

A COMPARISON OF DECENTRALIZED AND CENTRALIZED PATTERNS  
OF MANAGING THE ADVANCEMENT ACTIVITIES  
AT RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

by

Margarete Rooney Hall

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of The University of Maryland in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
1989

C. T.

Maryland

LD

3231

.M70d

Hall,

M.R.

Folio

Advisory Committee:

Professor Robert O. Berdahl, Chairman/ Advisor  
Professor Robert F. Carbone  
Associate Professor Daniel P. Huden  
Professor Rudolph P. Lamone  
Associate Professor Frank A. Schmidtlein

© Copyright by

Margarete Rooney Hall

1989



## ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation: A COMPARISON OF DECENTRALIZED  
AND CENTRALIZED PATTERNS OF MANAGING THE INSTITUTIONAL  
ADVANCEMENT ACTIVITIES AT RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Margarete Rooney Hall, Doctor of Philosophy, 1989

Dissertation directed by: Robert O. Berdahl,  
Professor, Department of Education Policy, Planning  
and Administration

This study compares three patterns of managing the  
institutional advancement activities of universities:  
a centralized pattern; a decentralized pattern; and, a  
semi-decentralized pattern.

A telephone survey of 97 colleges and universities  
determined that at research universities, in addition  
to the university-wide development office, 57% have  
development offices for their business schools and 44%  
for their engineering schools. Following up on the  
initial survey, case studies were conducted at three  
universities, one with each management pattern.  
Academic and advancement executives were interviewed.  
A mail survey was also conducted of 312 development

officers at research universities.

The case studies and the final survey show significant agreement in areas such as: (a) whether the academic unit or the central development office should bear the responsibility for maintaining the alumni/donor database and the records of gifts, for researching prospects, and for acknowledging gifts; and, (b) whether an academic unit development officer, in order to succeed, must be an integral part of the unit's management team, have easy access to the dean, and interact well with faculty and the members of the unit's volunteer board.

The responses show significant disagreement in areas such as: (a) whether an academic unit development officer, in order to succeed, must report to the dean, be paid by the dean, be located in the academic unit, have good rapport with the chief university development officer, or have an academic title; (b) whether the academic unit or the central development office should have primary responsibility for major gift solicitations, annual fund, setting development priorities, stewardship, and preparing the case statement; and, (c) how effective are coordination and control measures, volunteer boards, and communications between the central office and the

academic units and between the faculty and the development officers.

To address the strengths and weaknesses of each management pattern, it is recommended that: (a) a fully centralized system establish a Deans' Development Council, (b) a fully decentralized system establish an Executive Development Council and a Development Committee, (c) a semi-decentralized system give particular attention to communication from the central development office to the academic unit development offices.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I acknowledge with gratitude the support of my advisor, Dr. Robert O. Sordahl, and the members of my doctoral committee who individually and collectively have given me the opportunity to finish. I also acknowledge the support of Kathleen Kelly, who never had the opportunity to finish. I acknowledge the support of my advisor, Dr. Robert O. Sordahl, and the members of my doctoral committee who individually and collectively have given me the opportunity to finish. I also acknowledge the support of Kathleen Kelly, who never had the opportunity to finish.

## DEDICATION

To Kathleen Rooney, an expert editor and a friend who never had the opportunity to finish.

I acknowledge with gratitude the extraordinary support of my advisor, Dr. Robert O. Sordahl, and the members of my doctoral committee who individually and collectively have given me the opportunity to finish. I also acknowledge the support of Kathleen Kelly, who never had the opportunity to finish.

I acknowledge with gratitude and in friendship the intellectual and moral support of Kathleen Kelly to whom I often turned for assistance with defining my



### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge with gratitude the support of my employers during the time that this research was underway, the University of Maryland, College Park and Mount Saint Mary's College. These are institutions which practice what they preach: they encourage the pursuit of higher education with some tuition remission and some flexibility in work schedules and other tangible and intangible assistance.

I acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of Darlene Clem with transcription of interviews and production of survey correspondence.

I acknowledge with gratitude the expert editing and design assistance of Joan Krodel and Robert Blackmur.

I acknowledge with gratitude the extraordinary support of my advisor, Dr. Robert O. Berdahl, and the other members of my doctoral committee who individually and collectively were always interested in my work and always willing and able to provide assistance in every realm whether theoretical or procedural.

I acknowledge with gratitude and in friendship the intellectual and moral support of Kathleen Kelly to whom I often turned for assistance with defining my

ideas, testing my hypotheses, refining my conclusions and generally assuring myself that I was on a right track.

I acknowledge with love the contributions of my husband, Russell J. Hall, and my daughters, Pamela F. Hall and Megan M. Hall, who invested their thoughts and ideas, questions and solutions, theories and dilemmas, songs and poems, work and play in a family environment which stimulated and nurtured the extended life of this doctoral program and supported it to successful conclusion.

Chapter 1: Introduction and Background	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	13
Chapter 3: Methodology	27
Chapter 4: Data Analysis	38
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Recommendations, and Research Needs	143
Chapter 6: Appendix A: Survey Questions	185
Chapter 7: Appendix B: Lead Letter	190
Chapter 8: Appendix C: Cover Letter	191
Chapter 9: Appendix D: Final Survey	192
Chapter 10: Appendix E: Tables	197
Chapter 11: Literature Cited	251

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	8
The Development Function in Higher Education.....	9
The Role of the President in Development.....	11
Development as Described by Historians of Higher Education.....	13
Management Theories and Decentralization.....	23
Management Concerns in Decentralized Development Operations.....	27
Summary.....	32
Chapter 3: Research Design.....	34
Chapter 4: Results A	
The Trend Toward Decentralization.....	51
Aggregate and Group Analysis of Final Survey..	58
Factors Influencing Success in Decentralization.....	63
The Division of Development Responsibilities..	68
Chapter 5: Results B	
Management Issues and the Relative Merits of Centralized, Decentralized, and Semi-decentralized Development Systems.....	88
Case Study 1.....	89
Case Study 2.....	105
Case Study 3.....	118
Survey Data.....	134
Chapter 6: Conclusions, Recommendations, and Research Needs.....	143
Conclusions.....	149
Recommendations.....	177
Further Research Needs.....	181
Appendix 1 Case Study Questions.....	185
Appendix 2 Lead Letter.....	190
Appendix 3 Cover Letter.....	191
Appendix 4 Final Survey.....	192
Appendix 5 Tables.....	197
Literature Cited.....	263



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Age of Academic Unit Development Offices	197
2. Self-Reported Salaries	198
3. Years of Experience of Development Officers	198
4. Self-Reported Skill Level of Development Officers	199
5. Factors in AUDO Success: Aggregate Results	199
6. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Being Part of the Management Team of the Unit	200
7. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Having Easy Access to the Dean	201
8. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Having a High Level of Interaction with the Faculty	202
9. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Interacting with the Academic Unit's Volunteer Board	203
10. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Interacting with the University's Primary Volunteer Board	204
11. Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses Having a Dean Who is Committed to the Development Effort	205
12. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Being Paid by the Dean	206
13. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Reporting to the Dean	207
14. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Being Physically Located in the Academic Unit	208
15. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Having Interaction With Students	209



16. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Having a Good Rapport With the Chief Development Officer	210
17. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Having a Good Rapport With the University President	211
18. Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses Having an Academic Title	212
19. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Aggregate Responses	213
20. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Maintaining Alumni Databases	214
21. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Maintaining Gift Records	215
22. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Prospect Identification	216
23. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Case Statement Preparation	217
24. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Proposal Preparation	218
25. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Annual Fund	219
26. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Major Individual Gifts	220
27. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Major Corporate Gifts	221
28. Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison Major Foundation Gifts	222

29. Ideal Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Development Priority Setting	223
30. Ideal Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Stewardship of Gifts	224
31. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Aggregate Response	225
32. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Setting Development Priorities	226
33. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Preparing the Case Statement	227
34. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Cultivates Donor Interest	228
35. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Orchestrating Solicitations	
for Smaller Gifts	229
36. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Maintaining Gift Records	230
37. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Maintaining the Alumni Database	231
38. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Staff Support for Alumni Relations	232
39. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Staffing for Public Relations	233
40. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Soliciting Gifts from Unit Alumni	234

41. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Identifying Prospective Donors	235
42. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Acknowledges Designated Gifts	236
43. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Orchestrates Solicitation of Major Designated Gifts	237
44. Current Division of Responsibilities:	
Group Comparison	
Assures Gifts Are Used As Intended	238
45. AUDO as Source of Inside Information:	
Aggregate Response	239
46. AUDO as Source of Outside Information:	
Aggregate Response	239
47. AUDO as Source of Inside Information:	
Group Comparison	240
48. AUDO as Source of Outside Information:	
Group Comparison	241
49. CUDO as Source of Inside Information:	
Aggregate Response	242
50. CUDO as Source of Outside Information:	
Aggregate Response	242
51. CUDO as Source of Inside Information:	
Group Comparison	243
52. CUDO as Source of Outside Information:	
Group Comparison	244
53. Upward Communication: Aggregate Response	245
54. Downward Communication: Aggregate Response	245
55. Upward Communication: Group Comparison	246
56. Downward Communication: Group Comparison	247



57. Relationship Between Development Officers and Faculty: Aggregate Response	248
58. Relationship Between the AUDO and the Faculty: Group Comparison	249
59. Relationship Between the CUDO and the Faculty: Group Comparison	250
60. Occurrence of Shifts in Academic Priorities: Group Comparison	251
61. Manager of Priority Shifting Gift Group Comparison	252
62. Acceptance of Shift in Priority Group Comparison	253
63. Helpfulness of Volunteer Boards: Aggregate Response	254
64. Existence of Volunteer Boards Group Comparison	254
65. Helpfulness of Business Volunteer Boards Group Comparison	255
66. Helpfulness of Engineering Volunteer Boards Group Comparison	256
67. Existence of Tracking Systems Group Comparison	257
68. Effectiveness of Tracking Systems Aggregate Response	258
69. Effectiveness of Tracking Cultivation Group Comparison	259
70. Effectiveness of Tracking Solicitation Group Comparison	260
71. Effectiveness in Preventing Multiple Solicitations: Group Comparison	261
72. Increasing the Power of the Deans Group Comparison	262

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTION

As the higher education enterprise has become complex and sophisticated, management questions surrounding efforts to attract private support also have grown. Higher education has always been in the business of attracting private support. Currently, in addition to colleges and universities seeking support, subunits of some colleges and universities have begun to undertake their own advancement activities. These fund raising activities are in many ways separate from and competitive with development activities of the institution as a whole. Not only does each institution have a chief development officer charged with increasing the philanthropic support of the institution, but one or more of the deans or departmental leaders also may have a development officer who raises money to support that one college or department within the university.

Development activities of higher education have grown to be a major part of the administrative work of most educational institutions. In fact, in 1987-88, \$8.2 billion in philanthropic gifts was contributed to the support of American higher education by individuals, foundations, businesses, and associations. For the most part those gifts resulted

from specific and formal requests for support by the development offices of the recipient institutions.

As the number of colleges and universities grew, so did the number of fund raisers. Early colleges were small and organizationally simple; so were their development operations. When the colleges became larger and more complex, more development officers worked for them. Almost always the development officers worked for the president and sought philanthropic support for the institution as a whole. The exceptions were in areas such as medicine or law, units which in many ways were only loosely coupled to the university's core and which often were not even located on the same campus or in the same city.

