
	Research Question Number One.....	50
	Research Question Number Two.....	50
	Research Question Number Three.....	52
	Research Question Number Four.....	53
	Research Question Number Five.....	53
	Research Question Number Six.....	54
	Research Question Number Seven.....	54
IV	RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS .....	56
	Research Question Number One.....	56
	Research Question Number Two.....	60
	Research Question Number Three.....	62
	Research Question Number Four.....	68
	Research Question Number Five.....	68
V	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	89
	Synthesis of the Findings.....	89
	Research Question Number Six.....	89

Policy Implications for SUNY.....	101
Research Question Number Seven.....	101
Practical Interventions and Applications.....	105
Issues for Development.....	106
Recommendations for Further Research.....	106

## APPENDICES

A	List of Members of the Expert Panel.....	109
B	<u>Survey Instrument - I</u> , Initial and Follow-up Letters to Respondents.....	110
C	Program Development Questionnaire and Cover Letter.....	142
D	Program Development Questionnaire, Items Related to <u>Survey Instrument - I</u> , Criteria.....	166
E	Pilot Study of Program Development Questionnaire..	168
F	Study of Response Consistency of Items on Program Development Questionnaire.....	174

REFERENCES.....	178
-----------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	181
-------------------	-----

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Policy-Relevant Criteria Approved by Expert Panel.....	57
2. Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Organizational Structure and Program Resources.....	63
3. Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies.....	65
4. Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Fund Raising Methods and Techniques.....	67
5. Rank of Institutions Based on Average Gift Income and Gift Income as Percent of Potential.....	69
6. Average Rank by Type of Institution for Gift Income and Gift Income as Percent of Potential.....	70
7. Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP) versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in the Program Area of Organizational Structure and Program Resources.....	73
8. Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP) versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in the Program Area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies.....	82
9. Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP) versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in the Program Area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques.....	84
10. Percent of Items with Overproductive Average Greater than Underproductive Average by Section of Program Development Questionnaire.....	88



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Of all the initiatives undertaken by the State University to strengthen its current position, voluntary support from the private sector has the greatest potential for maintaining and enhancing excellence (Wharton, 1980).

With these words, Chancellor Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., on March 5, 1980, expressed to the New York State Senate Committee on Higher Education the importance and advantages of undertaking a new initiative in private fund raising for State University of New York. Chancellor Wharton further stated:

...in most instances, funds available through our regular budget are earmarked for operating purposes and other set functions, leaving no room for flexibility, innovation or the margin of difference between adequacy and excellence. In fact, operating funds themselves are now severely curtailed, further jeopardizing our ability to move forward (Wharton, 1980).

With limited financial resources in an inflationary economy, the State University of New York finds itself in much the same financial position as other major public universities throughout the country. Attempts to improve this position must be initiated now.

The purpose of this investigation is to provide an in-

depth policy-relevant analysis of the current status and methods of fund raising employed by representative colleges and universities within the State University of New York. This investigation is designed so that similar institutions of higher education will also benefit from the findings.

### The Problem

Both public and private educational institutions are confronted with serious questions concerning their financial stability. In an environment of declining enrollment projections, erosion of endowment funds and inflation, academic institutions are seriously considering alternative sources of funds to augment their programs of education, research, and public service. Therefore, it is important to consider the need and importance of philanthropy to American higher education.

Cheit (1971) was among the first to be outwardly concerned with the financial stability of academic institutions. In 1970, he completed an investigation involving 41 campuses in 21 states and had the following to say concerning the fiscal structure of these institutions:

Despite the growth, however, the fiscal structure of many institutions was not sound. There were problems of inadequate or neglected plant remaining from the Great Depression and World War II. Much of the library, laboratory space, and equipment support needed for new programs and new students was either not funded or financed by heavy dependence on foundation and government assistance of an explicitly



temporary nature. There was neither budget nor plan for permanent financing in the event of a downturn. Some institutions adopted new graduate programs without realizing how much it would cost to carry them on at their desired level of quality. Where plant expansion was financed, long-term maintenance and equipment replacement (sometimes only five years for scientific equipment) often was not. It was a time of competition for quality resources in the face of a generally rising price level. Many institutions were "trading up" in quality and getting caught by high expenses of transition. Some of the university administrators, who were aware during that time of the dangers of undercapitalization and over-expansion, could not deflate the boom psychology on their campus or were willing (or forced) to gamble that subsequent income would be found to bail them out (pp. 5, 6).

In American Higher Education in Decline, Ashworth (1979) said the following concerning higher education financing:

American higher education at this moment is nearing the end of one of these cycles. It has just spent twenty years responding to public pressures through government to grow, to open its doors to students previously denied access, to expand and add programs and degrees, to construct new buildings and campuses, and to correct social inequities -- and these are but a few of the demands. Our colleges and universities are not trying to explain why they should convince the public that the benefits of continued high levels of investment in higher education exceed costs. They are trying to defend the quality of their graduates to a public that is discovering more and more evidence that many college graduates lack basic skills in their specific fields of study and are deficient in their general education. Some degree holders are even found to be unable to write effectively or to do the simple computations required to function in today's world. In this cycle's response to questions about quality, the educators have extended the concept of diversity and are now rationalizing



new forms of education by claiming they are simply "non-traditional delivery systems" for an education equivalent to that provided by the old forms. In the face of inflation, staggering future indebtedness incurred during the recent period of rapid expansions and competition from non-traditional institutions, college and university presidents are applying every approach they can contrive in order to survive the upcoming decade. They look ahead and see that enrollments and income are likely to decline while costs continue to rise (pp. 21, 22).

In a report by the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on College and University Endowment Policy, Williamson (1975) stated:

After two decades of relative prosperity, colleges and universities are now facing critical financial problems. Higher education is confronted with the harsh reality of both a slowdown in enrollments and a continuing rise in costs. What is more, the prospect of an actual decline in enrollment appears imminent. Although it is still too early to tell whether the quality of higher education will ultimately be strengthened or weakened by these developments, it is clear that the premises and policies appropriate in an era of rapid growth are inappropriate for an era of slowdown and uncertainty (p. 23).

Enrollments have become a critical factor in the financial stability of many academic institutions. The January 28, 1980, Chronicle of Higher Education cited the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education's final report showing that during the next two decades projected declines in enrollment will be from 5 to 15 percent. Such decline could be severe enough to bring fundamental changes to many American colleges and universities

and threaten the survival of others. Already the council sees signs of struggle for survival at some institutions. Some of these survival signs include the following:

The lowering of admissions requirements.

The search for non-traditional students, who in the past, have been least preferred.

The increased emphasis on retention of students sometimes regardless of their performance.

The rising level of grades to attract and retain students in courses and departments.

The turn toward vocational and professional subjects following student demand.

The introduction of new fields and courses that are highly popular with students.

The faculty interest in collective bargaining to protect tenure and real income, and, sometimes, to resist the impacts of affirmative action.

The effort to find top leadership which is good at cost accounting or at recruitment of students or at fund raising or at all three: to find managers for survival ... instead of innovators and planners for a different and hopefully better future (pp. 1, 11).

In general, the council concludes, the next twenty years will be fraught with a variety of problems for higher education, problems that will be difficult to solve.

Another assessment of the financial decline facing higher education was stated by educator and author, Mayhew (1977) in Legacy of the Seventies:

Just as suddenly as higher educational affluence and support had come, it began to go, between 1968 and 1970. And, as was true of the "golden years," the indices of



changed conditions can be quickly enumerated and are for the most part well known. Suddenly institutions found that their rates of increase of total revenue, and the reserves that had been built up during the 1960's were quickly eliminated through deficit spending...thus a downward spiral was initiated, with lower enrollments generating less income with which to support fixed and increasing costs. Lower enrollments in residential colleges lowered occupancy of newly constructed residence halls built with loan funds in the expectation that debt service could be easily taken care of by constant or expanding demand for residence hall facilities. When lower-than-needed debt service funds were acquired, those obligations had to be paid out of operating funds, thus intensifying already acute cash problems (p. 265).

In Mayhew's (1979) more recent book entitled Surviving the Eighties, he devotes chapters to such issues as Increasing the Chances for Survival, Managing Crisis and Developing Management Systems, Upgrading Recruitment and Admissions Procedures, and Maintaining Enrollments and Controlling Program and Faculty Costs. Mayhew's work centers on procedures and strategies for solving fiscal problems higher educational institutions will face in the decade of the eighties and beyond.

More recently, the February 17, 1981, Chronicle of Higher Education featured an article entitled "Serious Financial Problems Facing States Portend a Lean Year for Public Campuses." This article included the following important points:

Public colleges and universities -- which count on state government for about 45 cents of every dollar in their budgets -- face formidable financial difficulties in the

legislative sessions now under way.

Items:

Federal funds distributed to the states have been substantially reduced, increasing the competition for state tax money.

The economic recession has sharply reduced the states' income and sales-tax receipts.

Relatively high rates of unemployment, which are helping to maintain college enrollments at record levels, also result in increased welfare payments -- which further drain state treasuries.

Inflation has forced up the states' spending faster than it has raised their tax revenues.

Tax relief measures and spending limits imposed when their treasuries were bulging with surpluses a few ago have limited some states' ability to deal with economic downturns (p. 1).

The article continued with the following:

In the stepped-up competition for available state funds, higher education may have trouble mustering public support. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education reports that recent public-opinion surveys have shown "surprisingly strong sentiments to curtail public higher-education budgets before other public services."

One of the surveys, by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, asked people where they would make the biggest cuts if state and local budgets had to be curtailed. Twenty-three percent picked tax-supported colleges and universities as their favorite targets for budget cutting, topped only by the 40 percent in favor of reducing the spending on parks and recreation (p. 6).

Leslie (1971) summarized important factors that he



believes have contributed to the financial constraints higher education is now facing:

1. The leveling off and consolidation of federal and state financial support, which accelerated so rapidly during the golden years of the mid-sixties;
2. The increased competition for funds which higher education now has to face from social and ecological programs;
3. The decreased net revenue from tax sources governmental units now receive;
4. The apprehension among elected officials concerning the ability of institutions to manage themselves (p. 6).

In 1978, college and university presidents responding to the Carnegie Council survey indicated what changes they would like to see at their institutions in the next decade. The first priority was that of improving academic programs. The second-ranked response was improved and expanded physical facilities and the tenth-ranked response was improved fund raising. The final question in the Carnegie Council survey of college and university presidents was: "In your judgement, what are likely to be the most important issues facing American higher education between 1980 and the year 2000?" Financing higher education, maintaining enrollments and preserving the private sector were the first, third and sixth most frequently mentioned issues. These issues provide an indication of the important role philanthropy

will have in higher education throughout the remainder of the century (Carnegie, 1980).

In the Handbook of Institutional Advancement by Rowland (1978) there are many articles on fund raising practices, but especially important was the following:

Every American enterprise that depends, to whatever degree, on gift income knows that institutional survival is in serious jeopardy. Private schools, colleges, hospitals, and churches are especially threatened, and some have closed their doors in the recent past. Those that depend primarily upon public funds face growing taxpayer resistance, and are re-evaluating the quality and quantity of their services. In the years ahead, fund-raising success will be more important than ever before (Rowland, p. 265).

At a time when financial support from the private sector is at an all time high, yet not keeping pace with inflation, our colleges and universities are confronted with other financial problems. These additional problems include curtailment of federal and state financial assistance and the demands of costly new programs. Private sector gifts, therefore, become an indispensable element in the continued development and preservation of an educational institution, whether public or private. The need to respond to increasing financial demands is forcing academic institutions to expand their financial base through philanthropy from the private sector. How best to expand this financial base is the focus of this investigation.



### Significance

The significance of this study is reflected in the following points: (1) review of the literature indicates this investigation to be one of few studies directed specifically at policy-relevant questions of fund raising techniques; (2) the study addresses a recognized need -- better fund raising strategies -- as identified in fund raising literature; (3) for the first time, representative SUNY campuses will have available policy-relevant findings on their fund raising programs; (4) the findings of this investigation will benefit other academic institutions concerned with fund raising; and, (5) the findings will provide new direction for additional investigations of the organization and administration of effective development programs.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation is to provide an in-depth policy-relevant analysis of the organization, management, methods and effectiveness of fund raising at representative SUNY institutions. Included in this study will be university centers, health science centers, arts and science colleges, agricultural and technical colleges, and community colleges.

With the prospect of declining enrollments, inflation and increased competition for state and federal dollars, it is essential that public colleges and universities aggressively pursue philanthropy from the pri-

vate sector. This investigation will therefore answer questions concerning optimal fund raising strategies for the private sector.

#### Limitations of the Study

This study was limited in several ways. First, it only dealt with the State University of New York. There was no attempt to study either the private sector of higher education in New York State or to study the City University of New York, a unique system of public higher education in the state.

Second, the SUNY specialized colleges were not included in the sample because of their unique relationship to the industries they serve. In one instance the foundation serves the fashion industry, and in the other, the pulp and paper industry. Currently, the latter institution is without a chief development officer.

Third, one community college was dropped from the sample for lack of program output data from its fund raising activities for the past two years.

Fourth, variations existed among institutions in the definition of an alumnus. For the purposes of this study, an alumnus is defined as a degree-holding graduate.

Fifth, the sample of New York State colleges and universities was small but representative. Because of the small sample, data analyses were primarily descriptive.

Organization of the Study and Overview  
of Subsequent Chapters

This dissertation is reported in five chapters. Chapter One includes the introduction, problem, significance, purpose, and limitations of the study.

Chapter Two presents a review of related literature. Major topics reviewed include a brief history of philanthropy in the United States and a description and review of educational fund raising from the perspective of program improvement.

Chapter Three summarizes procedures including research questions, ideal program criteria, sample selection, questionnaire design, and data treatment.

Chapter Four includes results and comparative analyses.

Chapter Five includes a synthesis of the findings and the basic structure of an "ideal" but realistic development program. In addition, this chapter includes policy implications for SUNY, possible practical interventions and applications, and recommendations for further research.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This study provides an in-depth, policy-relevant analysis of optimal fund raising strategies. For background, this chapter reviews selected literature on philanthropy and relates this literature to the study. The literature selected for review is organized into two principal sections. First, literature concerning philanthropy in the United States is surveyed with special attention given to the history of educational fund raising. Second, literature concerning the organization, management, methods and effectiveness of educational fund raising is reviewed from the perspective of this policy-relevant study.

#### Historical Perspective of Educational Fund Raising in the United States

Cutlip (1965) wrote the first and perhaps the most scholarly investigation of the history of American fund raising to date. His book, Fund Raising in the United States, describes the evolution of fund raising and its effect on philanthropy and institutions. Cutlip documents the shift in philanthropy from the social elite to the "common" man, from

the predominately religious to predominately secular contributors, and from the volunteer to the professional.

Private generosity for the betterment of mankind is a unique American trait of the twentieth century. While private philanthropy once flourished in parts of Europe, the tradition has been lost there to the state, which now controls through politics and supports through taxation most educational, religious and cultural agencies (Broce, 1979). Historically, Americans, however, have been committed to preserving private philanthropy. For this reason, Marts (1966), a distinguished member of the fund raising profession, concluded that private philanthropy is one of the most durable factors of American life.

The first systematic effort to raise money in the United States had its origin in 1641 when Harvard College sent three clergymen to England to solicit cash contributions for the purpose of educating "the heathen Indian". Historian Morison (1965) related this account:

The Weld-Peter begging mission, which one may call in modern terms, the first concerted "drive" to obtain income and endowment for the College, began early. On June 2, 1641, the General Court entreated their respective churches to release Hugh Peter of Salem, Thomas Weld of Roxbury, and William Hibbens of Boston to go to England upon some weighty occasion for the good of the country (p. 4).

During those formative years, the colonial colleges concentrated their efforts in securing revenue primarily by looking to Great Britian. Speaking of fund raising during the



colonial days, McAnear (1952) recalls the financial difficulty faced by the first American colleges:

The greatest problem faced by the college administrators was that of getting the money necessary to keep the college open, for students' fees paid only a small part of the cost. In their search for requisite funds, promoters of the new colleges found that tapping the provincial treasure yielded only a trickle of cash. Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary all had been given both grants and annual subventions by their respective provincial governments or by the King. Among the newer colleges, only Dartmouth, King's and Philadelphia were voted money from the public treasuries, and King's alone was treated generously. None ever received an annual public subsidy, despite repeated applications (p. 4).

Because of financial difficulties, the English coffers were regularly and successfully tapped for more than a hundred years until a growing hostility between the mother country and her colonies resulted in the American Revolution, thus bringing the solicitation process to an end. Again, speaking of this early fund raising process McAnear (1952) records:

"The colleges were . . . saved by the development of widespread popular interest in higher education, interest intense enough to impel thousands of individuals, both in America and in the British Isles, to make cash gifts aggregating a very considerable amount. The collection of funds from private individuals was systematized, and methods of organized effort and personal solicitation directed by persons closely connected with the colleges were developed (p. 612).