Now it appears that a trend is developing toward the establishment of development offices within components of universities; within colleges, academic departments, institutes, and centers. In 1986, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), which annually holds more than 100 conferences on development for higher education institutions across the nation, held its first conference on development for academic deans. The interest was so strong that the conference was offered again in 1987, 1988, and 1989. Enrollments grow each year. A Spring



1988 issue of CASE Currents dealt exclusively with development issues faced by academic deans. This was the first time this journal, devoted to institutional advancement, focused on the development role of deans.

Management issues are central to the decisions about their advancement activities which institutional leaders must make. Deans must decide whether to invest scarce resources in establishing an advancement office. Presidents and chancellors must decide whether to allow or even encourage establishing subunit-based development offices. They must weigh the potential for increased resources against the potential for an inappropriate shift in institutional power toward the deans who control those new resources. Advancement officers with university-wide responsibilities must implement processes which will lead to a maximum receipt of philanthropic support but must also assure that no element of the institution lacks appropriate philanthropic support.

This study addressed several such management issues and sought answers to questions such as the following.

1. Is there a trend toward establishing development offices within academic units of universities and colleges? If so, why is



decentralization happening and what are the management implications of this change?

2. How does the university coordinate development activities of the academic units with their own development officers?

3. Does the chief development officer of the institution maintain control over the fund raising activities of the development officers who are hired and fired by individual deans?

4. How is communication maintained between the levels?

5. How is the work of academic unit development officers differentiated from the work of the university's central development officers? How do they help each other and how do they hinder each others' efforts?

The study sought to contribute to theory by examining the patterns of management at various universities and comparing the outcomes of the various patterns in areas such as coordination and control, communication, and balance of power within the university and between the university and its donors. The study sought to contribute to practice by identifying advantages and disadvantages of the various patterns for managing development activities

and suggesting mechanisms for achieving success in each.

This report, in Chapter 2, examines the literature concerning the development function in higher education and the management theories which help explain the decentralization of some operations. In Chapter 3, it discusses the particular focus of the research, including its hypotheses, and the methodology used. In Chapter 4, it provides the findings resulting primarily from the gathering and analysis of quantitative data. These results concern the trend toward decentralization, the factors influencing success in decentralization, and the division of development responsibilities. The results presented in Chapter 4 relate more to practice than those presented in Chapter 5 which related more to theory. In Chapter 5, the study presents findings resulting primarily from the gathering and analysis of qualitative data concerning the relative merits of centralized, decentralized, and semi-decentralized patterns of managing development activities. Chapter 5 discusses the responses of academic leaders and development executives to questions about the management of their institutions and their perceptions of the appropriate division of development

responsibilities. The final chapter integrates the findings, the pertinent literature, and the investigator's judgement to draw conclusions and make recommendations. The investigator brings to the study over ten years of experience as a development officer in the central administration of a decentralized system, as head of an academic unit development office, and as chief advancement officer for a small liberal arts institution.

Institutional advancement has matured to a point where the techniques are quite well understood. The issue in this study is the implementation of these techniques within the institutional setting in order to achieve the best results.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW



## LITERATURE REVIEW

In studying decentralization of development activities at some universities, this paper first examines development as a higher education management function. It also describes management theories which help explain the trend toward decentralizing some operations. Finally, it identifies issues which must be addressed by institutions which decentralize development.

### The Development Function in Higher Education

Higher education began early in the American colonies. "After erecting shelter, a house of worship, and the framework of government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance Learning and perpetuate it to Posterity... And then, it would seem, almost as a matter of course, there was Harvard" (Rudolph, 1962, pp. 3-4).

Early colleges were meant to instill loyalty, citizenship and order, and to train clergy and teachers for the next generation (Rudolph, 1962). Colleges were founded to bring civilization and Christianity to the wilderness and to train a "learned leadership" for the future of the communities (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 3). "The size of the continent, religious differences, and rivalries among the

colonies" lead to a proliferation of institutions (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 22). Efforts to obtain adequate resources to maintain the colleges began with the very first institutions.

There were nine colleges in the colonies. The presidents of the institutions were in constant search of adequate funding to maintain them. It is thought that Nathaniel Eaton, the first master of the college founded at Newtowne in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, brought John Harvard, a fellow Cambridge University man, to visit the new school and influenced him to leave half of his estate for its support.

The succeeding president of Harvard College is known to have hired agents to return to the mother country and solicit gifts for the school. The agents were armed with a brochure, New England's First Fruits, describing the College, its goals and vision of the future. All but Queens College followed suit.

Colonial governments provided some support for William and Mary, Harvard, Yale and King's College but, for the most part, colleges relied on private resources (Curti and Nash, 1965, pp. 22-23). During the period between the Revolution and the Civil War, the states had few resources to invest in higher education. Denominationalism accounted for the

establishment of many new colleges, each supported primarily by a religious faction (Rudolph, 1962, p. 55). Over time, colleges were founded to educate students in more practical fields, to offer education for women and Negroes, and to provide graduate education. Even when states again became more involved in supporting colleges and universities, acquisition of private support remained important to most institutions.

### **The Role of the President in Development**

Although almost every college hired agents to seek private support, early presidents were not able to rely solely on these external solicitors. John Witherspoon, who assumed the presidency of the College of New Jersey in 1770, spent most of his first year touring the colonies in search of contributions to support the school. He talked about specific needs of the school and of his personal commitment to it. He pointed out that "the short lives of the former Presidents have been by many attributed to their excessive labours, which it is hoped will be an argument with the humane and generous to lend their help in promoting so noble a design" (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 36). Similarly, Hezekiah Smith, President of



the College of Rhode Island, spent most of the winter of 1769-70 working the larger cities seeking support.

Presidents had an essential role in cultivating philanthropists' interests in their institutions. For example, Mark Hopkins, President of Williams College, received a benefaction in the 1840s from Amos Lawrence, a wealthy textile manufacturer, because Lawrence liked a speech which Hopkins had given as part of the Lowell Lectures in Boston. Hopkins nourished the interest of philanthropist Lawrence by regularly writing to him about the college and the impact which Lawrence's philanthropy was having on the institution. Lawrence is said to have cherished the esteem of Hopkins and continued his philanthropy as much out of friendship with the president as out of concern for the school (Rudolph, 1962, pp. 179-182).

As colleges became more diversified in their instruction, presidents continued to play a key role in attracting the support to expand the curriculum and to establish and maintain the newer institutions. It was his trust in, and respect for, zoologist and geologist Amos Eaton which convinced Stephen Van Rensselaer to provide support for the establishment, in 1824, of a small institution devoted to the practical arts (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 65). It was



an inaugural address by Harvard's president, Edward Everett in 1846, and his later efforts to provide at the school instruction in the practical sciences, which inspired Abbott Lawrence to offer support for such instruction (Curti and Nash, 1965, p. 68). It was the ability and vision of Milo Jewett, president of Cottage Hill Seminary, which confirmed Matthew Vassar in his desire to support higher education for women (Curti and Nash, 1965, pp. 92-97).

#### **Development as Described by Historians of Higher Education**

There are few American campuses without signs of philanthropic influence. Buildings, programs, and professorships all over America are named after philanthropists who contributed to their support. Despite this apparent influence of philanthropy and philanthropists on higher education, many education historians have said little or nothing about its impact.

Only recently has the development function become a formal part of the management of colleges and universities. Therefore, it is not surprising that historians seldom mention it. More surprising is the fact that few histories have been written specifically about the influence of philanthropy. But, historians

have dealt with philanthropy, and philanthropists, both in what they say and in what they fail to say. Historians, such as L. A. Cremin (1970, 1980), who tell education history as the story of the transmission of ideas, describe philanthropy primarily as a means for paying the bills and, therefore, outside the mainstream of their studies.

Historians who tell education history as the story of social control describe the role of philanthropists, through their gifts, as controlling education and thereby society. Some social control historians picture education as a mechanism for sorting who will lead in society and describe it as a tool for bringing about the triumph of the middle class over inherited wealth. Historians Merle Curti and Roderick Nash (1965) portray philanthropy as one of the major influences in the shaping of American higher education. They treat philanthropists as spokespersons for society. It is through the philanthropist that education learns what society wants it to accomplish. Society is forming education to the patterns it wants at least partially through the actions of philanthropists. Education, in turn, is influencing the next generation of society's leaders.

Other social control historians see education as the organizer of society. These historians have much less to say about fund raising activities. As Peter Dobkin Hall (1981) tells the story, power rests with the leaders of educational institutions. They influence society, rather than society influencing them. Good colleges create learning situations and influence who gains power and control from them. Hall says that education must be adequately supported, especially by philanthropists, because of its influential role in forming society but he does not credit donors with influencing the direction of college training.

David Allmendinger (1975) focuses on the ability of students to gain power and control through education. He sees education history from the bottom up. The role of philanthropy in this story is limited to its provision of financial support to poor students. The power for change is with the masses of students, not with the few philanthropists who supported some of them.

Historians who tell education history as the story of the growth of academic professionalism and the governance of institutions, see philanthropy as an interloper into these fields. Christopher Jencks and



David Riesman (1968) describe primarily the certification component of education, rather than education as a learning experience. They believe that the development of academic professionalism is the primary force in higher education; it is the academic revolution. They see education as directed by these academic professionals. The best colleges are the biggest; small and local are adjectives of failing and powerless schools. Graduates of the best schools, those run by the academic professionals, will lead society. They observe that it is the educational leadership which controls the production of societal leadership. The role of philanthropy is outside of the story they tell.

Lawrence A. Cremin (1970) views education history not as the story of social control but as the story of the transmission of ideas in society. Cremin says that education is the deliberate, systematic, sustained effort to transmit or evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities. Although he mentions philanthropy in passing, it does not play a major role in his story because he does not view it as a mechanism for transmitting ideas among people.

Historians who focus on administration and governance pay little attention to philanthropy. John Brubacher and Willis Rudy (1958) describe the organization of governance, the European influence on American colleges, the relationship of the student to the college, and the evolution of the curriculum, but their description is insular and disconnected from social contexts.

Richard Hofstadter and Walter Metzger (1955) are also historians of the governance and administration of higher education. They believe that early gifts to higher education were too small to be truly influential. But during the post-Civil War era, gifts were much bigger and carried greater power. New philanthropists were higher education entrepreneurs and were not accustomed to passive roles. "In the case of 90% of the money given to a large institution the initiative is taken by the donor, and not by the university concerned" (Hofstadter and Metzger, 1955, p. 140)., "Thus big business and professors came into fateful contact., The former supported the university and took command of its organ of government, the latter surveyed society and tried to sway its course; two spheres of action and interest, formerly far

apart, drew close and overlapped" (Hofstadter and Metzger 1955, p. 144).

Regardless of the emphasis which a historian places on philanthropy and on philanthropists, almost nothing is said by any of them about the role of the development officer. The fund raising efforts of presidents are chronicled. The initiatives of the philanthropists are described. The impact of some gifts is related. The work of some early agents for various institutions is mentioned. But the historians do not discuss the part played by individuals who, in the modern university, are responsible for alumni relations, public relations, and fund raising.

Perhaps this earlier neglect is because, despite the long history of philanthropic support for higher education, the role of the development officer is relatively new. About 1900 a few colleges set up news bureaus to send information about students to their hometown newspapers. But by the mid-1940s, only a handful of institutions had fully staffed public relations offices (Reck, 1946, p. 2).

As early as 1643, the alumni of Harvard were returning to campus to renew old acquaintances. In 1821, the University of Michigan hired an alumni secretary to help alumni keep in touch with one



another. Alumni of Yale and a few other institutions gave money during the Civil War to help their institutions keep the doors open despite the turmoil and disruption (Reichley, 1978). But by 1942 fewer than half America's colleges and universities had an alumni annual fund. In 1949 the membership directory of the American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA) first listed two individuals with the title of director of development and in 1952 there were still only 13 (Pray, 1981, p. 1). The organization of a staff function to deal with institutional advancement is a recent management development in higher education.