The development of higher education in the United States prior to the twentieth century was therefore attributable to private initiative and private funds. Almost every early educational institution founded in the United States was dependent, in part or in whole, on support from private gifts.



These private contributions enabled educational programs to achieve a level of excellence that would otherwise have been impossible. Private philanthropy was responsible for the development and support of scores of private and public institutions throughout the country. Marts (1953) found that private gifts to higher education, through personal efforts, founded such outstanding institutions in the United States as Harvard in 1636; Yale in 1701; Dartmouth in 1769; Amherst in 1821; Marletta in 1835; Knox in 1837; Olivet in 1844; Beloit and Grinnell in 1846; Washington in 1853; Washburn in 1865; and, Pomona in 1887.

The first attempt at a new type of fund raising, a federated fund drive, was undertaken in 1829 by Matthew Carey, who was interested in several social issues: wages for women, health, banking, immigration and tariff. In May 1828, Carey approached 97 "citizens of first respectability" to sign an appeal for funds entitled "Address to the Liberal and Humane". Carey (1965), reporting on the federated fund drive, stated:

This experience was tried for twenty days and a half. The last four days were but twelve dollars received and on the last day there was but a single dollar collected, which was not sufficient to pay the collector (p. 8).

It was, as Carey stated, "surely time to abandon the plan as hopeless". A total of 137 subscribers donated \$276.50. Although this campaign in many aspects was a failure, the fact remains, that the elements of modern fund raising were exercised, namely, the paid solicitor, the advance promotion,

the classified prospect list, and the federated drive.

During the 1800's, many colleges were experiencing severe financial constraints requiring resourceful fund raising efforts by the President. Typical was the Rev. E. P. Tenney of Colorado College, described by a former student as a "promoter of no mean rank". James Drummond Ellsworth, pioneer public relations director for the Bell Telephone System, remembers President Tenney in these words:

Every now and then the College (Colorado) treasurer would report that the young, struggling institution was out of funds. Thereupon, "Prexy" Tenney would jump the next train for the effete East where by hook or crook he would procure enough money to keep going for another few months. As far as anyone knew he never came back empty-handed and the College never closed down...The enterprising president brought back from the East not only money for the college, but he also brought back students to fill the dorms...

One of the president's fund raising schemes was to get students to take up land by pre-emption claims in the upper Cheyenne Canyon, and a caravan started with a party of young women students riding donkeys and with the boys driving the pack animals. The enterprise collapsed because the Boston girls could not cook and did not like camp life so like the Duke of York and twice ten thousand men, they marched up the hill and then down again. But, President Tenney built the useful institution of learning on desert ground, nursed it through infancy and by its means gave a broader life to many ambitious youth" (Ellsworth, n.d., pp. 16-18).

Recalling the end of the nineteenth century, Cutlip (1965) noted that from 1875 to 1900, America doubled its population, jammed its people, including large waves of immigrants, into larger and larger cities, enthroned the machine and developed mass production of goods and spanned the nation with rail and



wire communication. It was a turbulent, frenzied period of development making America into an interdependent society of specialists working along one massive national assembly line. These spectacular developments, according to Cutlip, brought with them increasing social and welfare problems that could only be met through the collective efforts of the whole community (p.23).

As the United States was experiencing major social changes in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, philanthropy of eleemosynary institutions was to respond by profoundly changing the nature of social, welfare, health and education institutions by making philanthropy a broad public enterprise rather than a selected activity for the very rich and elite.

Educational philanthropy in the United States prior to the twentieth century, in light of the economic conditions under which this group of young colonies were forming, was always characterized in the context of social issues. Organized religion dominated practically all colleges during the early years and a large portion of gifts came from the church, primarily for purposes of influence. There is good evidence that a significant portion of gifts received were for restricted purposes meeting fundamental needs such as buildings, grounds, professorships, library and scholarships. Unrestricted gifts, though relatively small in amount, were fairly dependable. There is also evidence in some foundation documents, with the exception of William and Mary, that most



early institutions intended from the start to rest upon philanthropy (Sears, 1922, p. 31).

The nineteenth century saw the beginning of public financial assistance to certain private institutions. John Quincy Adams's first annual message to Congress in 1825, under the rubric of promoting internal improvements, supported assistance for expeditions to the interior of the continent. This meant limited financial support for faculty who were professional naturalists and academic scientists (Nielson, 1979, p. 31). As Daniels (1971) in his social history of science in the United States observed, "Little thought was given to the idea of public support for science per se: it was only specific enterprises that could be viewed as necessary instruments for securing some public purpose which the democratic society could properly patronize" (p. 176).

In 1850 Jonathan Turner put forth a plan for the creation of public colleges: "If the farmers and their friends will now but exert themselves, they can speedily secure...for each State in the Union, an appropriation of public land adequate to endow in the most liberal manner a general system of popular industrial education" (Nevins, 1962, p. 14). Indeed Jonathan Turner's objective was accomplished in 1862 by the passing of the Morrill Act allocating a total of 16,000 square miles of federal land which the states could sell to create a network of land grant colleges.

During this same period of time many private institutions, originally founded on philanthropy, began looking to the government to assist in their financial plight. The same public pressures for democratic control over higher education also took the form of demands for greater accountability over private colleges receiving public funds (Nielson, 1979, pp. 32-33). Certain private institutions toward the end of the nineteenth century reacted to the public pressure for democratic control. Citing Harvard College as an example, Morrison (1936) writes that the state had retreated from the legislative control it might have exercised over Harvard by denying it further allocations; on the other hand, the college felt "...that to protect academic freedom she must at the earliest opportunity free her government from political elements; and that, as a price for freedom, she must look to her own alumni...not to the Commonwealth, for support" (p. 30).

### Twentieth Century Philanthropy

With Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller leading the way, large-scale philanthropy and benevolent foundations began emerging during the early part of the twentieth century. Andrew Carnegie, who had already amassed a fortune in steel making in excess of \$30 million, published his Gospel of Wealth insisting that "the millionaire will be but a trustee for the



poor," and in the early 1900's set up several large foundations (Andrews, 1978, p. 5). His were not the first but they set a pattern followed by John D. Rockefeller and others. The birth of major foundations brought fundamental changes in American philanthropy, even more significant than the growing list of large gifts to public projects. "Most earlier charitable trusts had been established for some narrowly defined purpose...The major trusts founded by Carnegie and Rockefeller, however, were limited only to the advancement of knowledge and human welfare. Relieving the needy was not their objective. They would attack misery at its source through the weapon of research" (Bremmer, 1960, p. 117).

During the same period, and into the 1920's, an important development in the field of fund raising emerged, namely, the federations. Community chests probably were the most outstanding examples of the federations, though there were others. Such federations of social agencies often had functions of planning and community organization of great significance but their fund raising functions were relatively unique. Federated fund raising techniques can be summarized as follows:

Usually all contributors are "members" of the chest, entitled to vote at the annual meeting, and sooner or later in smaller communities a number of these persons become members of the board of directors and gain intimate knowledge of the activities of local agencies and their budgeting problems. The fall campaign is highly organized, and draws in a veritable array of solicitors who attend district and general meetings, receive special publicity, and by their voluntary activities are given a



sense of participation. Finally, in a well-conducted campaign, every resident is invited to contribute (Andrews, 1950, p. 139).

Another important development in fund raising had its beginning with the Y.M.C.A. movement. The "campaign method" grew out of the concern of many that they were spending too much time begging for money. The solution was the campaign, staged with fixed goals and time limits, enabling the money-raising chore to be completed quickly.

A review of the early Y.M.C.A. techniques shows that many practices that were successful then are still productive today. The first campaigns stressed (1) careful organization, (2) picked volunteers, (3) team competition, (4) powerful publicity, (5) large gifts to be matched by the public, (6) careful records, (7) report meetings, and (8) a definite time limit (Broce, 1979, p. 11).

The decade of 1919-1929, termed by Jones (1965) "the golden age of fund-raising", came to a sudden halt; economic ruin and social chaos marked the Great Depression (Cutlip, p. 296). However, in the 1920's, the focus of philanthropy shifted from major capital fund drives for colleges and other civic groups to public giving for relief. And, in the 1930's another significant, far reaching development in American fund raising occurred with the passage of the 1935 Revenue Code allowing corporations a 5 per cent deductibility clause (Cutlip, p.318). Corporations today still take advantage of this important philanthropic tax law.

World War II brought new challenges to fund raising professionals. Capital programs that had begun gathering momentum as economic conditions were improving, were deferred or cancelled. Cutlip (1965), reflecting on the challenges of this period, concluded the following:

The fund raising lessons of World War I, the twenty years' experience with federated fund raising, and the dramatic lessons taught in the depression, were to be reflected in the money raising of World War II. This time there was less lost motion in getting to the task of unifying appeals and building organizations to provide money for the religious, recreational, and welfare needs of a nation in uniform and in total war production. The promotional patterns of World War I would be repeated, albeit with more style, more skill, more finesse -- and bigger totals. For the second war the fund raising professionals had the new and powerful medium of radio to use in their exhortations (p. 397).

The 1950's witnessed the emergence of federal funding programs. Jones (1949), a recognized fund raising expert, writing at that time, had these observations:

The government adds to the prospective giver's confusion. . . Now the very taxes that make possible this government financing are simultaneously altering the field of philanthropic support. The alteration is drastic. High taxation is resulting in the gradual disappearance of the multi-millionaire class . . . This shift in the balance of giving is forcing philanthropies to look elsewhere for support (pp. 8-9).

At the same time the American Association of Fund Raising reported:

Over the eleven year period from 1950 through 1960 Americans increased their investment in the nation's philanthropically supported institutions at a faster pace than either personal income or the gross national product



advanced. Private support of our religious, educational, health, and social organizations increased 100 percent in this period, while personal income rose 78 percent, and the gross national product 77 percent (American Association of Fund Raising Counsel, 1962, p. 10).

These figures suggest that Americans were becoming more generous, fund raisers more skillful, and perhaps multiple appeals more effective.

The decade of the 1960's was characterized by rapid growth and development of institutions in higher education. Harvard University had gained new status with the completion of an \$82 million campaign. Other institutions launched and successfully completed equally impressive campaigns. However, even in this positive climate of philanthropy, many academic institutions were confronted with financial stress (Cheit, 1971). In 1969, at the close of the decade, the Congress passed and the President signed into law the Tax Reform Act of 1969 which affected fund raising in the decade of the 1970's, both positively and negatively (Carson and Hudson, 1973).

During the latter part of the 1960's and throughout much of the 1970's the image of higher education waned in the public's eye. Educators, students, alumni and the general public began questioning life styles and personal values as well as challenging traditional teaching techniques and institutional goals. During the early years of the seventies, educators were aware of three pervasive conditions:

1. In the public eye, the image of higher education had become tarnished. To the public,



higher education -- the system in which so many people had put such high hopes for the advancement of mankind -- had proved to be as fallible as man himself.

2. Financially, some of our colleges and universities were in such economic straits that there were questions whether they could survive. In fact, among small, private colleges, the institutional death rate had begun to climb. Even the most affluent and most prestigious institutions, public and private, had experienced deficits and restricted spending.
3. The ordinary way of "doing things," of managing our institutions, was no longer adequate -- either for the given task or for the time left in which to complete that task (Leslie, 1969, p. 3).

In November, 1973, the Commission of Private Philanthropy and Public Needs was established with two primary objectives: (1) to study the role of philanthropic giving in the United States and, (2) to study that area through which giving is principally channeled, that is, the voluntary "third sector" of American Society. This special committee, chaired by John H. Filer, was commissioned to make recommendations to the United States Congress and the American people regarding the third sector and how it might be strengthened and become more effective. The research conducted spanned more than 700 organizations and individuals and was published in the book entitled Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector (1975).

The commission's findings concerning nonprofit activity and philanthropic giving is summarized in four broad observations:

1. The voluntary sector is a large and vital part of American society, more important today

than ever. But the sector is undergoing economic strains that predate and are generally more severe than the troubles of the economy as a whole (p. 16).

The commission estimated that there may be as many as six million organizations in American society which could be classified as the third or private, non-profit sector. The focus of the commission's attention, however, was upon the somewhat smaller part of the voluntary sector defined by Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, which includes those organizations that are both tax exempt and eligible to receive tax deductible gifts. The Code specifically designates charitable, religious, scientific, literary and educational organizations. The commission estimated further that the revenues in these areas, including both government and private funds, add up to nearly \$80 billion per annum. Non-money resources, such as volunteer work and free corporate services, would increase the \$80 billion to over \$100 billion in cash and other resources annually. These are significant sums indicating the size and importance of philanthropy from the private, non-profit sector to the charitable organizations in our country.

2. Giving in America involves an immense amount of time and money, is the fundamental underpinning of relationships between donor, donations and donee, and it is not keeping pace (p. 13).

The commission's largest single research effort was a survey of 2917 taxpayers conducted jointly by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center and the U.S. Census Bureau.



Some of the commission's findings concerning philanthropy were the following: college and university graduates give six times as much on the average as do those with only a high school diploma; small town residents give more than those from metropolitan areas; the married give more than the single; the giving of time correlated closely with giving of money; and, the individual who contributes to one organization is likely to give to another.

Although philanthropy is a very significant factor in the American way of life, the findings of the Commission showed that the purchasing power of the giving did not keep pace with the growth of the economy during the 1960's and early 1970's.

3. Decreasing levels of private giving, increasing costs of nonprofit activity and broadening expectations for health, education and welfare services as basic entitlements of citizenship have led to the government's becoming a principal provider of programs and revenues in many areas once dominated by private philanthropy. And government's growing role in these areas poses fundamental questions about the autonomy and basic functioning of private nonprofit organizations and institutions (p. 16).

In 1974, commission studies indicated the government contributed about \$23 billion to non-profit organizations, compared to \$25 billion from private sources. In addition to financial assistance, the government has absorbed many philanthropic functions and services which once were the responsibility of the private sector. For example, in the medical and health field the government was spending only 15 percent more than private philanthropy and in 1973 it was



spending nearly seven times as much. In 1960, about two-thirds of all institutions of higher education were private and in 1974 it was closer to one half. In 1950, more than one half of all students enrolled in higher education attended private institutions and in 1975 this amount was reduced to approximately 25 percent. The federal government increased its responsibility to the poor, the unemployed, the aged and the infirmed because of Social Security legislation enacted in the 1930's. Along with these changes has come a greater degree of involvement by government in the finances of non-profit organizations. No longer is the private sector totally private nor the public sector totally public, but rather a mixture of both.

4. Our society has long encouraged "charitable" non-profit activity by excluding it from certain tax obligations. But the principal tax encouragement of giving to non-profit organizations --the charitable deduction in personal income taxes--has been both challenged from some quarters in recent years on grounds of equity and eroded by expansion of the standard deduction (p. 17).

The charitable deduction has been part of the tax law since 1917 when it was instituted to reflect the important contribution philanthropy made to the American way of life. It was instituted to sustain gifts from the private sector in support of charitable purposes in the face of ever increasing tax rates and because it was held that philanthropy did not profit the individual donor. Since 1917, there have been

several amendments and tax reforms affecting contributions from the private sector.

The assignment of the commission to study philanthropy and its role in American society had major significance in its focus on the third sector and its integral role in American society. To understand better the scope and impact of philanthropy, one must evaluate the dollars contributed from various sources.

In 1980, individual citizens, corporations and foundations contributed a record \$47.74 billion to philanthropic causes. This was an increase in giving of 10.2 percent over the previous year. Individuals gave \$39.93 billion or 83.7 percent of the total. Corporations reached a new level of giving with \$2.55 billion in contributions. As a portion of all philanthropy, corporate giving represented 5.3 percent. Corporations have increased their share of giving during each year for which there is documentation. The giving of foundations totaled \$2.40 billion in 1980, which represented 5.2 percent of all philanthropy.

For the past twenty-six years, and 1980 was no exception, giving to religion outpaced all other categories. In 1980, religious organizations, agencies and institutions received a total of \$22.15 billion in donations, most of which were from individual sources.

In 1978, donations to the educational community surpassed giving to health and hospitals. Last year education maintained



its position as the second largest recipient of charitable gifts. In 1980, giving to education reached \$6.68 billion or 14 percent of all giving.

The health and hospital category of philanthropy received a total of \$6.49 billion in 1980, which accounted for 13.6 percent of all philanthropy.

During 1980, \$4.73 billion in contributions was given to organizations in the arts and humanities, accounting for 10 percent of all philanthropy. Giving to civic and public affairs organizations rose to \$1.36 billion this year and represented 2.9 percent of all philanthropy.