In 1958, the Ford Foundation sponsored the Greenbrier Conference at which alumni, public relations, and fund raising officers built "a new conceptual framework" for institutional advancement. This organizational framework was "gradually adopted by the majority of institutions in the succeeding two decades" (Pray, 1981, p. 2). The conferees suggested that public relations, alumni affairs and development be unified under one executive who would report directly to the president and be a member of the institution's top management team (American Public Relations Association, 1958). "But perhaps the most

challenging development has been the growing concept of fund raising and advancement as integral parts of a total organizational structure with more intimate and stronger relationships with other elements than before" (Pray, 1981, p. 5).

The institutional advancement officer today plays one of the key roles in the management of higher education institutions. Most colleges and universities have executive officers who carry this responsibility and are peers of the executives in charge of administrative affairs and academic affairs. Often joined by a senior student affairs officer, these individuals are the chief institutional advisors to the president.

The advancement officer is the manager of the institution's efforts to secure private support and thus stands as a bridge between the institution and its constituents. The officer cannot be an adjunct to the institution, but must be an integral part of it (Goldman, 1988; Muller, 1978; Rowland, 1974). The advancement officer must be involved in the essential decisions which relate to the organization which he/she represents to the constituents, including its planning (Adams, 1978; Pickett, 1981; Muller, 1978). The development officer is responsible for



communicating with both internal and external audiences (Muller, 1978; Reck, 1946; Blaney, 1988). In order to communicate effectively, the officer must be a highly visible participant in the institution's top management, anchored in the core work of the institution (Franz, 1981; Rowland, 1974; Swearer, 1988). This recent theory contrasts with earlier assumptions that the public relations and other advancement functions were subsidiary or peripheral programs of the institution. Private support has been essential to the growth and development of higher education since its earliest days in this land. Presidents have sought the aid of philanthropists through their own efforts and in conjunction with agents hired to solicit philanthropic support. Since the 1930s, alumni have regularly contributed financial assistance to their colleges. In the past several decades institutions have established staffs to maintain communication with internal and external constituents about the institution's goals and its need for their support.

Since the early 1960s the work of public relations officers, alumni affairs officers, and development officers have tended to be centralized under the leadership of an institutional advancement

officer who reports to the president and is a member of the top management team of the institution. Often when the possibility of decentralizing development operations has been mentioned, decentralization has been considered a less effective organizational structure than centralization because of the importance of the advancement officer's participation in top management activities (Muller, 1978; Rowland, 1974).

Nevertheless, many large institutions recently have begun to decentralize management of their advancement operations. Decentralization raises questions about who will plan institutional fund raising endeavors and who will control the prospects (Desmond & Ryan, 1985). Decentralization assures that the dean is an active participant in development activities but has the disadvantage of less coordination and control of institutional contacts with donors and prospective donors. At some institutions, development officers are hired jointly by the central administration and the deans, which increases coordination but decreases the deans' involvement (Sandberg 1985). Little has been written which discusses college or university components as decentralized units with top management of their own.

### **Management Theories and Decentralization**

Organizations are social structures which serve a social purpose. Within each organization, management structures either are designed or evolve to help the institution accomplish its purposes. "The dilemma is not whether to organize, but how to organize, to what degree, and for what purpose" (Peterson, 1985, p. 5). In higher education, development is one of the essential operations which must be managed for the good of the overall organization.

### **Structural Issues**

In some ways organizations are self-directed. They can be bureaucracies with rational decision making based on technical expertise with rules governing employee productivity (Blau & Scott, 1962). They can be hierarchies with decision making structures calling for the definition of the responsibilities of each decision maker and the establishment of mechanisms to narrow the options available to decision makers. In hierarchies, supervisors choose the ends/goals based on organizational values and employees then choose the means to those ends based on the factual information available (Simon, 1960). In a third organizational model, the professional organization, authority is



derived not from position in the organization but from the person's knowledge, his/her technical competence and professional reputation (Clark, 1963).

Organizational structure also must be responsive to external forces. Open system theory describes the organization as accepting input, processing it, and producing output which can be evaluated in order to modify the processes. The output recycles through the environment to generate additional input and maintain the cycle (Boulding, 1956; Katz & Kahn, 1966).

Organizations which can be described as "loosely coupled" or "garbage can models" may be better able than bureaucracies, hierarchies, or professional organizations to respond to their environments (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972; Glassman, 1973; Weick, 1976). In contrast to the highly structured management typical of a bureaucracy or hierarchy, a loosely coupled organization has components which are almost independent of each other but held together for their mutual benefit. Each component maintains its own identity and its boundaries are clear. Nevertheless they are responsive to each other and have some shared components. Each unit may grow or contract in response to outside stimuli without affecting the core of the other units.

### Functional Issues

Each description of the management structure of organizations must concern itself with several issues which affect how well the organization works.

Goal setting often is described as a key to organizational effectiveness. In centralized structures, such as bureaucracies and hierarchies, and in the classic models of decentralized structures, such as those implemented by Alfred P. Sloan at General Motors and A. W. Robinson at Westinghouse, goal setting is often described as a top down function; controlled by top management. In federal decentralization, such as that used by Sloan, and functional decentralization, as described by Henri Fayol in 1910, operational decision making is pushed downward to unit heads specifically in order to free top management for strategic planning and long-range goal setting activities (Blau and Scott 1962; Drucker 1974). Goal setting is not as clearly defined by less formal, decentralized models such as loosely coupled systems and open systems. It allows for smaller units

Coordination and control are essential to centralized models because they maintain unified movement within the organization's purpose. In decentralized models, control has a less essential

role and coordination can be horizontal, among subunits, rather than vertical, between organizational levels (Martin & Moore, 1985).

Employee motivation, information flow, and decision making processes also affect organizational productivity and effectiveness (Argyris, 1964; Etzioni, 1964; Grunig, 1975; Likert, 1967; Maslow, 1954; McGregor, 1960; Odiorne, 1965). The degree of centralization does not prescribe the selection of a particular method for addressing any of these issues (Baldrige, 1971; Dalton, et al, 1980).

Decentralization offers several advantages. It frees top management for top management tasks-- direction, strategy, goals. It improves the timeliness and effectiveness of communication by eliminating unnecessary management layers and forcing autonomous subunit leaders to educate top management about essential issues. Subunit managers can not simply send requested reports (Drucker, 1974). It provides a training and testing ground for future top managers (Drucker, 1954). It allows for smaller units which are more productive (Dalton, et al, 1980). Decentralization promotes experimentation and is better tolerated by well educated employees (Etzioni, 1964). Although decentralizing sometimes increases



the administrative costs, in the short-run it provides an immediate boost in profitability and in the long-run it enhances revenues adequately to offset the increased costs (Dale, 1960).

### **Management Concerns in Decentralized Development Operations**

Regardless of the degree of centralization of their development offices, universities strive to maintain autonomy, an appropriate balance of power with external and internal interests.

Social exchange is the currency of power. One party gives to another. The recipient reciprocates in kind. For interaction to occur both parties must be seeking an end which cannot be reached as well working alone. An unreciprocated exchange or an unevenly reciprocated exchange produces an imbalance in power. Social relations strive for balance, therefore further interactions occur to adjust the imbalance (Blau, 1964).

The power relationships between the university and its donors are an ongoing concern regardless of the degree of centralization of the development operation (Curti & Nash, 1965; Hofstader & Metzger, 1955; Rudolph, 1962; Veysey, 1965). Institutions seek donors whose interests overlap with the goals of the

college or university. Institutional leaders try to avoid accepting gifts which skew priorities, drain resources from core programs, or give the donor an opportunity to dictate internal policy such as personnel decisions or admission decisions. Since the ends sought by the donor and recipient are seldom identical, a creative tension develops which keeps each responsive to the other and helps to expand the perspective of each. Their conflicting maximum desires reconcile in an optimum (McDonald, 1950).

Decentralization of development introduces additional factors into the power equation. Of the five bases of power which exist within an organization, a subunit head enhances four by establishing a development office within his/her component. Power is based on control of a resource, on control of a technical skill or of an important body of knowledge, on legal prerogatives, or on access to people who can provide the others (Mintzberg 1983, p. 24). A professional development officer does not change the legal basis for power between the academic unit and the institution as a whole. But he or she does bring to the subunit technical skills and a body of knowledge much needed by, and in great demand at, the university. Institutional leaders are eager to

learn how to increase their resources, how to convince major individual and organizational donors to invest their philanthropic dollars in the programs of the university, and how to attract alumni support.

Successful development programs employ known and tested processes which the development officer is skilled in implementing. The development officer does help the subunit to increase its resources.

Also, an effective development operation necessarily will be grounded in the interest and involvement of volunteers who have affluence and influence. The development officer will help the academic unit identify alumni, community, and business leaders who will be strong and articulate advocates. These leaders will become donors themselves and will directly influence others to support the programs in which they have invested. An academic unit with its own development operation becomes even more loosely coupled to the whole institution because it strengthens its independent power base. Loose coupling favors the status quo and those with the most power (Lutz, 1982).

In addition to questions of internal and external autonomy, decentralization raises operational questions. The institution must assure that key



constituents (alumni, parents, friends, corporations, foundations) are offered the opportunity to become involved and that major institutional needs are addressed. In a decentralized, segmented program some constituents may be ignored while others, such as alumni with an undergraduate degree in one area and a graduate degree in another, or businesses interested in management programs, engineering research, and performing arts enhancement for the community, may receive inappropriate multiple requests for their involvement. Some important institutional needs, such as smaller academic units which have inadequate resources to hire a development officer or programs which are interdepartmental, may fall between the segments into areas for which no development officer holds responsibility.

Regardless of the degree of centralization or decentralization, potential donors must be identified and donor research will be needed to suggest areas where the prospective contributors' interests converge with the institution's. Funds must be raised for annual operating expenses and for capital expenses; designated support will be needed for faculty enhancement, scholarships, program enrichment and initiation, research and other special projects.

Support also will be needed to provide institutional leaders with the ability to respond to unforeseen and time-sensitive opportunities. Plans, including programs of general communications and fund raising communications, must be in place to encourage support from alumni, non-alumni friends, parents, students, faculty, staff, businesses, foundations, associations, and governmental bodies (Dittman, 1981). Donor acquisition must be considered, as well as upgrading current donor gifts and encouraging major gifts. Small contributions will be handled differently from large ones. All gifts must be recorded, acknowledged, and afforded appropriate stewardship. The institution must decide which of these operational functions will be more effectively handled at the academic unit level and which at the institutional level.

The essential functions of the development office are to help the organization prepare for seeking support, to identify prospective donors, to involve potential donors in the activities and work of the organization, to solicit support, and to steward the gifts received assuring that they accomplish the purposes for which they were requested and given (Hall, 1984). Research indicates that key indicators of success in a development operation are the

commitment of the chief executive officer to development activities, the financial resources allocated to the development program, and the commitment of an active trustee or volunteer group (Pickett, 1981). When a subunit establishes its own development operation, none of these functions can be overlooked. Either they all must be achieved by the subunit development office or a clear division of responsibility for them must be established between the central institutional development office and the academic unit development office.

### Summary

After a long history of seeking philanthropic support through the efforts of the presidents and the friends of institutions, the development activities of colleges and universities were unified in a single office under the direction of a senior executive of the institution. Development became part of the mainstream of the institution, not an adjunct function performed by an agent of the president. The success of modern development activities is closely related to their integration into the highest level of institutional management.