Americans gave \$3.37 billion to the "other" category--including foreign aid, technical assistance, international activities, education and studies, and foundation endowment.

Unfortunately, even though the growth of philanthropy has been impressive, it has not kept pace with increases in the nation's gross national product or the rising rate of inflation.

Contributors gave \$6.68 billion to American educational institutions and other educational programs during 1980. The Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE) recently reported that preliminary results of a study of more than one thousand colleges and universities showed an increase in giving of \$3.80 billion, compared with \$3.23 billion in 1979. Examining the donor breakdown of the CFAE's survey, it appears that small declines took place in the non-alumni, alumni and religious

groups compared to their levels a year earlier. An analysis of the CFAE survey also shows that the increase in overall giving by businesses and foundations in the United States did benefit higher education (American Association of Fund Raising Counsel).

Philanthropy has given force to new ideas, new colleges and universities, and new curricular offerings throughout the history of American higher education. However, research nor the literature has dealt sufficiently with policy-relevant studies of development programs. The need for such investigation is clear.

#### Policy-Related Studies of Development Programs

#### Organization and Management

Seymour (1966), in Design for Fund Raising, advocated that a college or university development program must be an integral and continuous part of the organizational structure of the institution. He contended that the broader the development office's tasks and the higher in the management framework the development officer is placed, the better that individual will perform.

Seymour believes that the term "development" is not simply another word for raising money. Development instead should be understood as the "broad term for the planned promotion of understanding, participation, and support" (p. 115). He states



that the purpose of institutional development should be to develop support through service and gifts.

The direct role in the area of fund raising itself is to promote all three legs of the fund raising tripod--occasionally capital campaigns, consistent annual giving by all elements of the constituency, and the promotion of deferred giving through bequests and living trusts. The indirect role in the area of public relations--because it is development's very life blood--is to sustain a critical awareness and the lively concern for the way in which the institution deals with the arts and graces of appreciation, hospitality, responses to suggestions and all other major processes of dealing with its constituency (p. 117).

He feels that as a matter of policy, development officers must have immediate access to the president and other key administrative officials, including the trustees, and must participate in all institutional policy discussions.

Pray, general editor of the Handbook for Educational Fund Raising (1981), had the following to say concerning organizational structure and management:

The development profession is still in the process of integrating and consolidating the evolutionary changes that brought it into being. While much creative thinking is being applied and most programs are becoming increasingly effective, the thrust of present changes seems to be toward better evaluation and refined management techniques rather than productive new processes or relationships . . . Three terms in particular, suggest it is time for a new look, even though conclusions may be speculative at this point. None is new, but none has been exploited. These three trends are:

The changing patterns of integration of advancement and development functions into the institutions general administrative structure in accord with what might be called a philosophy of "total resource development,"

the evolving relationships of volunteers, especially trustees, in the development effort, and,

the growing role of the advancement or development officers in the general management of the institution (p. 389).

Shea (Rowland, 1977) on organization and structure notes that the organization chart begins with the president. The original intent, he maintains, was gathering together the separate functions of institutional relations, fund raising, alumni work and service management to help the president as general manager of the educational enterprise. Shea believes that to fulfill this original intent requires that most American colleges and universities have administrative coordination of the functions of institutional relations, alumni relations, fund raising and service management. Sometimes this implies supervision of these functions by a single executive. The activities connected with these functions have increased markedly in the last twenty years, making the case for coordination even stronger (pp. 476-477).

Rowland (1977) noted that "the success of an institutional advancement program in colleges and universities rests largely on effective management" (p. 531). Rowland further states that an adequate budget, a well-trained and energetic staff and a sympathetic administration are necessary but, unless there is capable top-level management, the program cannot be successful. The executive manager must be concerned with planning; setting goals and objectives; establishing priorities; developing an



organization; selecting, training, and motivating personnel; allocating resources; programming to meet objectives; facilitating change and evaluating results (p. 531).

### Sources and Constituencies

The second area of interest relevant to the present investigation concerns fund raising sources and constituencies. Traditional programs in a comprehensive development office include annual giving, major gift solicitation, deferred or planned giving, corporate giving, foundation giving, athletic fund raising and capital campaigns. These programs solicit philanthropic contributions from alumni, non-alumni friends, corporations, foundations, parents, students, faculty and staff, governing boards, and clubs and organizations. These sources and constituencies are confirmed throughout the literature. Specifically, the above-mentioned activities are confirmed in a survey of twenty-three academic institutions, both large and small, public and private, conducted by Shea as reported in Rowland (1977, p. 476).

The Handbook for Educational Fund Raising (1981) devoted several chapters probing the support potential of college constituencies. Subjects covered included: parents as potential donors, students as fund raisers, faculty as donors, support from the local business community, trustees leading by example, and the president's role in administrative leadership.

The literature dealing with fund raising sources and constituencies also include many "how to" books, journals,

magazines, and booklets dealing with methods of fund raising. Of significance among these publications are the following: Foundation Fundamentals: A guide for Grantseekers by Carol M. Kurzig (1980); Tested Ways to Successful Fund Raising by George A. Brakeley, Jr. (1980); How to Raise Funds from Foundations by Joseph Dermer (1977); Designs for Fund Raising by Harold J. Seymour (1966); The Planned Giving Idea Book by Robert F. Sharpe (1980); and a series of books entitled New Directions for Institutional Advancement published by Jossey-Bass, Inc. (1979, 1980, 1981).

#### Methods and Techniques

Broce (1979), in his book Fund Raising, set forth several basic fund raising principles which are directly connected with fund raising methods and techniques. These nine principles include:

1. Institutional or organizational objectives must be established first.
2. Development objectives must be established to meet institutional goals.
3. The kinds of support needed determine the kinds of fund raising programs.
4. The institution must start with natural prospects.
5. The case for the program must reflect the importance of the institution.
6. Involvement is the key to leadership and support.
7. Prospect research must be thorough and realistic.
8. Cultivation is the key to successful solicitation.
9. Solicitation is only successful if principles one through eight have been followed (pp. 17-24).



George A. Brakeley, Jr., a recognized authority in fund raising, writing about fund raising methods, mentions what he considers fundamentals. Brakeley (1980) contends that institutional development and fund raising must be viewed as a continuous ongoing responsibility, with goals set to reflect immediate and future needs. Sound planning is therefore required and can only result from sound research which includes institutional goals and sources of support for these goals. Every not-for-profit institution needs to have an effective prospect research program.

Public relations also plays an important part in an institution's development effort. Good public relations and favorable publicity are essential to establishing and reinforcing the institutions basic case for support.

Brakeley also writes that it is axiomatic that an institution must spend money to raise money. Therefore, budgets adequate to do the job must be established.

Another fundamental according to Brakeley is that annual and capital giving interrelate. The announcement of a capital campaign can cause some alarm thus requiring good communication and full cooperation among the various administrators and departments concerned.

The first fundamental, as Brakeley discusses, is the case for support. An institution securing gifts from the private sector must be able to effectively state its case for support. Today there are nearly half a million 501(c)(3) not-for-profit

institutions in America that are dependent on philanthropy; the institution's statement of its case for support is the primary requisite for laying the foundation of a successful fund raising and development program (pp. 13-24). Pray (1981) notes that the case statement is the sales tool for development. It begins with a persuasive statement of the reasons for the continued existence of the institution, the role and purpose it plays in society, and the rationale for its programs. It provides a prospective donor with convincing evidence that both current and estate gifts will be administered wisely and that giving will be satisfying. The case must also include a list of needs, the rationale for these needs, and a program timetable (pp. 19-20).

#### Record Keeping and Gift Processing

Also of interest in the present investigation is the importance of record keeping and gift processing. Broce (1979) maintains that before significant fund raising can take place, the development staff must identify and evaluate those persons, foundations, corporations, and organizations from which it can reasonably expect to receive support. Prospect evaluation and identification should be a continuous staff function. Such research includes collecting information on which to base sound determination about the right prospects for the project, as well as the appropriate time to solicit a gift from the prospects (pp. 23-24).



Pray (1981), after an extended series of visits to development offices across the country, is convinced that research on prospective donors is sadly neglected. Pray noted the following:

The effective program identifies significant potential donors, develops information about each one to provide a sound base for action, suggests and guides prospect cultivation, and gives staff assistance to those making direct donor contact. Such a program is supported by an effective record system and adequate staff. . . Note well the word "significant" in my description. This is not a system to provide information on hordes of donors. It is a system to identify and provide in-depth information on the 20, 50 or 200 individuals or organizations capable of making a major impact on the institution if motivated to help (pp. 81-82).

According to Bergfeld (1981), director of development records at Washington University, an effective record system consists of the following:

Somehow, every institution must be able to record items of categorized information in some form of master record for qualified selection of prospects--for example, type of prospect, gift rating, memberships, or activities. Much of the information will come from the prospect files. The number and kind of items depend on the requirements of the individual institution.

The second important application of information is the gift record, which can categorize contributors by giving history, size of gift, purpose, and so on. Here again the computer can be useful. It can produce complex gift reports accurately and promptly for thousands of gifts. The institution's accounting system is probably already computerized or moving in that direction. Ideally, the gift accounting system and the development gift system should be one, thus eliminating wasteful separate accounting systems and the disagreeable task of reconciling the development gift figures with those of the business office.

Before calling on a prospect, the executive needs up-to-date prospect information in as concise a format

as practicable. This is the work of the prospect researcher--work made infinitely easier and more valuable if a good prospect file exists. For the new "suspect", the researcher relies heavily on directories, information-gathering services, historical societies, court records, and the like (pp. 270-271).

### Summary

A comprehensive review of the literature revealed minimal investigation conducted along the specific lines outlined by the statement of the problem for the present study. In reviewing dissertations on development, the fund raising studies that have been completed primarily involve specific problem areas, methods and techniques, types or geographic groupings of institutions producing important descriptive conclusions. Pickett (1977) in An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Fund Raising Policies of Private Undergraduate Colleges identified the most effective set of fund raising policies for private colleges. Effectiveness of these policies was determined by relating policies to fund raising potential. Based on Pickett's work, it is possible to suggest which fund raising policies are likely to be most effective for private undergraduate colleges.

The purpose of this chapter was to review relevant literature concerning educational philanthropy as it pertains to the history of fund raising in the United States and appropriate literature concerning the problem areas of the



present study. The first section of the chapter traced the history of educational philanthropy giving evidence of its influence in helping to shape colleges and universities as known today. In section two, the focus was on literature relating to the investigation per se, namely, the four major areas of interest including: (1) organizational structure and management; (2) fund raising sources and constituencies; (3) fund raising methods and techniques; and, (4) record keeping and gift processing.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this study were (a) to identify the main criteria or characteristics of an ideal development program, and (b) to conduct a policy-relevant analysis of these ideal criteria by comparisons among representative units of the State University of New York. This has been accomplished through analysis of surveys and interviews with experts in the field of development and chief development officers.

#### Research Questions

The following research questions guided this investigation from conception to conclusions:

1. What are the main criteria or characteristics of an ideal development program?
2. What are the basic output criteria for measuring effectiveness of a development program?
3. Where are representative SUNY institutions when compared to the criteria for the ideal development program referred to in question 1 above?
4. What is the relative position of representative SUNY institutions on indicators of program effectiveness referred to in question 2 above?
5. Is there a basic and meaningful relationship between the program development criteria as measured for the representative SUNY institutions and their program performance as measured by the effectiveness indicators referred to in question 2 above?



6. In the light of the empirical findings relating real program characteristics to the ideal program criteria and the analysis relating real program characteristics to measures of program effectiveness, what would be the nature or configuration of the most realistic and most effective fund raising program?
7. How can individual SUNY institutions best take advantage of the "ideal" policy-relevant findings of this study for their development program?

#### Population and Sample

This investigation dealt with the State University of New York, one of New York State's public systems of higher education. The State University of New York is composed of 64 individual campus units throughout the State. These campus units are organized into seven categories as follows: (a) four university centers, (b) thirteen arts and science colleges, (c) three centers for the health sciences, (d) six agricultural and technical colleges, (e) three specialized colleges, (f) five statutory colleges and (g) thirty community colleges.

The research sample consists of representative SUNY colleges/universities -- with the exception of the statutory and specialized colleges -- having development programs that meet the following criteria:

- (1) have been in existence for a minimum of three years, and
- (2) have a development professional assigned the responsibility of soliciting gifts from the private sector exclusive of sponsored research programs under the jurisdiction of the SUNY Research Foundation.

Geographically and institutionally, the sample is representative of New York State. Enrollment for Fall 1981, range from a low of 973 students at the Upstate Medical Center to a high of 24,126 students at the State University at Buffalo. The sample of sixteen institutions consists of seven institutions with enrollments of less than five thousand; four between five and ten thousand; three between ten and fifteen thousand; one between fifteen and twenty thousand; one between twenty and twenty-five thousand.

Included in this study are four university centers, one health science center, six arts and science colleges, three agricultural and technical colleges and two community colleges. All institutions included in this investigation are accredited by their respective regional associations. The sample is representative of SUNY institutions and thus supports the generalizability of findings.

#### Criteria of the Ideal Development Program

As part of the research design for the study, a panel of nationally recognized experts was established for the purpose for formulating policy-relevant criteria (including input, processes, and output criteria) for an ideal development program. The members (see Appendix A) were chosen on the basis of their professional background. The expert panel consisted of a board of trustee chairperson and member, former university president, chief institutional



advancement officer, chief development officer, corporate foundation executive officer, chief executive corporate officer, foundation executive officer, university professor with expertise in institutional advancement, general editor of the Handbook of Institutional Advancement, editor-in-chief for Jossey-Bass, New Directions for Institutional Development, and the president of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the national association for institutional advancement officers. The expert panel members also assist in a variety of educational fund raising efforts as volunteers and donors.

The researcher reviewed the literature and proposed tentative criteria for an ideal development program which were incorporated into a questionnaire (see Appendix B) mailed to the expert panel. The design of the questionnaire included forced-choice questions either to accept or reject the tentative criteria, an open-ended comments section for each criterion, an open-ended comments section for each tentative criterion, and an open-ended section for "other" criteria deemed important by the panel.

A personal or telephone interview was conducted with each expert panel member in order to review his responses to the survey. Some panel members chose either to respond to the survey or to be interviewed.

#### Final Questionnaire Development

The final instrument (see Appendix C) used for this

study is a comprehensive questionnaire on program development derived from the criteria accepted by the expert panel. In preparing the program development questionnaire, the responses of the expert panel members to both the survey and follow-up interview were analyzed and worded as detailed items on the program development questionnaire. Questionnaire items were derived for all criteria approved by the expert panel. Appendix D includes a table relating all items on the program development questionnaire to the ideal criteria established by the expert panel. All quantitative items are written positively, that is, higher ratings on items mean the program is approaching the ideal -- as approved by the expert panel that established the ideal program criteria. The program development questionnaire was organized into four categories.

- I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources
- II. Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies
- III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques
- IV. Record Keeping and Gift Processing

As a means of determining validity, relevance and clarity of questionnaire items, a separate panel of four independent judges was selected and asked to rate each item (see Appendix E). All four judges were senior institutional advancement professionals. Two were knowledgeable SUNY representatives while the other two represented a major



public and a private institution, respectively. No item on the questionnaire was found invalid, irrelevant, and unclear by all questionnaire judges.

The tentative form of the questionnaire was then sent to a pilot sample consisting of three SUNY campuses. At two of the campuses, only the chief development officer responded and, at the third campus, the chief development officer and one other campus representative responded. Personal follow-up interviews were conducted with each chief development officer. As a result, some items were deleted and others rephrased. The validity and relevance of the program development questionnaire was thus confirmed and the final form completed.

In addition to clarifying the validity of the program development questionnaire, about two weeks after final questionnaire administration, a random sample of chief development officers was asked to complete the questionnaire a second time. "Test-retest" item reliability was roughly estimated by the percentage of exact "hits" for each quantitative item on the questionnaire. Any item with a percentage of "hits" (i.e., choice of same response on item for both administrations) below 67 percent was eliminated from further analysis (see Appendix F).

#### Additional Data Base

In order to more fully answer the research questions of major interest, two additional sets of data were specified

and obtained for each institution in the sample, plus an additional 33 SUNY institutions from data bases at the SUNY Central Administration or from The College Handbook (1981). One set of data contained measures of program output, namely, the amount of gift income received for 1979-80 and 1980-81 from the following sources:

- Alumni
- Non-alumni friends
- Corporations and Businesses
- Foundations
- Deferred Gifts Received
- Endowed Income
- Investment Income

Another set of data contained variables found by Pickett (1977) to be predictive of fund raising potential. Pickett's major contribution to analysis of fund raising effectiveness is based on an analysis of extremes, that is, overproductive versus underproductive development programs. He determined and used fund raising potential, not total gift income, which is a relative outcome measure. Pickett's variables found most predictive of fund raising potential for private schools included the

- typical cost of attendance (i.e., socio-economic level of clientele),
- percent of graduating class attending graduate school (i.e., educational quality)



- market value of endowment (i.e., financial resources not consumed annually) and,
- number of alumni (i.e., size)

These variables plus average gift income for 1979-80 and 1980-81 were gathered for forty-nine representative SUNY institutions, including the sixteen sample institutions. These indicators of fund raising potential were gathered on a larger sample of SUNY institutions because the analytical technique (i.e., multiple, linear regression) used to determine fund raising potential require a sample approximately 10 times the number of variables involved in the regression.

#### Data Collection Procedure

Materials were mailed to eighteen chief development officers at SUNY institutions meeting the sample criteria noted above. The mailing included a questionnaire with instructions, a cover letter (see Appendix C), and a self-addressed envelope. A total of eighteen chief development officers, that is, 100 percent of the sample returned questionnaires. Of those returned sixteen were usable.

For clarification and protocol, a follow-up interview in person or by phone was conducted with all chief development officers in the sample. This interview was designed to clarify any questionnaire responses that may have been unclear to the respondents.

### Data Treatment and Analysis

Where appropriate, each quantitative item on the questionnaire was coded for direction and magnitude of item meaning. Four-point Likert scales were used to code importance, effectiveness, involvement, or emphasis for particular items. For example, "very ineffective" was scaled "1" while "very effective" was scaled "4". All quantitative questionnaire items were written in the positive and thus designed to reflect the criteria of the ideal development program. Therefore, the closer respondents came to scale values of 4, theoretically, the more ideal that program as perceived by each institution's chief development officer.

Items with yes/no responses were coded "2" for "yes" and "1" for "no". These types of items and the Likert scale items were treated as categorical variables. Variables reflecting number of staff and monetary values were treated as continuous variables. Unreliable, missing, or unusable data were so coded and not analyzed.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each quantitative item on the questionnaire, for all gift income variables, and for the four fund-raising-potential variables used by Pickett (1977).



Research Question Number One

What are the main criteria or characteristics of an ideal development program?

This general research question is answered by tabulating the acceptance or rejection by the expert review panel of the proposed criteria.

Research Question Number Two

What are the basic output criteria for measuring effectiveness of a development program?

Although total gift income is generally considered to be the main output criteria of development programs, program inputs and processes of small institutions could all be ideal and yet result in very little gift income. And similarly, program inputs and processes of large institutions could be much less than ideal and yet, such institutions may have considerable gift income.

In order to reflect the "true" productivity of SUNY institutions, the methodology used by Pickett (1977) will be employed. Pickett's methodology helps prevent "unfair" comparisons between institutions on the basis of gift income alone. Thus, to be classified as an overproductive development program, the program must be producing more gift income than predicted on the basis of potential. Overproductive colleges/universities raise more than their potential would predict. Underproductive colleges/universities raise less than their potential would predict. The basic

outcome measure then becomes overproductivity versus underproductivity, not total gift income.

A larger sample of institutions was used in determine productivity of the sixteen institutions receiving the program development questionnaire. For the larger sample of forty-nine institutions, total gift income for 1979-80 and 1980-81 was averaged and became the dependent variable in a multiple, linear regression equation. Linearity and quality of the regression was checked by plotting residuals, standardized by the error of measurement for the regression. Average total gift income was then regressed on the four Pickett variables including (1) cost of attendance, (2) number of alumni, (3) percent of graduates attending graduate schools, and (4) market value of endowment. The statistical significance of the regression and regression weights was determined by F values at  $p \leq .05$ . Final inclusion of a predictor variable was determined by significant change in r square.

The final regression equation was then used to predict the potential or expected gift income of the original sixteen colleges/universities that received the program questionnaire. Predicted gift income was subtracted from actual gift income. A positive difference meant that the college/university acquired more gift income than would be expected based on the regression. And, following Pickett (1977):



A negative difference meant that the college received less than expected. The difference was divided by the predicted gift income to produce a percent difference figure (p. 68).

The colleges/universities were then ranked on the percent difference. The percent difference controlled for size of gift income. Colleges/universities with positive percent differences were classified as overproductive. Colleges/universities with negative percent differences were classified as underproductive.

The output criteria for institutional fund raising programs were therefore defined as overproductivity or underproductivity.

### Research Question Number Three

Where are representative SUNY institutions when compared to the criteria for the ideal development program?

The approved ideal criteria were written in the form of a questionnaire. All quantitative questionnaire items were written positively, thus the greater the numerical value of the item the closer the perception of the chief development officer to the ideal program. To determine how representative SUNY institutions "approached" the ideal criteria, the sample was classified according to institutional type, that is, community colleges, university centers, etc. Weighted averages were then calculated for each policy-relevant item within institutional type. The weighted average for each

item was then subtracted from the maximum or ideal value for the item. Institutions by type were then compared on the percentage of items -- within the four program areas of the questionnaire -- with the smallest discrepancies from the ideal.

#### Research Question Number Four

What is the relative position of representative SUNY institutions on indicators of program effectiveness?

The indicators of program effectiveness included average gift income and gift income as percent of potential. Therefore, institutions were ranked on these indicators, categorized by type, and average rank determined by type of institution.

#### Research Question Number Five

Is there a basic and meaningful relationship between the program development criteria as measured for the representative SUNY institutions and their program performance as measured by the effectiveness indicators?

Sampled institutions were classified as overproductive or underproductive on gift income as percent of potential. Weighted averages for each questionnaire item were then used to determine which items -- reflecting fund raising policy -- had higher averages for overproductive colleges/-universities when compared to underproductive. Comparisons on item responses for underproductive and overproductive



institutions were also completed by (1) organizational structure and program resources, (2) fund raising sources and constituencies, (3) fund raising methods and techniques, and (4) record keeping and gift processing. These comparisons were based on the percent of items with "overproductive averages" greater than "underproductive averages".

#### Research Question Number Six

In the light of the empirical findings relating real program characteristics to the ideal program criteria and the analysis relating real program characteristics to measures of program effectiveness, what would be the nature or configuration of the most realistic and most effective fund raising program?

This research question was answered by synthesizing all findings and summarizing fund raising policies associated with overproductive development programs. A detailed analysis of the three most productive and the three least productive institutions was also made. Although somewhat complex, the emphasis in this portion of the analysis was on specifying ideal policies and program characteristics empirically, not simply on the basis of expert opinion. An ideal development program was therefore specified from a more realistic perspective, grounded in research findings.

Research Question Number Seven

How can individual SUNY institutions best take advantage of the "ideal" policy-relevant findings of this study for their development program?

This portion of the analysis was answered in the form of recommendations in the light of the research findings, program analysis and synthesis. Again, the emphasis on these recommendations was on realism, not simply idealism. However, colleges/universities with obvious program development potential were singled out as important centers of attention for SUNY central administration staff.



## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the results of analyses of the current status and effectiveness of fund raising employed by representative colleges and universities within the State University of New York. The data are presented in response to five of the seven original research questions guiding the investigation. (Research Questions 6 and 7 are answered in Chapter V.) The five research questions are answered individually and the analyses for each question are presented sequentially.

#### Research Question Number One

What are the main criteria or characteristics of an ideal development program?

The expert panel established a set of criteria necessary for an "ideal" development program. Although the panel did not unanimously agree on each criterion, there was general consensus before inclusion of a criterion in the Program Development Questionnaire. Only those criteria agreed upon by eighty percent of the expert panel were retained. The policy-relevant criteria agreed upon by the expert panel are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

## Policy-Relevant Criteria Approved by Expert Panel

- 
- Criterion A: Program includes effective and efficient record system providing the names, addresses, occupational information, history and other pertinent facts concerning prospective donors including alumni, non-alumni friends, corporations, and foundations.
- Criterion B: Program managed by an experienced professional staff with a history of fund raising successes.
- Criterion D: Major gifts (i.e., \$1,000 or more annually) actively solicited on a personal basis.
- Criterion E: Program includes an on-going donor research program to identify and qualify major potential donors.
- Criterion F: Program includes volunteers capable of providing--  
effective leadership  
significant financial support  
recruitment of additional contributors
- Criterion G: Development office continually plans and conducts a capital campaign.
- Criterion H: Development office is provided an adequate operating budget.
- Criterion I: Institution has a positive image in the public's eye.
- Criterion J: Program includes providing effective leadership, financial support and recruitment of additional contributors by the president, administrative personnel, faculty, and staff.
- Criterion J-2: Administrative personnel are engaged in the described development program activities --  
provides leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors
-



Table 7

## Policy-Relevant Criteria Approved by Expert Panel

- 
- Criterion J-3: Faculty are engaged in the described development program activities --  
provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors
- Criterion J-4: Support staff are engaged in the described development program activities --  
provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors
- Criterion K: Recruiting, recording, and acknowledgment of gifts is done in a timely and appropriate manner.
- Criterion L: Alumni and university/college relations offices are integrally involved in the establishment and implementation of development office goals.
- Criterion M: Development office can effectively state its case for philanthropic support.
- Criterion N: Chief development officer reports directly to the president of the institution.
- Criterion O: Cultivated constituency exists from previous, careful university/college relations and/or alumni relations efforts.
- Criterion P: Development office establishes annual fund raising goals which are--  
higher than previous year's goal  
significantly higher than previous year's goal
- Criterion Q: Relationships among development, university college relations and alumni relations offices are coordinated organizationally to enhance fund raising potential.
-

Table 1

## Policy-Relevant Criteria Approved by Expert Panel

- 
- Criterion R: Board of Trustees are engaged in the described development program activities--  
provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors
- Criterion S: Development program includes:  
annual giving  
corporate giving  
foundation giving  
deferred giving  
capital giving
- Criterion T: Chief development officer is intimately involved in institution planning.
- Criterion U: Development office is organized with immediate access to --  
president  
board of trustees  
major potential donors  
alumni leaders  
community leaders  
faculty leaders  
administrative personnel
- Criterion V: Entire institution and all constituencies clearly understand the role of the development office.
- 

In addition to the above criteria, there was consensus by the expert panel that the amount of money raised by the institution could be considered a program output criterion.

An additional criterion recommended and found consistent with the comments received by the expert panel was



that:

The development office must be accountable to the institution.

The following three tentative criteria were rejected by the expert panel:

President is engaged in providing financial support.

Chief development officer has held his current position for five or more years.

Institution has tradition of seeking financial support from the private sector.

The expert panel agreed that the number of years of successful development experience by the chief development officer was an important criterion but rejected the requirement of a minimum number of years in his current position. The expert panel agreed that a tradition of financial support is desirable, but this tradition can be developed at any point in time.

The final survey instrument mailed to the sample of SUNY institutions reflected the above changes in program criteria. The personal interviews and written comments of the expert panel improved the clarity of the criteria and wording as they were incorporated into the final survey instrument.

#### Research Question Number Two

What are the basic output criteria for measuring effectiveness of a development program?

The main output criteria chosen for measuring the effectiveness of development programs included under-

productivity and overproductivity. Given certain resources and potential, a development program at an institution should perform up to reasonable expectations. Reasonable, expected gift income for a development program was therefore predicted from (1) market value of endowment, (2) number of alumni, (3) typical cost of attendance, and (4) percent of graduating class attending graduate school.

The larger sample of forty-nine SUNY institutions was used in multiple, linear regression analyses to predict overproductivity or underproductivity. The first regression resulted in the following prediction of gift income:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gift income} = & -113,512 + .07 \text{ market value of endowments} \\ & +90.14 \text{ typical cost of attendance} \\ & +4.45 \text{ total number of alumni} \\ & +1,110.56 \text{ percent of graduate class} \\ & \text{attending graduate school} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Multiple } r = .91 \quad \text{Standard Error} = 290,903$$

$$r \text{ square} = .83$$

The inclusion of "Total Number of Alumni" in the regression resulted in a change in  $r$  square of .01. The inclusion of "Percent of Graduate Class Attending Graduate School" in the regression resulted in a change in  $r$  square of .001. Therefore, because of the small changes in  $r$  square, both variables were eliminated and the regression



calculated again with the following results:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gift income} &= -59,883 + .07 \text{ market value of endowment} \\ &\quad +114.35 \text{ cost of attendance} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Multiple } r = .91 \quad \text{Standard Error} = 293,586$$

$$r \text{ square} = .82$$

The final regression with two predictor variables resulted in an acceptable standard error 100,000 below the standard error Pickett (1977) obtained for private schools.

Residuals (observed gift income minus predicted) were then calculated for each of the 16 institutions receiving the Program Development Questionnaire. Nine institutions had negative residuals, meaning observed gift income was below predicted. The development programs of these nine institutions were therefore classified as underproductive (UP).

Seven institutions had positive residuals, meaning observed gift income was above predicted. The development programs of these seven institutions were thus classified as overproductive (OP).

### Research Question Number Three

Where are representative SUNY institutions when compared to criteria for the ideal development program?

Table 2 presents the percent of items deviating from the ideal (i.e., maximum value possible on each item) by type of institution for those questionnaire items dealing with Organizational Structure and Program Resources. No

Table 2

Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by  
Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Organizational  
Structure and Program Resources\*

Type of Institution (N)	Discrepancy from Ideal			
	0.00-1.00	1.01-2.00	2.01-3.00	3.01-4.00
University Centers (4)	29	26	45	0
Colleges of Arts and Science (6)	22	34	44	0
Health Science Centers (1)	50	35	15	0
Agricultural & Tech- nical Colleges (3)	10	24	66	0
Community Colleges (2)	29	46	25	0

\*Note: There were 68 reliable quantitative items on this portion of the Program Development Questionnaire.



institutions had item deviations greater than 3.00. The single Health Science Center had more items closer to the ideal (i.e., had the largest percentage of items in discrepancy category 0.00-1.00) than all other institutional types. The Agriculture and Technical Colleges deviated quite severely from the ideal.

The response patterns of the University Centers and the Colleges of Arts and Sciences are very similar. However, the University Centers had more item responses that were closer to the ideal.

The response patterns of the Community Colleges were unique in that, next to the Health Science Center, they had the smallest percentage of items in the category representing the greatest distance from the ideal. The percentage of items for Community Colleges in the 2.01 - 3.00 discrepancy category is nearly one-half the percentage for University Centers and Colleges of Arts and Sciences.

Table 3 presents the percent of items deviating from the ideal by type of institution for the questionnaire items dealing with Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies. Again, the single Health Science Center deviates the least from the ideal, as in Table 2 on Organizational Structure and Program Resources. And, the Agricultural and Technical Colleges have very few items that were rated close to the ideal.

Table 3

Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by  
Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Fund Raising  
Sources and Constituencies\*

Type of Institution (N)	Discrepancy from Ideal			
	0.00-1.00	1.01-2.00	2.01-3.00	3.01-4.00
University Centers (4)	18	60	22	0
Colleges of Arts & Sciences (6)	26	57	17	0
Health Science Centers (1)	65	22	13	0
Agricultural & Tech- nical Colleges (3)	13	65	22	0
Community Colleges (2)	48	43	9	0

\*Note: There were 23 reliable quantitative items on this portion of the Program Development Questionnaire.



One of the largest differences reflected in Table 3 is that between the University Centers (18%) and the Community Colleges (48%) on the least discrepant items that is, for discrepancy category 0.00-1.00. These data imply that the Community Colleges selected in the sample more often responded to the questionnaire items on fund raising in the direction of an ideal program.

Table 4 presents the percent of items deviating from the ideal by type of institution for those questionnaire items on Fund Raising Methods and Techniques. The immediate impression given by Table 4 is the lack of discrepancy from the ideal for all of the institutions. Compared to Tables 2 and 3, these institutions perceive fund raising in similar ways and come closer to the ideal more often than in both the areas of Organizational Structure and Program Resources or Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies. Even the Agricultural and Technical Colleges perceive this program area as do the other colleges and universities. In contrast to both program areas of Organization Structure and Program Resources and Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies, the area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques is perceived of in very similar ways by these SUNY institutions.

Program area four on the Program Development Questionnaire, namely, Record Keeping and Gift Processing, did not have reliable quantitative items sufficient for analyses similar to those performed for program areas I, II, and III.

Table 4

Percent of Items Deviating from Ideal by  
Type of Institution for Questionnaire Items on Fund Raising  
Methods and Techniques\*

Type of Institution (N)	Discrepancy from Ideal			
	0.00-1.00	1.01-2.00	2.01-3.00	3.01-4.00
University Centers (4)	67	33	0	0
Colleges of Arts & Sciences (6)	73	27	0	0
Health Science Centers (1)	87	13	0	0
Agricultural & Tech- nical Colleges (3)	80	13	7	0
Community Colleges (2)	67	33	0	0

\*Note: There were 15 reliable quantitative items on this portion of the Program Development Questionnaire.