Initially management theorists described three forms of organizational structures: bureaucracies,



hierarchies, and professional organizations. More recently several other structures have been analyzed: among them are open systems, loosely coupled organizations, organized anarchies. While colleges and universities have characteristics in common with both the earlier and later conceptualizations, the larger and more complex research institutions fit better into the latter set of descriptions than the earlier ones. Decentralization enhances productivity in large, complex organizations. When a college or university decentralizes its development activities, it will change the balance of internal power in favor of the subunits which establish their own development operations. The institution will want to assure that all areas of development work are being performed and that the work of various decentralized units is coordinated for maximum effectiveness.

### CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH DESIGN

## RESEARCH DESIGN

### Hypotheses

This study identifies and compares patterns for managing development activities in higher education. The study has the following six hypotheses.

1. There is a trend toward decentralizing the management of advancement activities in large universities.

2. Specific characteristics identify the institutions at which decentralization is occurring.

3. Consensus exists among development officers concerning some management issues, concerning who should be responsible for certain development activities, and concerning some of the factors which contribute to the success of an academic unit development office.

4. In areas where consensus among development officers does not exist, a development officer's evaluation of management issues, of the division of development responsibilities between the academic unit and the central development office, and of the factors contributing to the success of an academic unit development office will relate directly to: (a) the range of responsibility of the advancement officer, (b) the level of the officer's experience, and (c) the



fact that the officer works in a centralized or decentralized system.

5. Identifiable management issues, including recruitment and retention of senior development officers, effective communication between the central development office and the academic unit development offices, coordination and control of development activities, and the balancing of power between the president and the deans and between the university and its major donors, are common to advancement undertakings at all universities.

6. One of the three patterns of managing development activities, centralized, decentralized or semi-decentralized, is more effective than the other two patterns.

### **Methods**

The study proceeded to examine these hypotheses in three progressively more specific phases.

#### **Phase 1**

First it was necessary to determine whether a trend toward decentralization exists and whether decentralization is occurring at a large number of institutions or is only an anomaly at a very few institutions with special, non-general situations. Then, it was necessary to identify the characteristics

of institutions where it occurs. For these purposes a telephone survey was conducted in August 1987. To keep the size of the sample surveyed to a practical number and to have the units surveyed be comparable to each other, a decision was made to survey only two academic fields. Business colleges and engineering colleges were chosen because a study of the CASE membership directory indicated they were the colleges most likely to have their own development officers.

Fifty colleges were selected at random from among the 655 domestic educational institutions which were members of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) according to the organization's 1986-87 directory. Fifty colleges were selected at random from among the 267 institutions listed in the 1986 annual report of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) as having accredited engineering programs. All of the engineering programs which are included in the annual report are accredited by ABET, but AACSB does not accredit all of its members. Those selected from among the AACSB member colleges were representative of the membership as a whole, 37% of which are accredited. Forty-two percent of the random selection was accredited. Responses

are as follows.

were received from all 50 business colleges and from 47 engineering colleges.

Each college was asked four questions.

1. Does your college have its own development officer, separate from the university or campus development officer?

2. To whom does the development officer report?

3. Who pays the development officer?

4. For how long has your college had its own development officer?

This first phase of the study made clear that decentralization is occurring, but only at research universities. Many of those interviewed expressed a desire to learn more about how other universities are addressing the challenges and opportunities of their development offices. This survey also made clear that there are really three management patterns: (a) the centralized, staff model with all development officers supervised by the vice president and serving as staff to the president; (b) the fully decentralized, line model with development officers supervised by the deans; (c) and a semi-decentralized, matrix model with development officers supervised by the vice president but also receiving some supervision from the deans as line officers.



how well these areas are handled by each management system. Quantitative data could be gathered later to enrich the understanding of the phenomena observed and to assure that any findings could be generalized to a large group of institutions. A multi-case study was chosen in order to compare the three management systems: centralized, semi-decentralized and decentralized. Three study sites were chosen, not by random sampling but rather by purposeful sampling (Bogdan & Biklen, p.67). The development office at each site utilized a different one of these management systems.

As is typical of case studies, this methodology provided a detailed examination of each of the three management systems. Analysis of the descriptive data provided by the academic leaders and the development executives who participated in the case studies identified the important issues related to the choice of a management system. The case study methodology allowed for broader and deeper investigation of their perceptions of the issues than would have been obtained by designing a survey instrument to gather quantitative data. By doing the case studies at institutions with differing management patterns and then comparing, in each institution the areas which

received compliments and those which received complaints, issues could be identified which were common to all institutions. Also, a preliminary identification could be made of the advantages and disadvantages of each system, as described by the executives working in each.

Each institution at which a case study was performed has a Carnegie classification as a research university. Each has a business school accredited by the AACSB and an engineering school accredited by the ABET.

The pattern of managing development activities is different at each of the three universities studied. At the first institution, management is fully decentralized. Both the business school and the engineering school have their own development officers. Each is paid from the school's budget. Each reports directly to the dean. The university also has a vice president for advancement and a central development staff reporting to him.

At the second university, management is centralized. At this institution, the business and engineering schools do not have their own development officers, nor is a development officer assigned primarily to work with either school. The development

officers at this university are part of a central office and work on university-wide priorities, which include the business and engineering schools.

At the third university, advancement management is semi-decentralized. All development officers are part of the central university development office. They are paid from the budget of the central university development office. One development officer is assigned to work with the dean of the business school and one is assigned to work with the dean of the engineering school. The deans work with the vice president for advancement to select the development officers assigned to their schools. The academic unit development officers are located in the schools and work closely with the deans.

At each of these three institutions, interviews ranging from 30 to 60 minutes were conducted with the president or his representative, the vice president for advancement, the dean or acting dean of the business school and the engineering school. Where the positions exist, interviews were also conducted with the directors of development of the business school and the engineering school.

Each interview broadly covered topics of productivity, management effectiveness, employee



motivation, executive involvement, information flow, goal setting, coordination and control, prospect identification, cultivation and solicitation, and other development and management issues. The questions which the interviewees were asked are listed in Appendix 1.

### Phase 3

The third phase of the study was designed to gather additional data concerning the issues identified as important by the case study participants and the literature. Only development officers were surveyed. The academic leaders involved in the case studies were essential in indicating which areas needed to be considered. However, this study maintained its focus relatively narrowly on the theory and practice of managing development activities. Development officers were believed to have the most complete and accurate information on these activities.

The application of general management theory to development officers' work has been limited. There is a high level of interest among development officers in obtaining more information about management at similar institutions. They are not surveyed as often as are academic leaders and therefore were more likely to respond. Since this section of the research focused

on issues such as the division of specific responsibilities for fund raising tasks and the importance of several factors in improving the implementation of successful fund raising techniques, academic leaders generally would not be able to respond knowledgeably.

A questionnaire was prepared for development officers at each institution with a Carnegie classification as a research or doctorate-granting institution, a total of 213 colleges and universities. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix 2. A preliminary phone call was made to each institution to obtain the name and mailing address of the chief university development officer (CUDO). In nine cases it was determined that the position was currently vacant and no one would be prepared to respond to the questionnaire. Therefore only 204 questionnaires were mailed.

The same survey was sent to the director of development of the business school and the director of development of the engineering school, where these positions existed, at each of these 213 institutions. Preliminary telephone calls determined if each business and engineering school had a director of development and the director's name and mailing

address. A total of 108 academic unit development officers (AUDOs), 63 business and 45 engineering, were included. In all, 312 questionnaires were mailed.

One week before receiving the questionnaire, each recipient received a letter from Robert J. Wickenheiser, the President of Mount Saint Mary's College in Maryland. A copy of this letter is included as Appendix 3. The letter stated the purpose of the study and Dr. Wickenheiser's conviction that it would produce valuable results. It urged the recipient to respond to the questionnaire.

With permission of Mount Saint Mary's College, the survey questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter from the researcher on her official stationery as Vice President for Advancement of the College. A copy of the cover letter is included as Appendix 4. It was sent first class mail and included a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

The questionnaire had three parts. Parts 1 and 3 were to be answered by all recipients. Part 1 identified those institutions which have development officers in their business or engineering school, or expect to have them within two years. Part 3 requested information concerning:



- (a) the relationship between the development officers and the faculty,
- (b) the importance of the development officers as sources of information for the deans and academic units,
- (c) any shift in institutional priorities caused by a major gift,
- (d) the flow of information about development activities between the academic unit and the central development office,
- (e) the respondent's judgement about appropriate assignment of primary responsibility for various operational functions in the advancement area,
- (f) the current assignment of primary responsibility for various operational functions in the advancement area,
- (g) the existence and usefulness of volunteer boards,
- (h) the existence and effectiveness of systems for tracking cultivation and solicitation of prospect and active donors.

Answers to Part 2 were requested only of respondents at institutions which have academic unit development officers. Part 2 included questions concerning:

- (a) reporting relationships of academic unit development officers,
- (b) the length of time the academic unit development positions have existed,
- (c) the experience level of the development officers,
- (d) the factors judged important to the success of the academic unit development office,
- (e) the perceived change in philanthropic support resulting from the establishment of the academic unit development positions.

For analysis of the results of the final survey, the respondents were divided into several comparison groups according to their skill level, whether they were chief university development officers (CUDOs) or academic unit development officers (AUDOs), and whether their universities had centralized, decentralized, or semi-decentralized management. It was of interest whether responses indicated a consensus on any of the issues. Another major question was whether the responses to various questions were related to the respondent's group or whether the differing responses were more or less randomly distributed among respondents from the groups. Chi-square tests were used to make this determination since chi-square indicates the variation

between a distribution expected based on randomness and a distribution which relates to group membership.

### Limitations

Various factors created limitations which may affect the results of the study. Not all academic units were surveyed, only business and engineering schools. More independent units such as law schools and medical schools may have shown an even higher rate of decentralization. Academic units in other areas such as liberal arts and performing arts may have shown a lower rate of decentralization.

Personnel changes were occurring at each of the universities where case studies were performed. One dean was very new to his position, as was one of the AUDOs; one president was about to leave his position for a new one, as was one of the CUDOs. Although these individuals might have been influenced in some way by their changing status, such changes are a constant occurrence in higher education. The management of development activities must deal with change.

As was previously discussed, the general survey went to the CUDO and the AUDOs at institutions where AUDOs could be identified. The results of the survey may be affected by the fact that more than one person



responded from some institutions. On questions concerning issues such as the existence and effectiveness of tracking systems, or the effectiveness of communication, or the existence and usefulness of volunteer boards these multiple responses from a single institution could have skewed the results slightly.

The judgement of the investigator is a factor in the final analysis and conclusions drawn from this study. Her comprehensive experience in development, including work in the central office of an institution with a decentralized management system, as an academic unit development officer, and as the chief advancement officer for a small liberal arts institution, unavoidably affects the subjective judgements presented.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS A:

THE TREND TOWARD DECENTRALIZATION,  
FACTORS INFLUENCING SUCCESS IN DECENTRALIZATION, AND  
THE DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

## RESULTS A:

THE TREND TOWARD DECENTRALIZATION,  
FACTORS INFLUENCING SUCCESS IN DECENTRALIZATION, AND  
THE DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

## The Trend Toward Decentralization

The two surveys provide data needed to determine the existence of a trend toward decentralization, the factors influencing the success of an academic unit development office, and the division of responsibilities between the central development office and the academic units.