Research Question Number Four

What is the relative position of representative SUNY institutions on indicators of program effectiveness?

Table 5 displays total average gift income for two years and gift income as percent of predicted or potential gift income (i.e., the approach recommended by Pickett). Table 5 also contains the rank of each institution on both output variables. The ranks of each institution on each program effectiveness variable are quite similar. However, there are some discrepancies in rank, especially for institutions 12, 15, and 16.

Table 6 summarizes program output recorded in Table 5 by averaging the ranks on both output variables by type of institution. Though the sample is small, it seems reasonable to conclude that, even in the light of their greater potential, the University Centers, taken as a group, are still very productive.

Research Question Number Five

Is there a basic and meaningful relationship between the program development criteria as measured for the representative SUNY institutions and their program performance as measured by the effectiveness indicators?

The sampled institutions were classified as overproductive or underproductive based on Pickett's methodology as outlined in Research Question Number Two above. As a result, the study sample consisted of nine

Table 5

Rank of Institutions Based on Average  
Gift Income and Gift Income as Percent of  
Potential

Institution	Average Gift Income	Rank	Gift Income as Percent of Potential	Rank
1	1,168,832	3	+410	2
2	1,847,546	2	+471	1
3	469,540	6	+ 2	6
4	71,572	15	- 71	16
5	72,031	14	- 69	15
6	155,229	8	- 49	12
7	106,281	11	- 63	13
8	152,079	9	- 41	11
9	616,152	4	+102	4
10	73,370	13	- 66	14
11	497,487	5	+ 44	5
12	4,350,693	1	+ 00	7
13	114,288	10	- 18	9
14	212,231	7	- 25	10
15	101,533	12	+304	3
16	47,437	16	- 00	8



underproductive (UP) and seven overproductive (OP) institutions. It was hypothesized that an officer of an overproductive development program would rate each program development criterion more ideally (i.e., closer to "4") than would an officer of an underproductive development program.

Table 7 compares the average response for each questionnaire item responses for underproductive and overproductive development programs in the area of Organizational Structure and Program Resources.

Table 8 compares the average response for each questionnaire item for underproductive and overproductive development programs in the area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies.

Table 9 compares the average response for each questionnaire item for underproductive and overproductive development programs in the area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques.

Program area four on the Program Development Questionnaire, namely, Record Keeping and Gift Processing, did not have reliable quantitative items sufficient for analysis by underproductive versus overproductive development programs.

Tables 7, 8, and 9 consist of reliable items taken directly from the Program Development Questionnaire. The average item response for the nine underproductive (UP) and

seven overproductive (OP) institutions is reported directly on the response line for each item. The larger the average item response (e.g., 3.8 versus 2.5), the closer to the ideal (i.e., 4.0) for that item. Item numbers refer to items on the original Program Development Questionnaire (see Appendix B).



Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources

2. How involved is each of the following in establishing the overall administrative policy for the fund raising program?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
President	_____	UP 3.3 _____	_____	OP 3.9 _____
Director of Public Relations	_____	UP 2.0 _____	_____	OP 2.4 _____
Board of Trustees (College Council)	_____	UP 1.7 _____	_____	OP 1.9 _____
Chief Development Officer	_____	UP 3.7 _____	_____	OP 4.0 _____
Foundation Board of Directors	_____	UP 0.9 _____	_____	OP 1.0 _____

3. How many years has the Chief Development Officer worked as a development professional? \_\_\_\_\_ Years

UP 7.7  
OP 10.6

4. How many professional and support staff does your development office have?

Professional	_____	UP 2.1 _____	OP 2.5 _____
Support	_____	UP 1.3 _____	OP 4.1 _____

Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

6. How involved is the President in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	UP 3.1 _____	_____	OP 3.6 _____
Seeking financial support	_____	UP 2.7 _____	_____	OP 3.7 _____
Identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____	UP 2.2 _____	_____	OP 2.8 _____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	UP 2.7 _____	_____	OP 3.4 _____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	UP 2.1 _____	_____	OP 3.3 _____
Evaluating fund raising programs	_____	UP 3.0 _____	_____	OP 3.5 _____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	UP 2.8 _____	_____	OP 3.9 _____

7. How involved are all or most members of the Board of Trustees or College Council in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	UP 2.0 _____	_____	OP 2.1 _____
Providing personal financial support	_____	UP 2.2 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____



Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

## 7. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership		UP 1.9		OP 1.9
Seeking financial support		UP 1.8		OP 1.7
Soliciting potential major donors		UP 1.9		OP 1.9
Soliciting potential donors		UP 1.8		OP 1.9
Evaluating fund raising program		UP 1.8		OP 2.3
Establishing fund raising policy		UP 2.0		OP 2.3

8. How involved are all or most administrative personnel  
(excluding the President and development office) in the  
following program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership		UP 1.6		OP 2.6
Providing personal financial support		UP 2.0		OP 2.3
Seeking financial support		UP 1.7		OP 2.4

Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

8. Continued	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership		UP 1.3		OP 2.0
Soliciting potential major donors		UP 1.3		OP 2.1
Soliciting potential donors		UP 1.6		OP 1.9
Evaluating fund raising program		UP 1.4		OP 2.7
Establishing fund raising policy		UP 1.4		OP 2.7
10. How <u>involved</u> are all or most members of the faculty in the following development program activities?				
	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership		UP 1.6		OP 1.7
Providing personal financial support		UP 1.9		OP 2.0
Seeking financial support		UP 1.7		OP 2.1
Identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership		UP 1.3		OP 1.9



Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

## 10. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	UP 1.4 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	UP 1.1 _____	_____	OP 1.9 _____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	UP 1.1 _____	_____	OP 1.8 _____

11. How involved are all or most support staff (outside the development office) in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	UP 1.4 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____
Providing personal financial support	_____	UP 1.8 _____	_____	OP 1.9 _____
Seeking financial support	_____	UP 1.4 _____	_____	OP 1.7 _____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	UP 1.2 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	UP 1.1 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	UP 1.1 _____	_____	OP 1.7 _____

Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

## 11. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	UP 1.1 _____	_____	OP 1.9 _____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	UP 1.2 _____	_____	OP 1.9 _____

12. How involved are volunteers in the following development  
program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	UP 2.8 _____	_____	OP 3.1 _____
Providing personal financial support	_____	UP 2.9 _____	_____	OP 3.1 _____
Seeking financial support	_____	UP 2.7 _____	_____	OP 3.1 _____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	UP 2.3 _____	_____	OP 2.9 _____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	UP 2.2 _____	_____	OP 3.1 _____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	UP 3.1 _____	_____	OP 3.0 _____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	UP 2.3 _____	_____	OP 2.9 _____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	UP 1.8 _____	_____	OP 1.6 _____



Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

13. How involved are all or most students in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____ UP 1.8 _____		_____ OP 1.6 _____	
Seeking financial support	_____ UP 1.7 _____		_____ OP 1.7 _____	
Identifying, re-cruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____ UP 1.7 _____		_____ OP 1.6 _____	
Soliciting potential major donors	_____ UP 1.3 _____		_____ OP 1.4 _____	
Soliciting potential donors	_____ UP 2.0 _____		_____ OP 1.7 _____	
Evaluating fund raising program	_____ UP 1.2 _____		_____ OP 1.4 _____	
Establishing fund raising policy	_____ UP 1.3 _____		_____ OP 1.4 _____	

15. How important is it that relationships among development, public relations, and alumni relations offices be coordinated organizationally in order to enhance fund raising potential?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____ UP 3.7 _____		_____ OP 3.6 _____	

Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

---

16. At your institution, how effective is the coordination mentioned above in Item 15?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____ UP 2.9 _____		_____ OP 3.0 _____	

17. How involved is the chief development officer in total institutional planning?

Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
_____ UP 2.4 _____		_____ OP 3.3 _____	

18. How important is it that the entire institution and all constituencies clearly understand the role of the development office in support of institutional objectives?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____ UP 3.9 _____		_____ OP 3.3 _____	

19. How effective has the college/university been in clearly communicating the role of the development office to the entire institution and most, important fund raising constituencies?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____ UP 2.6 _____		_____ OP 2.7 _____	

---



Table 7

Average Item Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions  
in the Program Area of Organizational Structure  
and Program Resources (continued)

---

20. How effective has the development office been in clearly communicating its role to the institution and most, important fund raising constituencies?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	UP 2.7 _____	_____	OP 3.0 _____

21. How effective has the development office been in clearly communicating its role to the students?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	UP 2.7 _____	_____	OP 2.3 _____

25. How effective is your institution in providing an adequate operating budget for the development office?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	UP 2.2 _____	_____	OP 2.0 _____

---

Table 8

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in the  
Program Area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies

26. How effective are the following constituencies in providing funds to support your institution?

	Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
Alumni	_____	UP 2.3_____	_____	OP 2.4_____
Non-alumni friends	_____	UP 2.7_____	_____	OP 3.0_____
Faculty & Staff	_____	UP 2.1_____	_____	OP 1.7_____
Parents	_____	UP 2.0_____	_____	OP 1.7_____
Students	_____	UP 1.8_____	_____	OP 1.3_____
Athletic Booster Program	_____	UP 2.3_____	_____	OP 1.3_____
Business & Industry	_____	UP 2.9_____	_____	OP 3.0_____
Private foundations	_____	UP 2.1_____	_____	OP 2.6_____
Clubs & Organizations	_____	UP 2.3_____	_____	OP 2.1_____
Board of Trustees (College Council)	_____	UP 2.1_____	_____	OP 2.1_____
Foundation Board of Directors	_____	UP 2.8_____	_____	OP 2.8_____

27. How much development program time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent seeking funds from the following sources?

	No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
Major Gifts Programs	_____	UP 2.4_____	_____	OP 3.3_____
Annual Fund	_____	UP 3.6_____	_____	OP 3.0_____
Deferred (Planned) Gifts	_____	UP 2.0_____	_____	OP 2.3_____



Table 8

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in the  
Program Area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies  
(continued)

## 27. Continued

	No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
Capital Campaign	_____ UP 1.4 _____		_____ OP 1.7 _____	
Alumni	_____ UP 3.6 _____		_____ OP 2.9 _____	
Non-alumni friends	_____ UP 3.0 _____		_____ OP 3.0 _____	
Faculty & Staff	_____ UP 2.8 _____		_____ OP 2.1 _____	
Parents	_____ UP 2.1 _____		_____ OP 1.9 _____	
Athletic Booster Program	_____ UP 2.1 _____		_____ OP 1.3 _____	
Clubs & Organizations	_____ UP 1.9 _____		_____ OP 2.7 _____	
Board of Trustees (College Council)	_____ UP 2.4 _____		_____ OP 2.4 _____	
Foundation Board of Directors	_____ UP 3.0 _____		_____ OP 3.1 _____	

Table 9

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in  
the Program Area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques

29. How important is it for the development office to help plan and coordinate the capital and annual campaign?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 4.0		OP 3.9	

30. How important to development is it for the public relations office to identify and publicize substantive institutional activities that may be identified as important by the community or prospective contributors?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 3.9		OP 3.7	

31. As an assist to the development office, how active has the public relations office been in identifying and publicizing substantive institutional activities that may be considered important by the community or prospective contributors?

Very Inactive	Generally Inactive	Generally Active	Very Active
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 2.9		OP 3.4	

32. How active has the development office been in cultivating or emphasizing corporate/business matching gifts for dollars contributed?

Very Inactive	Generally Inactive	Generally Active	Very Active
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 2.7		OP 2.9	



Table 9

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in  
the Program Area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques  
(continued)

---

34. Does your institution have and use a formal case statement?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ (Yes = 2; No = 1)

UP 1.4

OP 1.4

36. How effectively does your entire college/institution  
communicate its case for philanthropic support?

Very Ineffectively	Generally Ineffectively	Generally Effectively	Very Effectively
-----------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

_____ UP 2.6	_____	_____ OP 2.7	_____
--------------	-------	--------------	-------

38. How important is the public's impression of your  
institution (i.e., the image your institution has in the  
public's eye) to the administration?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

_____ UP 3.7	_____	_____ OP 3.9	_____
--------------	-------	--------------	-------

39. How much development program time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS)  
is spent on improving your institution's public image?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-------------------

_____ UP 2.9	_____	_____ OP 3.0	_____
--------------	-------	--------------	-------

40. How much institutional time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is  
spent on improving your institution's public image?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-------------------

_____ UP 3.1	_____	_____ OP 3.3	_____
--------------	-------	--------------	-------

---

Table 9

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in  
the Program Area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques  
(continued)

---

41. How important is on-going, potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) to the success of development programs?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____ UP 3.9	_____	_____ OP 3.9	_____

42. How effective is your on-going potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) process or system?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____ UP 2.7	_____	_____ OP 2.7	_____

43. How involved are alumni in your on-going potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) practices?

Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
_____ UP 2.4	_____	_____ OP 2.0	_____

44. How much time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on prospect research and potential donor identification?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
_____ UP 2.4	_____	_____ OP 2.3	_____

---



Table 9

Average Responses for Underproductive (UP)  
versus Overproductive (OP) SUNY Institutions in  
the Program Area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques  
(continued)

---

45. How important are personal visits to your fund raising efforts?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 3.9		OP 3.7	

46. How much time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on personal visits by development officers?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 3.0		OP 3.0	

47. How important is it that major gifts (i.e., \$1,000.00 or more annually) be actively solicited on a personal basis?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____
UP 4.0		OP 3.6	

---

For summary purposes, Table 10 displays the percent of items for which the overproductive (OP) average was greater (i.e., closer to ideal) than the underproductive average. Percentages are broken down in Table 10 by Sections I, II, and III of the Program Development Questionnaire. Eighty-one percent of the items had higher OP-averages than UP-averages in the area of Organizational Structure and Program Resources. Fifty-three percent of the items had higher OP-averages than UP-averages in the area of Fund Raising Methods and Techniques. Thirty-nine percent of the items had higher OP-averages than UP-averages in the area of Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies. The fourth section of the Program Development Questionnaire did not have items appropriate to this type of analysis.

Table 10

Percent of Items with Overproductive  
Average Greater than Underproductive Average  
by Section of Development Questionnaire

Program Development Questionnaire	Percent of Items
I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources (68 items)	81%
II. Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies (23 Items)	39%
III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques (15 Items)	53%



## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings of a policy-relevant analysis of fund raising at representative SUNY institutions. The chapter is divided into four main sections. The first section answers Research Question Number Six and includes a synthesis of the findings and the basic structure of an "ideal" but realistic development program. The second section answers Research Question Number Seven and presents policy implications for SUNY. The third section deals with practical interventions or applications. The fourth section presents recommendations for further research.

#### Synthesis of the Findings

##### Research Question Number Six

In the light of the empirical findings relating real program characteristics to the ideal program criteria and the analysis relating real program characteristics to measures of program effectiveness, what would be the nature or configuration of the most realistic and most effective fund raising program?

Based on Pickett methodology, some colleges/universities raised more than their potential and were classified as over-productive. Others raised less and were classified as under-productive. An analysis of policy-relevant fund raising

activities employed by each program type resulted in identifying the following policies associated with over-productivity.

I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources

- A. The chief development officer has more years of professional development experience.
- B. There are more professionals and support staff.
- C. The president, the director of public relations, the governing board, the chief development officer and the foundation board of directors are involved in establishing overall administrative policy for the fund raising program.
- D. The management technique employed more often is Management by Objective (MBO) or a similar variation.
- E. The college/university president is involved in development program activities. These activities include providing effective leadership; seeking financial support; identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership; soliciting major donors; soliciting potential donors; evaluating fund raising programs; and, establishing fund raising policy.
- F. Administrative personnel (excluding the president and development office) are involved in development program activities. These activities include



providing effective leadership; providing financial support; seeking financial support; identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership; soliciting major donors, soliciting potential donors; evaluating the fund raising program; and, establishing fund raising policy.

- G. Faculty are involved in development program activities. These activities include: seeking financial support; identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership; soliciting major donors; evaluating fund raising programs and establishing fund raising policy.
- H. Support staff (outside the development office) are involved in the development program activities. These activities include: providing effective leadership; seeking financial support; identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership; soliciting potential major donors; soliciting potential donors; evaluating fund raising programs and establishing fund raising policy.
- I. Volunteers are involved in program activities. These activities include: providing effective leadership; providing personal financial support; seeking financial support; identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership; soliciting potential

major donors; and, evaluating fund raising programs.

- J. The chief development officer reports directly to the president. The frequency of meetings on development issues or activities is approximately weekly or as needed.
- K. The chief development officer is involved in total institutional planning.
- L. The development office is effective in clearly communicating its role to the institution and most important fund raising constituencies.

## II. Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies

- A. Alumni, non-alumni friends, business and industry and private foundations are important constituencies in providing philanthropic support.
- B. Significant development time or money (i.e., program EMPHASIS) is devoted to major gift programs and/or capital campaigns.

## III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques

- A. In assisting the development office, the public relations office is active in identifying and publicizing substantive institutional activities that may be considered important by the community or prospective contributors.
- B. The development office is active in cultivating or emphasizing corporate/business matching gifts for dollars contributed.



- C. The public's impression of the institution (i.e., the image the institution has in the public's eye) is important.
- D. Institutional time or money (i.e., program EMPHASIS) is spent on improving the institution's public image.

Based upon these findings, an "ideal" yet realistic development program should emphasize the above activities and management strategies. This is not to conclude that the other policy-relevant criteria are not valid or important but in the sample studied the activities above were important components of development programs at the overproductive institutions.

Although the fourth section of the Program Development Questionnaire on Record Keeping and Gift Processing did not lend itself to analysis, the data support the tentative conclusion that the overproductive development programs place greater emphasis on donor research and have more demographic and donor information on its alumni, non-alumni friends, corporations and foundations.

To help determine the nature or configuration of the most effective fund raising program, an additional analysis of extreme cases was done by comparing and contrasting the findings for the three most overproductive and three most underproductive institutions. The findings, although somewhat tentative because of the uniqueness of such extreme cases, provide additional insight into the nature of an effective fund

raising program. The analysis of extreme cases is discussed below for each program area on the Development Program Questionnaire.

#### I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources

Organizational Structure was very similar at each of the six institutions studied. In every case the chief development officer had direct access and reporting responsibilities to the college/university president. Further analysis indicated that two of the three institutions in both categories had a coordinated institutional advancement program including development, alumni relations and public relations. It can therefore be concluded that organizational structure per se for the sample studied was not a determining factor in distinguishing underproductive from overproductive institutions.

Although the number of professional and support staff were nearly identical between the two groups studied, the chief development officer had more experience as a development professional in the overproductive institutions. The findings showed that the overproductive group had two chief development professionals with ten or more years of experience and the underproductive group had two professionals with five or less years of experience. This provided additional evidence that the experience of the development professional was an important factor to the success of the development program.



The responses to the management techniques employed by the development programs were also analyzed for both extreme groups. Although no major differences in the management techniques employed were apparent, there was a tendency for the overproductive institutions to emphasize Management by Objective.

A major difference was apparent over the involvement of the president in the development activities. For the underproductive institutions, the president was most often either very uninvolved or generally uninvolved. In contrast, for the overproductive institutions, the president was generally involved and more often very involved in the development program activities.

Within both groups, all institutions responded that their governing board (i.e., college council or board of trustees) was either very uninvolved or generally uninvolved. The literature would suggest that the governing board of an institution should be one of the primary sources of financial support and major gifts. However, SUNY governing boards are usually political appointments and historically have not been asked to support the institutions financially.

Another significant contrast is the involvement of the foundation board of directors. For the underproductive institutions, the foundation board members were generally either very uninvolved or generally uninvolved. However, the

board members for the overproductive institutions were generally involved and occasionally very involved for certain activities, such as, evaluating and establishing fund raising policy, gift solicitation and making contributions.

Faculty, administrative personnel (excluding the president and development office), support staff and students were generally uninvolved in development program activities for both extreme groups. The above mentioned groups of individuals for the underproductive group tended more towards being very uninvolved in the development program activities.

A clear difference between underproductive and overproductive institutions was confirmed for the involvement of volunteers in the development program activities. Volunteers were often involved in development program activities for the overproductive institutions.

All three underproductive institutions responded that relationships among development, public relations and alumni relations should be coordinated organizationally in order to enhance fund raising potential. Two of the three underproductive institutions noted that their coordination was generally ineffective. The overproductive institutions however felt coordination was generally important but also believed their institutions were only generally effective concerning coordination of these programs.



The overproductive and underproductive institutions responded that it was very important for the entire institution and all constituencies to clearly understand the role of development in support of institutional objectives. A difference was apparent however in that the overproductive institutions believed their college/university had been generally effective, whereas, the underproductive institutions believed their college/university had been generally ineffective in communicating the role of the development office.

The chief development officer was generally involved in total institutional planning at the overproductive institutions, whereas, the chief development officer was generally uninvolved in total institutional planning at the underproductive institutions. This finding implies a difference between how the president at the underproductive and overproductive institutions choose to involve their chief development officer in the broader range of institutional planning activities.

There was no observable difference between the two extreme groups concerning the effectiveness of the development office in clearly communicating its role to the various fund raising constituencies and to the students. The responses ranged from generally ineffective to generally effective.

## II. Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies

The extreme overproductive institutions generally concurred that non-alumni friends, business and industry, private foundations and the foundation board of directors were the most effective constituencies in providing financial support. The underproductive institutions on the other hand felt the most effective constituencies in providing financial support included: alumni, non-alumni friends, parents, and business and industry. It seems significant that the perception of what constitutes an effective constituency differs considerably between the two extreme groups.

Concerning how much development program time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent in seeking funds, the overproductive institutions put moderate to heavy emphasis on major gift programs, non-alumni friends, business and industry and foundation board members. On the other hand, the underproductive institutions put moderate to heavy emphasis on the annual fund, parents, alumni giving, and business and industry. Again, it is quite clear that the emphasis differs between the two groups.

## III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques

All six institutions for the two extreme groups felt that it is very important for the public relations office to identify and publicize substantive institutional activities that may be identified as important by the community or



prospective contributors. As an assist to the development office, the public relations office was more active in identifying and publicizing substantive institutional activities considered important by the community or prospective contributors for the overproductive institutions. As one would expect, this suggests that public relations plays a vital role in the success of a productive development program.

The two extreme groups differ on the effectiveness of the college/university in communicating its case for philanthropic support. The underproductive institutions were generally ineffective whereas the overproductive institutions were generally effective in communicating its case.

All six institutions were very conscious of the importance of the public's impression of their institution, but only the overproductive institutions consistently placed heavy emphasis on institutional time or money in improving their institution's public image. The underproductive institutions placed some emphasis, but to a lesser degree.

Concerning the importance of on-going potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research), all six institutions perceived it as being very important to the success of the development program. However, a difference occurred in the effectiveness of prospect research. The overproductive institutions were generally effective and the underproductive were generally ineffective in having an on-going potential

donor identification program. None of the six institutions involved their alumni substantially in this potential donor identification process. Each of the institutions for both groups commit minimal amounts of time or money on prospect research and potential donor identification.

Another fund raising technique confirmed throughout the literature is the importance of personal visits in fund raising. Without exception, all of the extremes institutions considered personal visits as being very important. However, the difference occurred in that overproductive institutions committed more time and money to personal visits.

Major gifts (i.e., \$1,000 or more annually) to be solicited on a personal basis was considered very important by all institutions. However, a difference occurred in that the overproductive institutions spent significantly more time and money in seeking major gift support.

#### IV. Record Keeping and Gift Processing

Responses to this portion of the Program Development Questionnaire were not substantially different for the two extreme groups. However, subsequent personal interviews and campus visits confirmed different levels of sophistication in record keeping and gift processing. There seemed to be no clear pattern between the quality of records kept for the two groups. Both groups had institutions which had little more than mailing labels for its prospective donors and both groups



had at least one institution which had records that included occupational information, donor history and other pertinent facts concerning the prospective donors. Concerning the frequency of updating records, again, no consistent pattern emerged for either group of institutions.

There was no difference between the two groups on the timeliness of acknowledging gifts. Each institution in both groups acknowledged gifts within one week and considered their record system for acknowledging gifts as being effective.

In summary, Research Question Number Six has been answered in two ways. First, the analysis of policy-relevant fund raising activities resulted in identifying those policies and activities associated with overproductivity. Second, an analysis of extreme cases clarified those policy-relevant criteria and activities associated with overproductivity and/or underproductivity. The analysis of the extreme cases confirmed many findings obtained from the first approach.

#### Policy Implications for SUNY

##### Research Question Number Seven

How can SUNY institutions best take advantage of the "ideal" policy-relevant findings of this study for their development program?

This policy-relevant study of fund raising, including organizational structure and program sources, fund raising sources and constituencies, methods and techniques, and record keeping and gift processing, provides findings which should

benefit all SUNY institutions, whether underproductive, over-productive, or just beginning.

First, none of the SUNY institutions included in this study are meeting all of the criteria deemed important for an "ideal" development program as agreed upon by the expert panel and reported in Table 1. This fact is confirmed by the percent of items deviating from the ideal for each of the major sections of the Development Program Questionnaire as reported in Tables 2, 3, and 4. This finding is understandable since all the development programs at the sampled SUNY institutions are still maturing. However, it could be quite constructive for the chief development officer to assess the development program in the light of the established criteria proposed by the expert panel and report the findings to the campus-related foundation board. The development director and the foundation board of directors could select those criteria they feel their program is not exemplifying and make them a priority. In turn, the foundation could present its plan of action for support to the college/university administration.

Second, based on the methodology used in Chapter Three and the results presented in Table 5 concerning an institution's potential for fund raising, these factors could be considered in determining the scope and type of development program for an institution. For example, an institution classified as underproductive because gifts received are less than predicted,



should carefully analyze their program in the light of the input criteria as incorporated in the Program Development Questionnaire. Conversely, overproductive institutions should continue strengthening existing development programs.

Third, Tables 5 and 6 give evidence that the various types of institutions indeed do experience certain general levels of philanthropic support and their potential for support will vary depending upon the variables suggested by Pickett. This becomes important for other SUNY institutions contemplating starting a development program. The approach used in this study provides a rational basis for making a sound estimate as to what they could reasonably expect from their predictor variables (i.e., their potential) and their initial and continuing financial investment. This methodology may also be used to determine the cost effectiveness of the development program. Furthermore, Table 6 also provides some indication of productivity by type of institution.

Fourth, the results of the analysis of nine underproductive and seven overproductive institutions on item responses from the Program Development Questionnaire, as shown in Tables 7, 8 and 9, can assist all SUNY development programs. Rather than relying on professional opinion on a certain program criterion, these results can be compared to data gathered on new or additional institutions. Thus, any institution will be able to study their responses to each

criterion and to see how other overproductive and underproductive SUNY institutions responded. The research findings should be generalizable, within reason, to other campuses.

Fifth, the answer to Research Question Number Six, as presented in the beginning of this chapter, for the first time, provides SUNY institutions and the development field empirical findings on policy-relevant fund raising activities associated with overproductivity. These findings should be carefully studied and considered for practical application at other SUNY campuses.

Sixth, the analysis of extreme cases provides additional findings that should have practical applications. For example, the overproductive institutions concurred that non-alumni friends, business and industry, private foundations and the foundation board of directors were the most effective constituencies in providing philanthropic support. The underproductive institutions however considered its alumni, non-alumni friends, parents and business and industry as most effective. The review of the literature indicated that the amount of philanthropic support -- by sources -- to educational institutions, as reported for 1981, most closely correlates with the sources used most frequently by the overproductive institutions.



### Practical Interventions and Applications

In addition to each policy implication or intervention strategy for representative SUNY campuses there are three major practical applications for this research for SUNY Central Administration.

First, a recognized panel of experts has determined what criteria are clearly important for an "ideal" development program. These criteria are supported by the literature, as reported in Chapter 2. The policy-relevant criteria and the Program Development Questionnaire provide a very detailed and comprehensive management and investigation tool to measure progress for many areas of an established development program.

With the support and cooperation of SUNY campuses, the Program Development Questionnaire could be administered at regular intervals, perhaps every two years, to determine progress being made by each campus toward the "ideal" development program. For the first time, professional assistance could be given, based on meaningful questionnaire data rather than professional hunches. As a result, a comprehensive, and reliable program development and management system could be developed to assist in making policy decisions at the central office.

Second, a research methodology has been confirmed that ranks representative SUNY institutions on fund raising potential rather than total dollars received. This enables distinguishing those institutions which are overproducing or

underproducing on potential.

Based on the findings of fund raising potential, SUNY Central Administration could then be in a better position of recommending certain fund raising methods and programs. This could be accomplished through both campus visits and development workshops.

Third, one objective of this research was to identify fund raising policies which significantly contribute to productivity of fund raising at representative SUNY institutions. These policies so identified can now be shared with campuses and implemented where appropriate.

#### Issues for Development

An investigation such as this dealing with policy-relevant analysis of fund raising programs raises a set of value questions which must be addressed. Although it is outside the purposes of this study to provide answers to the value questions, it is important to identify them for careful consideration by development professionals and administrators.

1. Should the administration of an educational system allocate more resources to those institutions with greater fund raising potential or should resources be allocated equally among all institutions?
2. Should a development program only be evaluated on "output criteria", that is, the amount of philanthropic support received.



3. Should a development office only concentrate on those sources and constituencies which will produce the greatest amount of dollars with the least amount of institutional resources in the shortest period of time?
4. Should a development office solicit or accept major gifts which could substantially alter the academic program of the institution?
5. Should a development office be concerned with the source of funds received?

#### Recommendations for Further Research

Since this study is among the first of its kind in the field of development and the first of its kind for public institutions and State University of New York, the following topics are recommended for further research.

1. The research on estimating fund raising potential as reported in this study should be replicated on a larger sample of public institutions to firmly establish its validity. Attention should be given to further reducing the standard error of the regression equation used to estimate fund raising potential.
2. The research methodology used to estimate fund raising potential may, as suggested by Pickett (1977), be applicable to other resource acquisition activities such as student recruitment. It could be helpful to analyze the effectiveness of student recruitment at various institutions based on overproductivity and underproductivity rather than the

total number of students enrolled.

3. The policy-relevant criteria, as established by the expert panel, should be applied via the Program Development Questionnaire to a larger sample of various types of colleges and universities, both private and public, undergraduate and graduate.
4. More detailed policy-relevant research should be done on fund raising as it relates to the effectiveness of solicitation methods and sources, record keeping and gift processing and budget support. The findings of this investigation for these areas were tentative because of sample size and incomplete data.
5. A policy-relevant analysis of institutional advancement programs including alumni relations, public relations and development should be conducted at representative SUNY institutions as well as other representative institutions, both public and private, undergraduate and graduate.
6. More study is needed of donors and non-donors to determine what motivates them to make or not to make a contribution to an academic institution, whether public or private. If more empirical data were available on what motivates potential donors, then fund raising would become more precise and effective.



## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### List of Members of the Expert Panel



Members of the Expert Panel

James L. Fisher, President  
 Council for Advancement and  
 Support of Education;  
 Past President, Towson State University,  
 Baltimore, Maryland

Ross Jones, Vice President for  
 Public Affairs  
 Johns Hopkins University

Russell G. Mawby, President  
 W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Elisabeth Luce Moore, former  
 Chairman, SUNY Board of Trustees;  
 first woman Chairman of the Board of  
 the Institute for International  
 Education;  
 Trustee of the China Institute, the  
 Asia Foundation and the United Board for  
 Christian Higher Education in Asia

Michael Raddock, Senior Vice President  
 for Development and University Relations  
 University of Southern California

David Z. Robinson, Executive Vice President  
 Carnegie Corporation;  
 Trustee, City University of New York

A. Westley Rowland, Professor of Higher  
 Education, University at Buffalo;  
 Editor Handbook for Institutional Advance-  
ment;  
 Editor-in-Chief for the Jossey-Bass Series,  
New Directions for Institutional  
Advancement

Laurence D. Stifel, Vice President and  
 Secretary  
 The Rockefeller Foundation

Charles Taggart, Director of Development  
 Princeton University

William H. Wendel, Past President  
 Kennecott Copper Company;  
 Past President of The Carborundum Center;  
 Chairman of the Board, Polaris Corporation

APPENDIX B

Chancellor Clifton R. Wharton's Letter to Respondents  
Follow-up Letter to Respondents  
Survey Instrument-I





State University of New York  
State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor for  
University Affairs and Development

December 4, 1981

Mr. Laurence D. Stifel  
Vice President and Secretary  
The Rockefeller Foundation  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036

Dear Laurence:

This letter is to request your assistance to serve as a member of an expert panel for a doctoral dissertation my Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations, Charles Webb, is doing on "A Policy-Relevant Study of Development Programs at Representative Institutions Within the State University of New York." The purpose of the expert panel is to establish a set of criteria for an ideal development program which will become the basis of a standardized interview guide for an in-depth policy-relevant analysis of the organization, management, methods and effectiveness of fund raising at representative State University of New York institutions.