Of the 97 business and engineering schools contacted during the initial survey, 27% (N=26) have their own development officers. When these colleges and universities are sorted according to their Carnegie classification<sup>1</sup>, it is apparent that decentralization has occurred at some types of institutions more often than at other types. If only

---

<sup>1</sup>The Carnegie Foundation classifies all 3,300 institutions of higher education which are listed in the Higher Education General Information Survey of Institutional Characteristics into ten categories: Research University I, Research University II, Doctorate-granting University I, Doctorate-granting University II, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges I, Comprehensive Universities and Colleges II, Liberal Arts Colleges I, Liberal Arts Colleges II, Two-year Colleges and Institutions, and Professional Schools and Other Specialized Institutions. Classification is based on the level of degree offered and the comprehensiveness of their missions.



institutions categorized by Carnegie classification as research or doctorate-granting institutions are selected, 50% (23) of the engineering and business colleges have their own development officers. Only three of the colleges in institutions with Carnegie classifications as comprehensive or liberal arts have their own development officers. Chi-square for a matrix comparing research and doctorate-granting institutions with and without academic unit development officers to comprehensive and liberal arts institutions with and without academic unit development officers is 25.89 with three degrees of freedom and significance beyond .01 alpha level.

Of the business schools at research and doctorate-granting universities, 57% reported that they have their own development officers. All of these business schools are accredited; none of the non-accredited business schools have their own development officers. The chi-square for accredited institutions versus non-accredited institutions is 13.64 with one degree of freedom and is significant beyond .01 alpha level. Of the engineering schools at the same type of universities, 44% have their own development officers.

The initial survey also shows that 18 (56%) of colleges which are classified by Carnegie as research or doctorate-granting institutions and which are part of public universities have development officers and five (36%) of similarly classified colleges which are part of private universities do. Results show a chi-square of 5.27 with one degree of freedom, significant beyond .05 alpha level, indicating that the distribution is not random.

Some of the colleges indicate that they have semi-decentralized management of development. In 15% of the cases during the initial survey, the college says that it has its own development officer but the development officer either reports jointly to the dean and a campus development officer or the college's development officer is paid jointly by the dean and the central development office.

Of the 26 colleges identified through the initial survey as having their own development officers, only one college has had a development officer for longer than ten years and only five more have had development officers for longer than five years. The remaining 20 hired their development officers within the past five years and 15 of them say that they hired their first development officer within the past two years.

The results of the initial survey make it clear that decentralization is occurring but only at research and doctorate-granting institutions. Therefore, only these types of institutions are included in the remainder of the study. The questions raised concerning the management of development activities in decentralized institutions are not fully answered by the initial survey. More study was needed, but it would not have been useful to survey institutions which the initial work showed to be highly unlikely to be decentralized.

The final phase of the study provides additional data which confirms and extends the results of the initial study. It was sent to 312 individuals. Responses were received from 202 (65%) of them. The 202 individuals who responded represented 156 different institutions.

The final survey provides additional data on the decentralization trend at research and doctorate-granting institutions. Of the 156 institutions represented in the responses, 61% (N=95) have either a business or an engineering development officer or both. This compares to the 50% of the initial survey respondents that have a development officer in the academic unit. Among the schools which have neither,



21 plan to hire such a development officer within two years and 35 do not have such plans. The remaining five did not answer this question.

Of the respondents at institutions with an engineering school, 46% (N=72) indicate that the institution has a development officer for that school. Fifty-three percent (N=84) of the respondents at institutions with a business school say that the institution has a development officer for that school. The comparable data from the initial surveyed shows 44% and 57%.

The final survey provides additional data concerning to whom the academic unit development officers report and by which offices they are paid. Thirty-six percent of the business school development officers and 24% of the engineering school development officers are said to report to their deans. Only 11% of the business school development officers and 18% of the engineering school development officers report to the central development office. A joint reporting relationship is reported for 52% of the business school development officers and 57% of the engineering school development officers. Not quite 1% of each report to a an officer of a university-related

reporting relationships and budgeting patterns. In

foundation, rather than either the dean or the central development office.

Taken as an aggregate, 31% of the academic unit development officers report to their deans; 14% of them report to the central development office; 54% of them report jointly to the dean and the central development office. Less than 1% report to an officer of a university-related foundation.

The budgets of the academic units pay the salaries of their development officers in 41% of the cases (48% of the business schools and 31% of the engineering schools), according to the respondents to the final survey. The salaries of the academic unit development officers are paid by the central office budgets in 27% of the cases (21% of the business development officers and 34% of the engineering development officers). The salaries are paid jointly by the budgets of the academic units and the central development office in 30% of the cases (28% of business and 32% of engineering). In 3% of cases the academic unit development officers are paid by a university-related foundation.

The data received during the final survey contrasted sharply with those from the initial survey on reporting relationships and budgeting patterns. In

the initial survey 85% of respondents indicate that the academic unit development officer reports solely to the dean and is paid solely from the academic unit's budget. Since the final survey includes a larger sample, its data are considered more reliable.

The final study confirms the data from the initial study indicating that many more institutions are hiring academic unit development officers now than in the recent past. Forty-seven percent of the offices are reported to have been initiated within the past three years. Seventy-six percent of them have existed for fewer than seven years and only 12% have been in place for longer than nine years. See Appendix 5, Table 1.

Data on gender and salary trends also are provided by the final survey. Fifty-six percent of respondents report that their institution's business school development officer is male and 44% say female; 67% say the institution's engineering school development officer is male and 33% say female; 86% say the university's chief development officer is male and 14% say female. Reported salaries are shown in Appendix 5, Table 2.



### Aggregate and Group Analysis of the Final Survey

The results of the final survey provide data concerning the factors influencing the success of academic unit development programs and concerning the division of responsibilities between the central development office and the academic units. The results are analyzed in aggregate in order to present an overall picture of what is happening and what development officers believe should happen in the management of development offices at research universities. The respondents also are grouped in order to compare and contrast the data on key issues. On a number of issues, all development officers agree. On others, there is considerable disagreement depending on the development officer's position within the institution and on the type of management structure currently in place at the institution. Ten groups are established; each respondent is a member of more than one group. Among the respondents:

- (a) 32 were development officers in engineering schools,
- (b) 41 were development officers in business schools,
- (c) 43 were academic unit development officers (AUDOs) in semi-decentralized systems,

- (d) 30 were AUDOS in fully decentralized systems,
- (e) 61 were chief university development officers (CUDOs) in fully centralized systems,
- (f) 24 were CUDOs in fully decentralized systems,
- (g) 44 were CUDOs in semi-decentralized systems,
- (h) 71 were self-reported as having senior level development experience,
- (i) 43 were self-reported as having a mid-level of development experience,
- (j) 26 were self-reported as having novice level development experience.

The ten individual subgroups of development officers listed above are placed in four comparison groupings.

**Group A. Subgroup 1:** Chief university development officers at fully centralized institutions versus Subgroup 2: chief university development officers at fully decentralized institutions versus Subgroup 3: chief development officers at semi-decentralized institutions.

**Group B. Subgroup 4:** Academic unit development officers at fully decentralized institutions versus Subgroup 5: academic unit development officers at semi-decentralized institutions.

Group C. Subgroup 6: Chief university development officers versus Subgroup 7: academic unit development officers.

Group D. Subgroup 8: Self-reported senior level versus Subgroup 9: self-reported mid level versus Subgroup 10: self-reported novice level development officers.

In fully centralized systems, the salaries of all development officers are paid from the budget of the central development office and there is no development officer whose primary assignment is fund raising for the business school or the engineering school.

In fully decentralized systems, there is a development officer for the business school and the engineering school and the salaries of those development officers are paid from the budgets of the academic unit.

In semi-decentralized systems, there is a development officer for the business school and the engineering school and the salary of at least one of those development officers is paid, at least in part, from the budget of the central development office.

The responses of business school development officers and engineering school development officers are combined and reported as academic unit development



officers (AUDOs). This is justified by the similarity of the duties and responsibilities of the development officers' and by the fact that their positions within the institution's management structure are similar.

Also, chi-square tests were run comparing the responses of the business and engineering development officers on 50 key issues, including questions concerning the division of responsibilities when the institution is in a capital campaign and when it is not in a capital campaign, and on which factors are essential for an academic unit development officer to succeed. On 96% of the responses, business and engineering development officers could not be distinguished with an alpha level of .05 assurance.

Two measures of experience level are taken in the final survey, years of experience and self-reported skill level. Academic unit development officers tend to have less development experience than chief university development officers, although almost one-third of the academic unit officers have nine or more years in the field. Thirty-seven percent of academic unit development officers have three or fewer years of development experience while only 13% of chief university development officers have so few years. Thirty-three percent of academic unit development

officers and 18% of chief university development officers have four to eight years of development experience. Thirty percent of academic unit development officers have nine or more years of experience, while 69% of chief university development officers do. See Appendix 5, Table 3.

The development officers perceive themselves to be more skilled than their years of experience might suggest. Thirty-nine percent of the academic unit development officers and 82% of the chief university development officers are reported to have "senior level" skills. Forty-four percent of the academic unit officers and 14% of the chief university officers are reported to have "mid level" skills. Only 16% of academic unit officers and only 4% of chief university officers are reported to have "novice level" skills. See Appendix 5, Table 4.

The self-reported level of experience is used for grouping the respondents. Since in development many factors influence the intensity and quality of a year's experience, it was decided that the respondents could best judge where they should be placed.

officer:

- (a) be physically located in the unit,
- (b) be part of the management team of the unit,

## **Factors Influencing Success in Decentralization**

According to 88% of the respondents to the final survey, the establishment of an academic unit development office lead to an increase in philanthropic support of their institutions. The academic unit development officers (AUDOs) manage the cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of gifts at all levels of the giving pyramid. Sixty-two percent of them manage the giving process for gifts of \$1 million or more; 70% of them manage the giving process for gifts between \$100,000 and \$1 million. Several institutions do not have the AUDOs manage the giving process for smaller gifts; only 44% of them managed gifts of less than \$1,000.

### **Areas of Agreement** **Concerning AUDO Success Factors**

A series of questions were asked to determine the importance of specific management structures in promoting the success of an academic unit development office. More than 50% of the respondents, taken as an aggregate, think it essential that the development officer:

- (a) be physically located in the unit,
- (b) be part of the management team of the unit,



- (c) have easy access to the dean,
- (d) have a high level of interaction with the faculty,
- (e) interact with the academic unit's volunteer board,
- (f) have a good rapport with the chief university development officer, and
- (g) have a dean who is committed to the development effort. See Appendix 5, Table 5.

When analyzed by comparison groups, consensus also exists on several factors:

1. The majority of respondents in each of the ten groups rank being part of the management team of the academic unit as essential to success. See Appendix 5, Table 6. The AUDOs are most strong in this ranking with 78% of them responding that it is essential. The AUDOs at fully decentralized institutions place the most value on this factor, with 83% of them ranking it essential compared to 74% of the AUDOs at semi-decentralized institutions. Fewer than 10% of any group rank it as unimportant.

2. There is consensus among all development officers that having easy access to the dean is essential. In no group do fewer than 79% rank it lower. See Appendix 5, Table 7.

3. The respondents are close to consensus on the importance of having a high level of interaction with

the faculty. In each group about 50% of the respondents rank it as essential and about 50% rank it as helpful. See Appendix 5, Table 8.

4. Almost 75% of each group rank interacting with the academic unit's volunteer board as essential, with 93% of the CUDOs giving this ranking and only 73% of AUDOs. Novice development officers rank it essential less often than any other group. See Appendix 5, Table 9.

5. All groups agree that interacting with the university's primary volunteer board is helpful. Between 63% and 70% of responses in each group fall to this ranking. Of those who do not rank it as helpful, more rank it as essential than as unimportant. See Appendix 5, Table 10.

6. There is clear consensus on having a dean who is committed to the development effort. More than 90% of all respondents rank it as essential and fewer than 2% of any group rank it unimportant. See Appendix 5, Table 11.

### Areas of Disagreement

#### Concerning AUDO Success Factors

There are also several factors on which there is disagreement between members of the comparison groups:

1. Most chief university development officers (CUDOs) rank being paid by the dean as unimportant with the rest saying only helpful. Few academic unit development officers (AUDOs) rank it as unimportant. The chi-square distribution shows that the differing responses between CUDOs and AUDOs is significant beyond the alpha level of .01. There is also a significant difference in response between AUDOs at fully decentralized institutions and those at semi-decentralized institutions. The majority of the former rank being paid by the dean as essential while the majority of the latter rank it only as helpful. See Appendix 5, Table 12.

2. Many CUDOs rank reporting to the dean as helpful, with almost as many of them ranking it as unimportant. This ranking places them clearly apart from the AUDOs, the majority of whom rank it as essential, with almost all of the rest ranking it helpful. Only 4% of AUDOs rank it as unimportant compared to 40% of the CUDOs. Development officers with mid-level experience also differ from those with senior level or novice level experience. Fewer of the mid-level officers consider it unimportant compared to the others. See Appendix 5, Table 13.



3. Being located in the academic unit is given less value by CUDOs than by AUDOs. Seventy-seven percent of AUDOs rank this location as essential, while only 37% of CUDOs do. When responses are analyzed by the experience level of the officers, the majority at each experience level rank location in the unit as essential. See Appendix 5, Table 14.

4. More than half of the respondents in each group rank interacting with students as helpful. The other half of each group splits between unimportant and essential with more CUDOs and more officers at every experience level saying unimportant and more AUDOs saying essential. The chi-square distribution indicates a significant difference between the CUDOs and the AUDOs on this point. See Appendix 5, Table 15.

5. Although almost no one ranks having a good rapport with the chief university development officer as unimportant, there is a major difference between the percentage of AUDOs who say it is essential and the percentage of CUDOs who do. Only slightly more than half of the AUDOs (56%) rank it essential. Of the CUDOs, 83% give it an essential ranking. See Appendix 5, Table 16.

6. More than half of each group rank having a good rapport with the president as helpful and at least another quarter of each group rank it as essential. More CUDOS (19%) rank it unimportant than any other group. The difference between AUDOS and CUDOS is significant here on the chi-square distribution beyond .05 alpha. See Appendix 5, Table 17.

7. Rankings on having an academic title differ greatly among the groups. Sixty-four percent of CUDOS rank it unimportant while only 28% of AUDOS do. Only 4% of CUDOS rank it essential, while 18% of AUDOS do. See Appendix 5, Table 18.

### **The Division of Responsibilities Between the Central Development Office and the Academic Units**

A series of questions was asked to determine the ideal division of responsibilities between the academic unit and the central development office during non-campaign fund raising and campaign fund raising efforts. These questions were asked of all development officers, regardless of whether they operate in centralized or decentralized systems because even without a development office the academic unit often participates in development activities such

as priority setting, preparation of proposals and case statements, prospect identification and cultivation, and solicitation and stewardship.

Respondents chose to say that responsibility for a given activity should be (a) primarily with the academic unit, (b) primarily with the central development office, or (c) evenly held between the central development office and the academic unit. No further definition was given in the survey of the intended meaning of the term "evenly held".

#### Areas of Agreement Concerning

#### The Division of Responsibilities

Analysis of the responses taken in aggregate shows that on several issues a majority opinion is not reached and there is no issue on which a majority of respondents agree that the academic unit should have primary responsibility. However, a majority of respondents do agree that both in non-campaign and campaign fund raising the central development office should have primary responsibility for: (a) the annual fund, (b) the alumni data base, and (c) gift records. During a campaign, the majority agree that major individual gifts and major foundation gifts



should primarily be a central office responsibility and almost as many believe that major corporate gifts should be.

A majority also state that responsibility for prospect identification should be evenly held regardless of campaign status. Almost as many believe that responsibility for development priority setting and stewardship of gifts should be evenly held both in non-campaign and in campaign fund raising. See Appendix 5, Table 19.

Analysis of the comparison groups provides additional insight in these areas:

1. Development officers in all groups most often would assign responsibility for maintaining alumni data bases to the central office. Over 90% of CUDOs say the responsibility should always be in the central office. Seventy percent of AUDOs would assign it there, with most of the rest saying it should be evenly held. Experience level is not a significant factor in determining where development officers would assign this responsibility. See Appendix 5, Table 20.
2. Most development officers also agree that the central office should bear the responsibility for maintaining gift records. No CUDOs would assign this responsibility to the academic units and fewer than

10% of them say it should be evenly held. Ten percent or fewer AUDOs would assign this responsibility to the academic unit offices or have it be evenly held when the institution is not in a Capital Campaign with a few more AUDOs assigning it to the academic unit and only about 10% more assigning it to be evenly held during a Campaign. Over 84% of development officers in all experience level groupings would assign the maintenance of gift records to the central office at all times, except for one anomaly. During a Capital Campaign, only 20% of mid-level officers would assign this task to the central office with the rest assigning it to be evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 21.

3. More than 50% of the members of each group would assign the responsibility for prospect identification to be evenly held by the central and academic unit offices both when a Campaign is in progress and when it is not. See Appendix 5, Table 22.

4. Development officers in each group came close to consensus that the responsibility for preparation of a case statement should be evenly held. Over 40% of CUDOs in fully centralized institutions believe the responsibility should be even held both during a

Campaign and when not in a Campaign. CUDOs in decentralized systems would give primary responsibility to the academic unit office slightly more often than would CUDOs in centralized systems, but only when the institution is not in a Campaign. Just over 50% of AUDOs would give primary responsibility for the preparation of the case statement to the academic unit office when not in a Campaign with most of the rest saying it should be evenly held. During a Campaign, the AUDOs, in about even numbers, shift the responsibility away from the academic units toward the central office and toward being evenly held. All experience groups tend to give this responsibility to the academic units or have it evenly shared, with the mid-level officers leaning toward the academic units more than the senior officers or novice officers. See Appendix 5, Table 23.

5. Most development officers would assign proposal preparation to the academic unit office or have it be an evenly held responsibility. AUDOs and all experience levels most often would place it in the units while CUDOs most often would have it evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 24.



### Areas of Disagreement Concerning the Division of Responsibilities

Analysis of the responses by comparison groups also shows considerable disagreement concerning the assignment of responsibility for some development activities. The data indicate that the division of responsibility often is assessed differently by CUDOs and AUDOs, but at times the division is also different among CUDOs in separate groups; between the two groups of AUDOs; between development officers in fully centralized, fully decentralized, and semi-decentralized systems, regardless of whether they are CUDOs or AUDOs; and, among development officers with varying levels of experience. Disagreement is significant in the following areas.

#### Annual Fund

Although an absolute majority of development officers would assign responsibility for annual fund to the central office, when the responses are analyzed by group, there is disagreement on who should be responsible for it. CUDOs in centralized and semi-decentralized systems would assign it to the central office, but the responses of those in fully decentralized systems split almost evenly among the three possible assignments.

AUDOS also show no agreement about who should have this responsibility, with about one-third of them giving each possible assignment. CUDOS taken as a group more often say the responsibility should be with the central office and AUDOS taken as a group lean slightly toward the academic unit, but disagreement is more common than agreement on this issue.

Chi-square distribution tests show a significant difference in responses among the chief development officers (Groups 1, 2, and 3) and between the chief development officers and the academic unit development officers (Groups 6 and 7).

Experience is not the distinguishing factor here. Development officers at all three levels of experience lean slightly toward giving the responsibility to the central office. See Appendix 5, Table 25.

### Major Individual Gifts

Significant disagreement is evident between CUDOS and AUDOS concerning who should bear the responsibility for major individual gifts. When the institution is not in a Capital Campaign, the former place responsibility for major individual gifts with the central office and the latter place it with the academic unit. When the institution is in a Capital

Campaign, even more of the CUDOs place the responsibility for major individual gifts with the central office. In a Capital Campaign, enough of the AUDOs shift the responsibility to the central office to give the central office a majority but even more of them shift it to being evenly held between the central and academic unit offices.

Experience level also is significant on this factor when the institution is not in a Capital Campaign. More senior officers place the responsibility with the central office or have it evenly held, while more mid-level and novice officers place it with the academic unit. During a Capital Campaign there is agreement among officers at all experience levels that the central office should retain responsibility. See Appendix 5, Table 26.

### **Major Corporate Gifts**

The pattern of disagreement evident when assigning responsibility for major corporate gifts parallels that evident when assigning responsibility for major individual gifts. When the institution is not in a Capital Campaign, CUDOs would most often assign it to the central office. CUDOs in fully or semi-decentralized institutions often indicate that the responsibility should be evenly held between the



central office and academic unit offices. CUDOs in fully centralized institutions seldom do. In a Capital Campaign, all CUDO groups shift responsibility toward the central office.

AUDOs assign the responsibility for major corporate gifts to the academic unit offices. When the institution is in a Capital Campaign, both AUDO groups shift the responsibility toward being evenly held or toward the central office, with a much higher percentage of each group assigning it to the evenly held category.

When not in a Capital Campaign, senior and mid-level officers would assign responsibility to be evenly held between central and the academic unit offices more often than to either office but novices would assign it more often to the academic unit office. In a Capital Campaign, the novices most often would assign it to the central office, while the senior and mid-level officers would shift away from the academic unit offices but about half of those who shift would move to the central office and the other half to evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 27.

### **Major Foundation Gifts**

AUDOs and CUDOs disagree on who should be responsible for major foundation gifts. Slightly more

than one-quarter of CUDOs and slightly more than one-third of AUDOs would assign the responsibility evenly when the institution is not in a Capital Campaign. The same percentage of CUDOs but almost one-half of AUDOs would assign it evenly during a Capital Campaign. Fewer than 10% of CUDOs would assign this responsibility to the academic units in either situation, while over 40% of AUDOs thought the responsibility should be with the academic units when not in a Campaign and almost 30% while in a Campaign.

Senior and novice level development officers more often would place the responsibility on the central office. Mid-level development officers more often believe it should be evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 28.

### **Setting Development Priorities**

When an institution is not in a Campaign, only 8% of CUDOs would have the academic units take primary responsibility for setting development priorities and over half of them would have it be evenly held. Of the AUDOs, 58% would have the academic units be primarily responsible when not in a Campaign, with another 40% having it be evenly held. During a Campaign, all groups would shift slightly toward giving the central office primary responsibility but

most development officers would maintain it evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 29.

### Stewardship of Gifts

While only 9% of CUDOs believe the academic unit should have primary responsibility for stewardship of gifts when an institution is not in a Campaign and only 8% when it is in a Campaign, 46% of AUDOs believe the academic unit should have this responsibility when not in a Campaign and 34% when in a Campaign. Over 40% of both CUDOs and AUDOs say the responsibility should be evenly held in both cases. Senior officers divide fairly evenly between the three choices for who should hold the responsibility. Over 60% of mid-level officers say it should be evenly held. Novice officers most often would give the responsibility to the academic units when not in a Campaign and have it evenly held when in a Campaign. See Appendix 5, Table 30.

### Current Assignment of Responsibilities

In addition to being asked who ideally should have responsibility for various development activities, the final survey participants were asked who currently had various responsibilities. When taken as an aggregate the responses show some patterns. See Appendix 5, Table 31. When analyzed by



groups the patterns become blurred, indicating that neither the degree of decentralization or nor the experience level of the development officers was the sole determinant for assigning responsibility.

Analysis by group also shows a lack of clarity over who had the current responsibility. In some areas, the responses from the majority of CUDOs in decentralized systems are at variance with the responses from the majority of AUDOs indicating that within some institutions it is unclear who had the responsibility.