Since this dissertation is the first policy-relevant study of development programs, I believe it can make a significant contribution to the development profession and to State University of New York. In a few days, Chuck Webb will be requesting your participation as a member of the expert panel. Your participation will require responding to a questionnaire and a brief telephone interview. A list of the other proposed members of the expert panel is enclosed for your information.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Clifton R. Wharton  
Chancellor

Enclosure



State University of New York  
State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor for  
University Affairs and Development

January 29, 1982

Mr. Laurence D. Stifel  
Vice President and Secretary  
The Rockefeller Foundation  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036

Dear Mr. Stifel:

As a follow-up to Chancellor Clifton R. Wharton's December 4, 1981, letter, we again request your participation as a member of an expert panel for a policy-relevant study of development at representative institutions within the State University of New York. This study will complete my requirements for the doctor of philosophy degree in Administration and Higher Education at Michigan State University.

The purpose of the expert panel is to establish a set of criteria for an ideal development program which will become the basis for a standardized interview guide for an in-depth analysis of the organization, management, methods, and effectiveness of fund raising at representative State University of New York institutions.

As a member of the expert panel you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and respond to a brief telephone interview. I will be calling in a couple of days asking you to serve as a member of the expert panel.

Each panel member will be provided with a summary of the study when it is completed. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Webb  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Alumni Relations & Development

Enclosure



A POLICY-RELEVANT STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT  
REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE  
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

SURVEY INSTRUMENT - I

Instructions:

Please complete this survey instrument and return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. If you wish to elaborate, please do so in the "comments" or "related criteria" sections provided for each stated criterion. Add any additional policy-relevant criteria you think important for an ideal development program on the blank pages provided at the end of the survey instrument.

Survey Instrument - I completed by:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Thank You

CRITERION A

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Program includes effective and efficient record system providing the names, addresses, occupational information, history and other pertinent facts concerning prospective donors including alumni, non-alumni friends, corporations, and foundations.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION B

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Program managed by an experienced professional staff with a history of fund raising successes.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION C

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Institution has tradition of seeking financial support from private sector.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION D

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Major gifts (i.e., \$1,000 or more annually) actively solicited on a personal basis.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION E

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Program includes an on-going donor research program to identify and qualify major potential donors.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION F

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Program includes volunteers  
capable of providing--

effective leadership  
significant financial support  
recruitment of additional  
contributors

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION G

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development office continually plans and conducts a capital campaign.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION H

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development office is provided an adequate operating budget.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION I

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Institution has a positive image in the public's eye.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION J

Is this a valid criterion  
for an ideal development  
program?

Program includes providing effective  
leadership, financial support and re-  
cruitment of additional contributors  
by the

president

administrative personnel

faculty

staff

_____ Yes	_____ No
_____ Yes	_____ No
_____ Yes	_____ No
_____ Yes	_____ No

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION J-2

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Administrative personnel are engaged in the described development program activities--

provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors

Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION J-3

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Faculty are engaged in the described development program activities--

provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors

Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION J-4

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Support staff are engaged in the described development program activities--

provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors

Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION K

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Recruiting, recording, and acknowledgement of gifts is done in a timely and appropriate manner.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION L

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Alumni and university/college relations offices are integrally involved in the establishment and implementation of development office goals.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION M

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development office can effectively state its case for philanthropic support.

\_\_\_\_\_Yes \_\_\_\_\_No

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION N

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Chief development officer reports directly to the president of the institution.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION O

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Cultivated constituency exists from previous, careful university/college relations and/or alumni relations efforts.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION P

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development office establishes annual fund raising goals which are--

higher than previous year's goal  
significantly higher than previous  
year's goal

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION Q

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Relationships among development, university/college relations and alumni relations offices are coordinated organizationally to enhance fund raising potential.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION R

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Board of Trustees are engaged in the described development program activities--

provides effective leadership  
provides financial support  
solicits potential major donors

Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION S

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development program includes:

annual giving  
corporate giving  
foundation giving  
deferred giving  
capital giving

Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____
Yes _____	No _____

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION T

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Chief development officer is intimately involved in institution planning.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION U

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Development office is organized with immediate access to--

president	Yes _____	No _____
board of trustees	Yes _____	No _____
major potential donors	Yes _____	No _____
alumni leaders	Yes _____	No _____
community leaders	Yes _____	No _____
faculty leaders	Yes _____	No _____
administrative personnel	Yes _____	No _____

Comments


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria


---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

CRITERION V

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Entire institution and all constituencies clearly understand the role of the development office.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



CRITERION W

Is this a valid criterion for an ideal development program? (Please check.)

Chief development officer has held his current position for five or more years.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Related Criteria

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Describe new criterion of an ideal development program on this page.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.



CRITERION Y

Describe new criterion of an ideal development program on this page.

This image shows a single page of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

## CRITERION Z

Describe new criterion of an ideal development program on this page.

[illegible]



APPENDIX C

Cover Letter and Program  
Development Questionnaire  
For Study



State University of New York  
State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor for  
University Affairs and Development

February 10, 1982

President John M. Carter  
University at Buffalo Foundation, Inc.  
250 Winspear Avenue  
Buffalo, New York 14215

Dear John:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project for my dissertation. This investigation has the support of Chancellor Wharton and your assistance will contribute significantly to the quality of the findings.

Please read the enclosed instructions and complete your review/evaluation and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope by February 25, 1982. I am sticking to a tight deadline with this project and truly appreciate your efforts.

Upon receiving your review/evaluation, I will follow-up with a telephone interview regarding your responses. Would you like to receive a copy of the summary of this research project?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your assistance. I trust your work continues well.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Webb  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Alumni Relations & Development

CHW/eaj  
Enc.



PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire has four main parts:

- I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources,
- II. Fund Raising Sources and Constitutencies
- III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques, and
- IV. Record Keeping and Gift Processing.

Most items can be completed with check marks.

If you would like to elaborate on any question, please do so on separate paper and clearly indicate said item.

Questionnaire completed by:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# I. Organizational Structure and Program Resources

1. In the space below or on a separate sheet, please indicate your organizational chart. Show, as appropriate, the relationship of the governing board, campus administration, public relations, the alumni and development office. Please enclose a printed organizational chart if available.

2. How involved is each of the following in establishing the overall administrative policy for the fund raising program?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
President	_____	_____	_____	_____
Director of Alumni Affairs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Director of Public Relations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Board of Trustees (College Council)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Chief Development Officer	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foundation Board of Directors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Department Chair- person/faculty	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____



3. How many years has the Chief Development Officer worked as a development professional? Years

4. How many professional and support staff does your development office have?

Professional

Support

5. Many universities and/or programs use formal or informal management techniques such as Management by Objective (MBO), Program Planning and Budgeting (PPBS), Operations Analysis, PERT, etc. Please describe the management technique employed in the development program, how long it's been used, and briefly evaluate its effectiveness.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are approximately 20 lines visible. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a set of legal pads. There is no handwriting or other markings on the page.

6. How involved is the President in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re-cruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

7. How involved are all or most members of the Board of Trustees or College Council in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re-cruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____



## 7. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. How involved are all or most administrative personnel (excluding the President and development office) in the following program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, recruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____

## 8. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

9. How involved are all or most members of the Foundation Board of Directors in the following program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

10. How involved are all or most members of the faculty in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____



## 10. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

11. How involved are all or most support staff (outside the development office) in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____

## 11. Continued

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

12. How involved are volunteers in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re- cruiting and in- volving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____



13. How involved are all or most students in the following development program activities?

	Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
Providing effective leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Providing personal financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Seeking financial support	_____	_____	_____	_____
Identifying, re-cruiting and involving volunteer leadership	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential major donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Soliciting potential donors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Evaluating fund raising program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Establishing fund raising policy	_____	_____	_____	_____

14. How often does the chief development officer report directly to the president of the institution?

Daily \_\_\_\_\_

Weekly \_\_\_\_\_

Monthly \_\_\_\_\_

Bi-monthly \_\_\_\_\_

Quarterly \_\_\_\_\_

Semi-annually \_\_\_\_\_

Annually \_\_\_\_\_

15. How important is it that relationships among development, public relations, and alumni relations offices be coordinated organizationally in order to enhance fund raising potential?

Very  
Unimportant

Generally  
Unimportant

Generally  
Important

Very  
Important

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

16. At your institution, how effective is the coordination mentioned above in Item 15?

Very  
Ineffective

Generally  
Ineffective

Generally  
Effective

Very  
Effective

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

17. How involved is the chief development officer in total institutional planning?

Very  
Uninvolved

Generally  
Uninvolved

Generally  
Involved

Very  
Involved

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

18. How important is it that the entire institution and all constituencies clearly understand the role of the development office in support of institutional objectives?

Very  
Unimportant

Generally  
Unimportant

Generally  
Important

Very  
Important

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

19. How effective has the college/university been in clearly communicating the role of the development office to the entire institution and most, important fund raising constituencies?

Very  
Ineffective

Generally  
Ineffective

Generally  
Effective

Very  
Effective

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



20. How effective has the development office been in clearly communicating its role to the institution and most, important fund raising constituencies?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	_____	_____	_____

21. How effective has the development office been in clearly communicating its role to the students?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	_____	_____	_____

22. Approximately how much money is budgeted, spent, or in other ways provided in support of fund raising on an annual basis by the college/university? (Note: Total should roughly include professional and staff costs plus fringe benefits, supplies, etc.)

Estimated total costs for development program	_____ (1978-79)
	_____ (1979-80)
	_____ (1980-81)

23. Do you think your advancement budget is at or above average for institutions of your size and type? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

24. In institutional advancement, do you have as many or more people on staff as do other similar institutions? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

25. How effective is your institution in providing an adequate operating budget for the development office?

Very  
Ineffective

Generally  
Ineffective

Generally  
Effective

Very  
Effective

\_\_\_\_\_

## II. Fund Raising Sources and Constituencies

26. How effective are the following constituencies in providing funds to support your institution?

	Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
Alumni	_____	_____	_____	_____
Non-alumni friends	_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty & Staff	_____	_____	_____	_____
Parents	_____	_____	_____	_____
Students	_____	_____	_____	_____
Athletic Booster Program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Business & Industry	_____	_____	_____	_____
Private foundations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clubs & Organizations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Board of Trustees (College Council)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foundation Board of Directors	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____



27. How much development program time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent seeking funds from the following sources?

	No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
Major Gifts Programs				
Annual Fund				
Deferred (Planned) Gifts				
Capital Campaign				
Alumni				
Non-alumni friends				
Faculty & Staff				
Parents				
Students				
Business & Industry				
Athletic Booster Program				
Clubs & Organizations				
Board of Trustees (College Council)				
Foundation Board of Directors				
Other (please specify)				

28. Have individuals, corporations, or foundations with special interests in your institution been identified on a regular basis?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

General Examples \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### III. Fund Raising Methods and Techniques

29. How important is it for the development office to help plan and coordinate the capital and annual campaign?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

\_\_\_\_\_

30. How important to development is it for the public relations office to identify and publicize substantive institutional activities that may be identified as important by the community or prospective contributors?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

\_\_\_\_\_



31. As an assist to the development office, how active has the public relations office been in identifying and publicizing substantive institutional activities that may be considered important by the community or prospective contributors?

Very Inactive	Generally Inactive	Generally Active	Very Active
_____	_____	_____	_____

32. How active has the development office been in cultivating or emphasizing corporate/business matching gifts for dollars contributed?

Very Inactive	Generally Inactive	Generally Active	Very Active
_____	_____	_____	_____

33. How important is it that the development office establish the following types of fund raising goals?

	Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
Higher than previous year's goal	_____	_____	_____	_____
Significantly higher than previous year's goal	_____	_____	_____	_____
Inflation plus 5-10%	_____	_____	_____	_____
Major effort based on an anniversary (or the like)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Realistic expectations	_____	_____	_____	_____

34. Does your institution have and use a formal case statement?  
 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

35. Is this case statement available for review? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

36. How effectively does your entire college/institution communicate its case for philanthropic support?

Very Ineffectively	Generally Ineffectively	Generally Effectively	Very Effectively
_____	_____	_____	_____

37. How effectively does your development office, in conjunction with the entire university, highlight the accomplishments of alumni, faculty, students and staff?

Very Ineffectively	Generally Ineffectively	Generally Effectively	Very Effectively
_____	_____	_____	_____

38. How important is the public's impression of your institution (i.e., the image your institution has in the public's eye) to the administration?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____

39. How much development program time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on improving your institution's public image?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
_____	_____	_____	_____



40. How much institutional time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on improving your institution's public image?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
_____	_____	_____	_____

41. How important is on-going, potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) to the success of development programs?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
_____	_____	_____	_____

42. How effective is your on-going potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) process or system?

Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
_____	_____	_____	_____

43. How involved are alumni in your on-going potential donor identification (i.e., prospect research) practices?

Very Uninvolved	Generally Uninvolved	Generally Involved	Very Involved
_____	_____	_____	_____

44. How much time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on prospect research and potential donor identification?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
_____	_____	_____	_____

45. How important are personal visits to your fund raising efforts?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------

46. How much time or money (i.e., EMPHASIS) is spent on personal visits by development officers?

No EMPHASIS	Minimal EMPHASIS	Moderate EMPHASIS	Heavy EMPHASIS
----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------

47. How important is it that major gifts (i.e., \$1,000.00 or more annually) be actively solicited on a personal basis?

Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------

48. How effective are the following methods and techniques in optimizing your fund raising effort? (Only respond for methods and techniques currently being used.)

	Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
--	---------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	-------------------

Printed brochures	_____	_____	_____	_____
Computerized letters	_____	_____	_____	_____
Personalized letters	_____	_____	_____	_____
Humor in printed material	_____	_____	_____	_____
Annual themes	_____	_____	_____	_____



## 48. Continued

	Very Ineffective	Generally Ineffective	Generally Effective	Very Effective
Suggested gift amounts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Designated gifts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Class agent system	_____	_____	_____	_____
Class reunion giving	_____	_____	_____	_____
Phoning by students	_____	_____	_____	_____
Phoning by alumni	_____	_____	_____	_____
Personal visits	_____	_____	_____	_____
Special gift program	_____	_____	_____	_____
Outside professional counsel	_____	_____	_____	_____
Prospect research	_____	_____	_____	_____
Case statements	_____	_____	_____	_____
Organized groups of friends	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please specify)	_____	_____	_____	_____

49. Funds raised from private sources can be designated for many uses. How important is each of the following in positively influencing your donors to contribute?

	Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
Scholarships	_____	_____	_____	_____

## 49. Continued

	Very Unimportant	Generally Unimportant	Generally Important	Very Important
Endowment	_____	_____	_____	_____
Specific academic areas	_____	_____	_____	_____
Library acquisitions	_____	_____	_____	_____
Intercollegiate athletics	_____	_____	_____	_____
Endowed Chairs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Faculty projects	_____	_____	_____	_____
Special programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital projects	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gifts-in-kind	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____	_____
Campus beautification	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other (please describe)				
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

50. What do you feel are the most outstanding features of your total fund raising program?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



IV. Record Keeping and Gift Processing

51. How are alumni records stored?

☐ College/University Computer☐ Development Computer☐ Addressograph☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

52. How many records [i.e., total number of names on mailing list(s)] are stored?

☐ 1-5000☐ 15,001-30,000☐ 5001-15,000☐ 30,001-50,000☐ over 50,00053. Do your records include occupational information, history of giving, or other pertinent facts concerning prospective contributors? Yes ☐ No ☐54. Does the development office acknowledge gifts in a timely fashion, that is, within one week? Yes ☐ No ☐55. Are prospects rated as to giving-potential and ranked in priority order? Yes ☐ No ☐

56. Which of the following prospective contributors are presently in your donor research file?

President ☐Board of Trustees (College Council) ☐Campus Related Foundation/Board of Directors ☐

## 56. Continued

Alumni	_____
Non-alumni Friends	_____
Faculty and Staff	_____
Parents	_____
Business and Industry	_____
Private Foundations	_____
Clubs and Organizations	_____
"Alumni" of special programs (e.g., an Advanced Management Program)	_____

## 57. How often are records updated?

Monthly	_____	and as needed	_____
Bi-monthly	_____	and as needed	_____
Quarterly	_____	and as needed	_____
Semi-annually	_____	and as needed	_____
Annually	_____	and as needed	_____
As needed only	_____		

## 58. Are there provisions for keeping records secure?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

## 59. How often is an analysis of prior giving by individual and/or other constituencies done?

Monthly	_____
Bi-monthly	_____
Quarterly	_____



59. Continued

Semi-annually \_\_\_\_\_

Annually \_\_\_\_\_

As needed \_\_\_\_\_

60. How effective (or efficient) is your system in recording and acknowledging all gifts received?

Very  
Ineffective

Generally  
Ineffective

Generally  
Effective

Very  
Effective

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you!