#### Areas for Which the Academic Unit is Responsible

A majority of all respondents say that the academic unit is currently responsible for:

##### Setting development priorities.

The academic unit sets development priorities in almost one-half of the institutions with fully centralized development systems. The other half of those institutions splits evenly between the central office setting the priorities and the responsibility being evenly held.

In institutions with fully decentralized development, 71% of the academic units have primary responsibility for priority setting and in most of the rest it is evenly held.

In institutions with semi-decentralized development, 70% of the CUDOs indicate that the responsibility is evenly held with most of the rest saying it is handled primarily by the academic unit.

More than 87% of all AUDOs as well as more than 73% of development officers at each experience level indicate that the academic unit has primary responsibility for setting priorities. See Appendix 5, Table 32.

#### Preparing the case statement.

However, perceptions differ concerning who prepares the case statements when the analysis is done by comparison groups. More than one-half of development officers at each experience level indicate that the academic unit prepares the case statement, while most of the rest say the responsibility is evenly held.

Only a little over one-third of CUDOs indicate that the academic unit has primary responsibility for preparing the case statement and with another 38% saying it is evenly held. But almost 80% of AUDOs indicate that the academic unit primarily has this responsibility. See Appendix 5, Table 33.

#### Cultivating donor interest.

Only among CUDOs in fully centralized systems is there much indication that the central office plays a significant role in cultivating support for the academic unit. All other groups indicate that the academic unit has primary responsibility or that it is evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 34.

### Orchestrating solicitations for smaller gifts.

Except for CUDOs in fully centralized institutions, 63% of whom place responsibility for solicitations of smaller designated gifts with the central office, more than 63% of all groups indicate it rests with the academic units. See Appendix 5, Table 35.

### Areas for Which the Central Office is Responsible

A majority of all respondents say that the central office is currently responsible for:

#### Maintaining gift records.

Agreement is not as clear when the comparison groups are analyzed. Although most CUDOs (82%) indicate that the central office has responsibility for maintaining gift records, with almost all the rest of the CUDOs saying it is evenly held, only 49% of AUDOs indicate that the central office primarily holds this responsibility. Seventy percent of senior officers, 58% of mid-level officers but only 44% of



novice officers say the central office has this responsibility. Most of the rest indicate that it is evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 36.

**Maintaining the alumni database.**

All groups agree that the central office bears the responsibility for maintaining the alumni data base. More than 80% of each group gives this response, except for the AUDOS in fully decentralized systems, 64% of whom indicate the central office with 18% saying each the academic unit and evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 37.

**Providing staff support for alumni relations.**

Although when taken in aggregate, the respondents assign staff support for alumni relations to the central development office, when analyzed by group it varies depending on the degree of decentralization. In fully centralized systems, 92% of respondents indicate that it is handled by the central office. In fully decentralized and semi-decentralized systems, CUDOS and AUDOS disagree. More CUDOS indicate that the central office has primary responsibility and more AUDOS indicate that the academic unit has it. See Appendix 5, Table 38.

### Staffing the public relations program.

Responsibility for public relations also varies according to the degree of decentralization. In centralized institutions, it is handled by the central office. In fully decentralized institutions it is more often handled by the academic units. In semi-decentralized systems, the responsibility is most often evenly held. Close to 40% of senior and mid-level officers indicate that the academic unit has primary responsibility for public relations with a similar percentage indicating that the central office does and about 20% saying evenly held. Over half of novices indicate the central office with the other half fairly evenly divided between the academic unit and evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 39.

### Soliciting annual gifts.

Close to a majority of all respondents say that the central office is responsible for the **soliciting annual gifts** from the academic unit's alumni. Group comparisons show that in fully centralized systems, 80% of respondents indicate that the central office is responsible for the academic units' annual funds, but another 18% say that the responsibility is evenly held. In fully decentralized systems, 48% of respondents indicate that the academic unit has this

responsibility and 35% say the central office does, with the remaining 17% saying evenly held. In semi-decentralized systems, one-half indicates that the central office handles this annual fund responsibility, while about 25% each say the academic unit and evenly held. There is consensus across experience level groups. About 43% of respondents indicate that the academic unit handles this responsibility, about 35% say the central office, and about 22% say that it is evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 40.

#### **Areas in Which Responsibility is Evenly Held**

A majority of all respondents say that the responsibility is evenly held for:

#### **Identifying prospective donors.**

Group comparisons show that more than one-half of CUDOs, senior level officers, and novice level officers indicate that the responsibility for identifying prospects is evenly held. The rest of the CUDOs give the central office more of the responsibility, while the senior and novice officers give more of it to the academic units. More than one-half of the AUDOs indicate that the academic unit has the primary responsibility with most of the rest of the AUDOs saying it is evenly held. The mid-level



officers split about half and half between the academic units having primary responsibility and it being evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 41.

### Acknowledging designated gifts.

Group comparison shows that the central development office seldom has primary responsibility for acknowledging designated gifts. CUDOs indicate that it is most often evenly held. AUDOs split almost evenly between indicating that it is evenly held and that the academic unit has primary responsibility. Fewer than 5% of mid-level or novice officers indicate that the central office primarily carries this duty with the rest splitting fairly evenly between the academic unit office and evenly held. Senior officers more often (27%) indicate the central office. See Appendix 5, Table 42.

### Areas with No Clear Pattern

No clear pattern of assignment of responsibility emerges on the following issues when the data are analyzed in aggregate. The comparison groups show some trends.

### Orchestrates solicitations for major designated gifts.

Seventy percent of CUDOs at fully centralized institutions indicate that the central office

orchestrates major gift solicitations, with another 28% saying this responsibility is evenly held.

At both fully decentralized institutions and semi-decentralized institutions, about 25% of CUDOs indicate that the academic unit holds primary responsibility in this area while 60% of the AUDOs in these same institutions say primary responsibility rests with the academic units.

Over 60% of mid-level officers indicate that this responsibility rests with the academic units with most of the rest saying it is evenly held. The senior officers split almost evenly among the three choices, while almost one-half of the novice officers indicate that the responsibility rests with the units and another one-third of them saying it is evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 43.

**Assures gifts are used as intended.**

CUDOs and AUDOs disagree on who has primary responsibility for assuring that gifts are used as intended. About one-third of CUDOs indicate that the academic unit primarily has this responsibility, another one-third indicates the central office, and the final third indicates that it is evenly held. About one-third of AUDOs indicate that it is evenly

held but most of the rest say the academic unit bears it.

Among mid-level and novice development officers, 60% indicate that the academic unit assures gifts are used as intended. Only 45% of senior officers indicate the academic unit, while just under one-third say the central office, and 23% say evenly held. See Appendix 5, Table 44.

## CHAPTER 5

### RESULTS 8:

#### MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND

#### THE RELATIVE MERITS OF CENTRALIZED, DECENTRALIZED AND

#### SEMI-DECENTRALIZED DEVELOPMENT OFFICES



## CHAPTER 5

### RESULTS B:

#### MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND THE RELATIVE MERITS OF CENTRALIZED, DECENTRALIZED AND SEMI-DECENTRALIZED DEVELOPMENT OFFICES

**RESULTS B: MANAGEMENT ISSUES AND  
THE RELATIVE MERITS OF CENTRALIZED,  
DECENTRALIZED, AND SEMI-DECENTRALIZED SYSTEMS**

The case studies identify and allow for extended discussion of the management issues which academic and development leaders at each university consider to be the most important. They also indicate the relative merits of each system as judged by the interviewees.

**Case Study 1: University X**

University X has a fully decentralized development structure. The vice president for development reports to the president and has a relatively small staff which is responsible for all annual fund activities and for a few university-wide programs, such as the president's unrestricted fund and a merit based scholarship program. The vice president has responsibility for coordinating the activities of all development officers on campus, whether or not they are on his staff, to assure maximum yield on fund raising effort and to minimize overlapping solicitations to donors. Each dean has a development officer who is paid from the academic unit's budget and reports to the dean.

The president of University X believes that decentralized management of development is consistent

with his philosophy of organizational management. He believes that all areas of institutional management should be as decentralized as possible, including development. He says that if you believe the institution ought to operate with the deans and directors of major units having as much freedom to operate those entities as possible and if decision making is delegated to those levels, then to superimpose upon them a centralized bureaucracy for fund raising is an egregious error.

The president says that only during a Capital Campaign, might he want to create additional lines of authority for the central development office. During a Campaign he would envision the whole management of the campus becoming more centralized so as to project a short term focus on a few campus-wide priorities. He believes that the increased centralization of the entire administration would require similar increases in centralization of development.

According to the president, it is essential that the deans have a high level of commitment to development activities. They expend a large proportion of their professional and personal time on development. The involvement of the deans is increased by giving them full control over development



for their schools and by requiring that each school fund and manage its own development activities.

This president is satisfied that the system he has established is best for his institution. He is not yet satisfied with the system of coordination which the university has established for its development operation. He wants a protocol that provides better lines of communication to keep him informed of who's talking to whom and who's likely to be more successful in getting support from a specific individual or organization. But this president insists that he wants to avoid turning prospect management and information sharing into control of all gifts. He is not concerned about maintaining control over gift designation. He says that the institutional mission is an umbrella, a flexible product that varies depending upon the innovation and ingenuity of the people in the academic units. It can have one shape this year and another next year while still moving in an appropriate direction. The faculty in the units should move the institution into the areas where they have the greatest expertise. Senior administrators cannot know faculty expertise better than the faculty does. Units cannot be "totally unfettered" but he claims not to like the idea of "control".

This president is convinced that having fundraisers at the academic unit level changes the balance of power among the deans. Decentralization of development activities creates a danger of sending a "cleaver into carefully crafted teamwork". Those who can spend more are envied. It creates barriers. It also gives a dean "a sense that he's got one more tool in the arsenal" when dealing with the president. It creates a sense of "independence". Some might think that allowing deans to have development officers gives them too much power. But the president believes that this institution's mission is sufficiently broad and flexible for there to be infinite possibilities. "Anyone who would try to run the whole university from this office would be absolutely foolish. That would be a throwback in management style". It is the president's job not to set a mission in stone but to provide an overall sense of values for the institution making certain at all times that those values are protected, yet providing as much freedom as an entrepreneurial dean can wisely use.

The deans of business and engineering at University X concur with the president's statement that development is a very high priority for them. Attention is given to development activities every

day. The three highest priorities for these deans are academic mission, recruitment of faculty and students, and development.

They also share the president's view of how the institutional mission is defined. The campus sets overall academic standards in terms of expectations relative to faculty role and responsibility, but the academic unit clearly has the responsibility for implementing that policy in a way that best meets the expertise of each particular unit. They see the administrative management of the campus as generally decentralized.

Each of these deans has a board of volunteer advisors for his school. Neither board was initially established primarily as a development board. Both boards were established before the dean had hired a development officer. The boards advise the dean on a variety of academic and external relations issues. Each board has become more involved in development activities as the board matured. Board members are prospective donors themselves and become knowledgeable about the school's needs and priorities through board service. They also help to interest potential donors who are not board members in the activities of the school. The boards work closely with the dean and his



development officer. Members of these boards sometimes also serve on the university-wide development board, bringing their knowledge of the school's needs to the discussions of university-wide development activities.

The deans said that they believe major gifts have a real impact on the future of their colleges and, through the colleges, on the university as a whole. To assure that a gift does not skew the priorities of the institution, the recipient has to be able to communicate well with the donor about those priorities. In a university with decentralized academic management, it is the dean who can best address the question of priorities. Thus, the dean is in the best position for dealing directly with the donor. The president is the ultimate spokesperson for the university, assuring the donor that the gift meets an institutional priority and is important to the whole institution. But the president and his staff are not, according to the deans, the best negotiators of the purpose of the gift because they cannot have as deep an understanding of the need being addressed by the gift and the impact which the gift will make on the institution.