APPENDIX D

Program Development Questionnaire  
Items Related to Survey Instrument - I  
Criteria



Program Development Questionnaire  
Questionnaire Items

Survey Instrument-I  
Criteria

1	N, Q, U
2	J, L, R
3	B, W
4	B, H
5	B
6	D
7	D, R
8	D, J, J-2
9	D, J
10	D, J, J-3
11	D, J, J-4
12	D, F
13	D
14	N
15	L, Q
16	L, Q
17	T
18	C, T
19	C, O, V
20	C, O
21	C, O
22	H
23	H
24	H
25	H
26	F, S
27	D, S
28	S
29	G, S
30	I, O
31	L
32	S
33	P
34	M
35	M
36	O
37	O
38	I
39	I
40	O
41	A, E, O
42	E, O
43	A, E, O
44	A, E
45	D
46	D
47	S
48	A, D, E
49	S

Continued

Program Development Questionnaire  
Questionnaire ItemsSurvey Instrument-I  
Criteria

50	None
51	A
52	A
53	A
54	K
55	A, E
56	A, E
57	A
58	None
59	A, E
60	A



## APPENDIX E

List of Evaluators  
Cover Letter Item Rating  
Form for Program Development Questionnaire  
and Cover Letter for Pilot Study

EVALUATORS FOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT-I

Joseph E. Dickinson  
Vice President for Development  
Michigan State University

Gary Evans  
Vice President for Resource Development  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Robert Perrin  
Vice Chancellor, University Affairs  
and Development  
State University of New York

James Van Houten  
Coordinator of Alumni Affairs  
State University of New York





State University of New York

State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor for  
University Affairs and Development

January 15, 1982

Mr. Joseph E. Dickinson  
Vice President for Development  
Michigan State University  
1407 South Harrison Road  
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Dear Joe:

Thank you for agreeing to review the enclosed questionnaire that I will be using in my dissertation for the Ph.D. at Michigan State University. Your experience and abilities in the area of development will certainly contribute to the quality of this instrument and the findings of my investigation.

Please return your evaluation in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Would you like a copy of the summary of my findings?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you again. I look forward to reading your review/evaluation.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Webb  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Alumni Relations & Development

CHW/eaj  
Enclosure

A POLICY-RELEVANT STUDY OF  
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT REPRESENTATIVE  
INSTITUTIONS WITHIN THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

SURVEY INSTRUMENT - I  
EVALUATION FORM

The attached questionnaire incorporates criteria and program components deemed important to ideal development programs. These criteria have been proposed by development officers of major institutions and corporations and selected from program development literature.

This survey instrument will be used to gather information on development programs from development officers, and as such, should be relatively uncomplicated to read and complete.

On the page that follows, please note the clarity or ambiguity of each question using the following scale:

- 1 - Clear
- 2 - Undecided
- 3 - Ambiguous

On separate paper, please comment on any item you consider to be ambiguous and indicate said item.



EVALUATION

## A. Questions

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_
25. \_\_\_\_\_
26. \_\_\_\_\_

27. \_\_\_\_\_
28. \_\_\_\_\_
29. \_\_\_\_\_
30. \_\_\_\_\_
31. \_\_\_\_\_
32. \_\_\_\_\_
33. \_\_\_\_\_
34. \_\_\_\_\_
35. \_\_\_\_\_
36. \_\_\_\_\_
37. \_\_\_\_\_
38. \_\_\_\_\_
39. \_\_\_\_\_
40. \_\_\_\_\_
41. \_\_\_\_\_
42. \_\_\_\_\_
43. \_\_\_\_\_
44. \_\_\_\_\_
45. \_\_\_\_\_
46. \_\_\_\_\_
47. \_\_\_\_\_
48. \_\_\_\_\_
49. \_\_\_\_\_
50. \_\_\_\_\_
51. \_\_\_\_\_
52. \_\_\_\_\_

53. \_\_\_\_\_

54. \_\_\_\_\_

55. \_\_\_\_\_

56. \_\_\_\_\_

57. \_\_\_\_\_

58. \_\_\_\_\_

59. \_\_\_\_\_

60. \_\_\_\_\_

61. \_\_\_\_\_

62. \_\_\_\_\_

EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_

POSITION \_\_\_\_\_

INSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you!





State University of New York  
State University Plaza  
Albany, New York 12246

Office of the Vice Chancellor for  
University Affairs and Development

January 15, 1982

Ms. Patricia Bartlett  
Assistant Vice President for Development  
Empire State College  
2 Union Avenue  
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Dear Pat:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project for my dissertation at Michigan State University. Your assistance will contribute significantly to the quality of the findings.

Please read the enclosed instructions and complete your review/evaluation by February 1, 1982. I am sticking to a tight deadline with this project and truly appreciate your efforts.

Would you like to receive a copy of the summary of this research project?    Yes \_\_\_\_\_    No \_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your assistance. I trust your work continues well.

Sincerely,

Charles H. Webb  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Alumni Relations & Development

CHW/eaj  
Enclosure (2)

## APPENDIX F

Study of Response Consistency of Items  
on Program Development Questionnaire



Reliability statistics based on the responses of six SUNY chief development officers to the retest of the questionnaire.

<u>Criterion Statement</u>	<u>Same Response*</u>	<u>Different Response #</u>	<u>Proportion of Agreement <del>g</del></u>
1	6	0	1.00
2	4	2	.67
3	5	1	.83
4	6	0	1.00
5	6	0	1.00
6	6	0	1.00
7	4	2	.67
8	4	2	.67
9	5	1	.83
10	4	2	.67
11	4	2	.67
12	5	1	.83
13	4	2	.67
14	5	1	.83
15	5	1	.83
16	5	1	.83
17	6	0	1.00
18	6	0	1.00
19	6	0	1.00
20	6	0	1.00
21	5	1	.83
22	6	0	1.00
23	4	2	.67
24	5	1	.83
25	5	1	.83
26	6	0	1.00
27	5	1	.83
28	6	0	1.00
29	4	2	.67
30	4	2	.67
31	5	1	.83
32	5	1	.83
33	6	0	1.00
34	6	0	1.00
35	6	0	1.00
36	6	0	1.00
37	5	1	1.00
38	6	0	1.00
39	6	0	1.00
40	6	0	1.00
41	5	1	.83
42	6	0	1.00
43	6	0	1.00
44	5	1	.83
45	6	0	1.00

<u>Criterion Statement</u>	<u>Same Response*</u>	<u>Different Response #</u>	<u>Proportion of Agreement <math>\phi</math></u>
46	6	0	1.00
47	5	1	.83
48	6	0	1.00
49	6	0	1.00
50	6	0	1.00
51	6	0	1.00
52	5	1	.83
53	5	1	.83
54	5	1	.83
55	6	0	1.00
56	4	2	.67
57	5	1	.83
58	6	0	1.00
59	6	0	1.00
60	5	1	.83
61	5	1	.83
62	4	2	.67
63	3	3	.50
64	4	2	.67
65	4	2	.67
66	4	2	.67
67	4	2	.67
68	4	2	.67
69	4	2	.67
70	6	0	1.00
71	4	2	.67
72	6	0	1.00
73	5	1	.83
74	6	0	1.00
75	5	1	.83
76	5	1	.83
77	5	1	.83
78	5	1	.83
79	6	0	1.00
80	4	2	.67
81	6	0	1.00
82	4	2	.67
83	6	0	1.00
84	4	2	.67
85	4	2	.67
86	6	0	1.00
87	4	2	.67
88	4	2	.67
89	4	2	.67
90	6	0	1.00
91	4	2	.67
92	5	1	.83
93	6	0	1.00
94	6	0	1.00
95	5	1	.83



<u>Criterion Statement</u>	<u>Same Response*</u>	<u>Different Response #</u>	<u>Proportion of Agreement <math>\phi</math></u>
96	5	1	.83
97	4	2	.67
98	6	0	1.00
99	6	0	1.00
100	3	3	.50
101	3	3	.50
102	6	0	1.00
103	4	2	.67
104	4	2	.67
105	5	1	.83
106	2	4	.34
107	6	0	1.00
108	6	0	1.00
109	5	1	.83
110	4	2	.67
111	4	2	.67
112	3	3	.50
113	3	3	.50
114	3	3	.50
115	6	0	1.00
116	5	1	.83
117	3	3	.50
118	4	2	.67
119	3	3	.50
120	6	0	1.00
121	4	2	.67
122	4	2	.67
123	6	0	1.00
124	4	2	.67
125	4	2	.67
126	5	1	.83
127	6	0	1.00
128	4	2	.67
129	6	0	1.00
130	5	1	.83
131	2	4	.34
132	4	2	.67
133	3	3	.50
134	4	2	.67
135	4	2	.67
136	4	2	.67
137	2	4	.34
138	2	4	.34
139	2	4	.34
140	2	4	.34
141	3	3	.50
142	2	4	.34
143	0	6	.00
144	2	4	.34

<u>Criterion Statement</u>	<u>Same Response*</u>	<u>Different Response #</u>	<u>Proportion of Agreement <math>\phi</math></u>
145	3	3	.50
146	3	3	.50
147	5	1	.83
148	4	2	.67
149	4	2	.67
150	4	2	.67
151	5	1	.83
152	3	3	.50
153	6	0	1.00
154	5	1	.83
155	3	3	1.00
156	5	1	.83
157	4	2	.67
158	4	2	.67
159	5	1	.83
160	6	0	1.00
161	6	0	1.00
162	6	0	1.00
163	6	0	1.00
164	2	4	.34
165	2	4	.34
166	6	0	1.00
167	4	2	.67
168	5	1	.83
169	3	3	.50
170	5	1	.83
171	4	2	.67
172	3	3	.50
173	2	4	.34
174	4	2	.67
175	5	1	.83
176	6	0	1.00
177	5	1	.83
178	6	0	1.00

\* Same Response is the number of individuals who gave identical responses on the two administrations of the questionnaire.

# Different Response is the number of individuals whose responses on the second administration of the questionnaire were not identical to their previous responses.

$$\phi \text{ Proportion of Agreement} = \frac{\text{N of Same Response}}{(\text{N of Same Response} + \text{N of Different Response})}$$



## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Allen, Edison B. (ed.). Fundamentals of Educational Fund Raising. Washington, D.C.: American Alumni Council, 1968.
- American Alumni Council, the Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Association of Independent Schools. Voluntary Support of Education, 1977-7-1978; 1978-1979. Washington, D.C.: American Alumni Council for Financial Aid to Education, and the National Association of Independent Schools, 1978-1979.
- American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel. Giving U.S.A.: 1975 Annual Report. New York: AAFRC, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Giving U.S.A.: 1977; 1978; 1979. New York: American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc., 1977-1978, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Giving U.S.A.: 1980 Annual Report. New York: American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc., 1980.
- Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc. A Study of the Development Potentials of State University of New York. New York: Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc., 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Voluntary Support for Public Higher Education. New York: Brakeley, John Price Jones, Inc., 1977-78.
- Commission on Financing Higher Education. Nature and Needs of Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Cornell, C. D. "Staffing the Small College Development Office." Techniques, January-February 1970.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. Voluntary Support of Education. New York: Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1977-1978.
- Cowley, W. H. Presidents, Professors, and Trustees. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1980.



- Desmond, Richard L. Higher Education and Tax-Motivated Giving. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association, 1967.
- Education Commission of the States. Higher Education in the States. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1978.
- Gamble, Charles. How to Raise Money. New York: Association Press, 1942.
- Hunter, T. Willard. The Tax Climate for Philanthropy. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association, 1968.
- Morris, D. A. A. An Analysis of Donors of \$10,000 or More to the \$55 Million Program at the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1970.
- National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Margin for Excellence: The Role of Voluntary Support in Public Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1966.
- New Directions for Institutional Advancement. Analyzing the Cost Effectiveness of Fund Raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1979.
- Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. Quality in Higher Education in Times of Financial Stress. Oregon State University Press, 1975.
- Pfnister, Allan O. Planning for Higher Education. Boulder, Co.: Westview Press, 1976.
- Pollard, John A. Fund-Raising for Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.
- Sheehan, Ernest T. Public Universities and Private Support. Washington, D.C.: American Alumni Council, 1958.
- Ten Brook, Andrew. American State Universities: Their Origin and Progress. Cincinnati: Robert Clark and Co., 1975.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY



BIBLIOGRAPHYBOOKS

- Andrews, F. Emerson. Philanthropic Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950.
- Andrews, F. Emerson. Philanthropy in the United States. New York: The Foundation Center, 1978.
- American Association of Fund Raising Counsel. Giving U.S.A.: 1962 Annual Report. New York: AAFRC, 1963.
- American Association of Fund Raising Counsel. Giving U.S.A.: 1981 Annual Report. New York: AAFRC, 1981.
- Ashworth, Kenneth H. American Higher Education in Decline. College Station: Texam A&M University, 1979.
- Brakeley, George A., Jr. Tested Ways to Successful Fund Raising. New York: AMACOM, 1980.
- Brenner, Robert H. American Philanthropy. Chicago: University Press, 1960.
- Broce, Thomas E. Fund Raising. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1980.
- Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.
- Corson, John J. and Hodson, Harry V. (ed.). Philanthropy in the 70's: An Anglo-American Discussion. New York: The Council on Foundations, Inc., 1973.
- Curti, Merle and Nash, Roderick. Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Cutlip, Scott. Fund Raising in the United States. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Daniels, George H. Science in American Society: A Social History. New York: Knopf, 1971.

- Dermer, Joseph. How to Raise Funds from Foundations. New York: Public Service Materials Center, 1977.
- Filer, John H. Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector. Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975.
- Fisher, James L. Presidential Leadership in Advancement Activities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.
- Garin, Maurice G. What Volunteers Should Know for Successful Fund Raising. New York: Stein and Day, 1981.
- Hungate, Thad Lewis. Financing the Future of Higher Education. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, 1946.
- Jacobson, Harvey K. (ed.). Evaluating Advancement Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.
- Jenkins, Edward C. Philanthropy in America. New York: Association Press, 1950.
- Jones, John Price. Philanthropy Today. New York: The Inter-River Press, 1949.
- Katz, Harvey. Give! Who Gets Your Charity Dollar. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1974.
- Kurzig, Carol M. Foundation Fundamentals: A Guide for Grant-seekers. New York: The Foundation Center, 1980.
- Leslie, John W. Focus on Understanding and Support. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association, 1969.
- Leslie, John W. Seeking the Competitive Dollar: College Management in the 70s. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association, 1971.
- Maddalena, Lucille A. (ed.). Encouraging Voluntarism and Volunteers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.
- Marts, Arnaud C. The Generosity of Americans: Its Source, Its Achievements. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1966.
- Marts, Arnaud C. Philanthropy's Role in Civilization. New York: Harper and Brother, 1953.



- Mayhew, Lewis B. Legacy of the Seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1977.
- McAnear, Beverly. "The Raising of Funds by the Colonial Colleges," Mississippi Valley Historical Press: Vol. XXXVIII, 1962.
- Morison, Samuel Elliot. Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.
- Nevins, Allan. The State Universities and Democracy. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1962.
- Nielsen, Waldemar A. The Endangered Sector. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.
- Pray, Francis C. (ed.). Handbook for Educational Fund Raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981.
- Rowland, A. Westley. Handbook of Institutional Advancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.
- Sears, Jesse Bundage. Philanthropy in the History of American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922.
- Seymour, Harold J. Designs for Fund Raising. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Sharpe, Robert F. The Planned Giving Idea Book. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1980.
- The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on College and University Endowment Policy. Funds For The Future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Welch, Patrice A. (ed.). Increasing Annual Giving. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

#### PERIODICALS

- "Carnegie Panel Says Enrollment Declines Create a 'New Academic Revolution.'" The Chronicle of Higher Education. January 28, 1980.
- "Serious Financial Problems Facing States Portend a Lean Year for Public Campuses." The Chronicle of Higher Education. February 17, 1981.

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

- McGinnes, Dennis Robert. "A Study of Fund Raising Programs at Selected State Colleges and Regional Universities." Ed. D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1980.
- Perrotte, Ronald J. "Fund Raising in Higher Education in the United States with Special Reference to Selected Institutions in Michigan." Ed. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.
- Pickett, William L. "An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Fund Raising Policies of Private Undergraduate Colleges." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1977.
- Sherratt, Gerald R. "Methods and Techniques of Fund Raising at Selected Public Institutions." Ph. D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1975.
- Stout, Glenn. W. "A Study of Fund-Raising at Selected Public Multi-campus Universities." Ed. D. dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1977.
- Wharton, Clifton R. , Jr. "Testimony Before the Senate Committee on Higher Education." Albany, New York: March 5, 1980.