These deans believe that having an effective development operation changes their power base within the institution by increasing their interaction with influential community members and providing them with an additional staff member who is particularly skilled at gathering information. Information is always a source of organizational power. One of the deans said that if the academic unit could no longer have its own development officer, the biggest loss might be the information which the development officer brings to the college about what is going on around the university and among client companies.

These deans see the major advantages to their decentralized system as encouraging their own and the faculty members' direct involvement in the identification and cultivation as well as solicitation of donors and providing them with on-the-spot professional guidance and staffing for their development undertakings. Decentralization allows for grassroots involvement and will create a broader base of operation and a broader base of support.

Decentralization also enables the university to hire more experienced development professionals who want the responsibility for building an effective program. The deans want to be working with senior

development officers and believe that their schools are attractive to senior development officers because of the reporting relationship with the dean. If their development officers had to report to the central office, they are convinced that only junior officers would be interested in the positions because they would not have the freedom to set an agenda and implement it.

The deans believe that decentralization also helps this university to keep good fundraisers. There are plenty of senior people around to serve as mentors. As people become more skilled they can stay at the university because there are many senior positions available. If a development officer wants a new challenge, she or he does not have to go to a new institution.

The disadvantages to their system are based in poor management at the central development office level, according to the deans. The central development office's attempts at coordination vacillate between being inadequate and being overly constraining. Either no one is helping the deans avoid bumping into one another in the outer office of a potential major donor, or the deans and their development officers are spending hours and hours



filling out reports on who they are visiting and then never getting any feed back on their activities, those of the other deans, or those undertaken directly by the central office.

Decentralization requires a vice president with advanced interpersonal management skills, according to these deans. The vice president must lead the other senior development people by force of his or her record of past achievement and must create a spirit of university-wide cooperation based on recognition of his or her professional stature. The vice president must have the respect of both the deans and the development officers. When a conflict arises the deans and development officers must have confidence that the vice president will propose the best possible alternatives and will mediate with wisdom. University leaders realize that they cannot win each dispute but only the vice president can build the team spirit that encourages an academic unit to concede a case knowing that good judgement has been exercised in requesting the concession.

The vice president for development at University X says that the decentralized management structure evolved; it was not designed. Luckily it fits with the management style of the current president, who

came to office just as the first of the deans was hiring his own development person. Additional deans had hired development people before the new president started to give much attention to development and the system is appropriate for all concerned.

The vice president believes that the deans hired development professionals because they placed a high value on fund raising and needed more advice and assistance than the understaffed central office could provide. Also under the previous president, the central development office was primarily charged with a few of his top priorities rather than with university-wide programs.

The vice president says that a universal dissatisfaction with the coordination of development activities arose because each school began its fund raising independently and with some annoyance that the central office did not provide the service it desired. Now, even with all new staff in central, some resistance persists to building a cooperative attitude.

The resistance to cooperation is built into the system. When development officers meet to discuss prospects and priorities, they usually come to consensus on most topics. Occasionally agreement is

not complete on one prospect or proposal. Since the development officers are not accountable to the chair of the Coordination Council, who is a central development officer, but only to their deans, the basic disagreement persists. The development officers who disagree will go their own ways continuing to believe that they should do the best thing for their individual colleges. At some point, conflict will occur. To date, according to the vice president, no procedure exists for settling such a conflict, or derailing the problem before it becomes a conflict.

The vice president for development and the vice president for academic affairs are working together on a solution to the coordination problem. The Coordination Council will identify areas of potential conflict and the Deans' Council will resolve them based on academic priorities. The vice president for development believes that the advantage to this system will be in having academic priorities set by academic leaders, not development leaders.

Unlike the president, the deans, and the development officers at the colleges, the vice president for development says that despite the stated advantages of the system in place he would favor a more centralized system. He would prefer to have the



development officers reporting to him and paid from his budget, but assigned by him to the various schools.

The academic unit development officers prefer the decentralized system as it is. They enumerate several advantages to decentralized management of development. Stewardship is improved. Since the development officer is located in the unit and working daily with the faculty and students of the school he or she can easily evaluate the impact of the gift and report back to the donor. The development officer can also use stewardship as an opportunity to involve the donor in additional school activities, thereby cultivating the next possible gift.

When the development officer is a part of the academic unit, the commonly perceived tension between faculty and fundraisers is ameliorated. By working together on committees, attending meetings together, having lunch together, working on school-wide programs such as an MBA Case Competition or an Engineering Hall of Fame dedication, and just sharing the many group-building experiences of people in close proximity to each other, faculty and fundraisers get to understand each other. The cooperation engendered by this increased understanding advances the goals of each and

of the school as a whole. The ability of the development officer to succeed in raising money for the school is greatly enhanced by involving the faculty members. They are the people who can really make the case for support to a major donor or a large corporation. The academic unit development officers claim that faculty are much more willing to work with them than with a central development officer whom they don't know and who doesn't understand as well as the academic unit development officer their needs and priorities and language.

According to the academic unit development officers, being a member of the management team of an important component of the university is considerably more rewarding professionally than being a staffer in the central development office. The impact of one's efforts is observable. It is easier to build relationships with the people who are the heart of the university--the students and the faculty. The priorities of the school are more clear. It is possible to become relatively expert in the areas where the school possesses particular expertise. As a central development officer there are so many areas of university expertise that it is impossible to try to learn enough to speak in a skillful way about them.

The academic unit development officers say that they become assimilated into the subculture of the unit. This offers advantages when dealing with donors who are also part of that subculture. Humanists do not use the same jargon as engineers. A development officer who is an integral part of the academic unit has better rapport than a central development officer with a donor comfortable in the subculture.

The competition created by a decentralized development system is healthy according to these academic unit development officers. Development officers learn from each other, can have a support system, and can have measures for judging their success without looking outside the institution. They can be totally responsible for the advancement of a medium sized institution while still having colleagues within the wider university. The competition among the academic units over prospects is exaggerated according to them. A large company is unlikely to object to two or three excellent, reasonable, and well conceived proposals for projects clearly within the company's areas of interest. The company might be frustrated at having too many good choices; but the problem is over-rated in the views of these development officers.



Nevertheless, coordination of the prospect pool is necessary to avoid inappropriate multiple solicitations of donors. These development officers agree with the vice president that the deans should be responsible for coordinating the most sensitive major prospects through their deans' council. Other prospects should be assigned through a peer review system, using the respect and confidence which the academic unit development officers have in each other rather than relying on a central development officer, who may have less experience and stature than the academic unit officers, to make assignments.

### Summary of University X Results

#### Philosophy of Management

Decentralization of the management of development is appropriate if and only if the rest of the administration of the university is decentralized. A president who wants to make, or control the making of, all major decisions on campus will not work well with a decentralized development system. If the president sees his or her role as stating the general direction for the institution, and expects the academic units to initiate the implementation of programs to lead the institution in that direction, then decentralization is probably the best system.

### Advantages of the Current System

Decentralization encourages a high level of involvement on the part of deans and faculty and provides them with professional staffing for their development activities. It provides opportunity for broad volunteer involvement and improves stewardship activities. It encourages entrepreneurial initiatives by the components of the University, leading to more cultivation and solicitation activity and the likelihood of more gifts. By providing several relatively autonomous development offices, it creates several positions for senior development professionals within the University thereby allowing the institution to accumulate a high level of development expertise.

### Disadvantages of the Current System

In this decentralized system the vice president of development is given responsibility for the success of the university-wide development program, but is not given the authority to allocate resources as needed nor to enforce policies which he believes are necessary. Although an improved prospect management system is being developed, coordination of development activities is at present perceived as ineffective.

### Special Requirements of the Current System

The vice president for development in this system must possess a high level of interpersonal skill. He must lead by the force of his professional experience and stature, building consensus, and creating a cohesive team of senior professionals who respect his expertise and judgement. The system requires the involvement of the vice president for academic affairs in development issues since the college development officers really report to him, through the deans.

### Level of Satisfaction of the Academic and Development Leaders

The president, the deans, and the college development officers give the system a high rating, although they want to make some improvement in the prospect management procedures. The vice president for development believes that more central control would improve the effectiveness of the University's development activities.

### **Case Study 2: University Y**

University Y has a fully centralized system of managing development activities. All development officers work for the central development office, are paid from the central office budget and report to the vice president for development. The responsibilities



of the development officers are distinguished by function, i.e. annual fund, corporate relations, foundation relations, major giving, rather than by constituent base, i.e. school of business, school of engineering.

The acting president maintains centralization in the university's development office for two primary reasons. He believes that coordination and control of the prospect pool is essential to effective fund raising and that centralization is the best way to assure this goal. And he believes that effective development work requires a high level of skill and professionalism which can best be achieved if the entire development team is under the leadership of a development professional. If deans hire their own development officers, those development officers are taking direction from academic rather than development experts.

Deans play an important role in a centralized development operation. The president believes that University Y deans spend a great deal of time on development activities, particularly on acquisition of contracts and grants. In the business school, the dean spends more time on industry and individuals

because not as many opportunities for grants are available.

According to the acting president, deans are supposed to work through the central development office which "causes a slight degree of friction or maybe a larger than slight degree of friction when they don't". During the recent Capital Campaign, fund raising initiatives "had to be tightly tied together because we were approaching so many companies and individuals". One dean had established a relationship with several companies ten or fifteen years ago for scholarship aid. Corporate enthusiasm for this type of support had diminished recently. The university needed to go to those firms in the Campaign and wanted to present many opportunities for gifts, not all in the school where the original ties had existed. The central development office was able to make professional judgements about which companies would be most receptive to which requests, using previously established relationships between the university and the company as sources of information rather than as limiting factors.

Although on balance the acting president prefers to have a centralized development office, he recognized some disadvantages to this system. He

believes that a centralized system captures less of the energy which could be directed to development activities by academic leaders. It also is less effective at "coupling the donor to a program of special interest to him". He says that very few donors make large unrestricted gifts, and therefore the university needs to tie the donor to a program which he supports or might support. Central development officers are not as effective in creating and maintaining those ties as development officers who are part of the school in which the donor has the most interest. The acting president believes that the number of deans and directors actually involved in visiting prospective donors is lower in a centralized system and that the deans feel less a part of the team. It is essential to have deans involved with development so that the development officers and president are very clear on the school's priorities and expertise.

Centralization requires that the vice president for development be a skilled manager of interpersonal relationships. The vice president must assure that the deans are involved in development without foregoing the development office's control of the development process. If the vice president is less



skilled than necessary, animosity will exist between the deans and the central development office. Their goals differ, since the vice president seeks to raise the maximum amount from each donor for some part of university and the dean seeks to raise maximum for one part of the university. The president believes that the animosity can be minimized by the central development officer if he or she is willing to expend the necessary time to build a friendly relationship with the various deans. They must be willing to trust and share information.

The deans of business and engineering at University Y say that the advantages to centralization all accrue to the central development office and the disadvantages all accrue to them. One mentioned that he was so sure that he could raise more money, that he offered to take whatever part of the central development office budget was allocated to his school and whatever development officer the vice president least wanted to keep, and would guarantee to double the amount raised within a year. The vice president "refused to take the offer seriously. He laughed it off. I was hurt."

The deans feel that it is essential to have a development officer representing their schools who is

knowledgeable in their fields. According to the deans, the central development officers all have liberal arts backgrounds and cannot articulate the special expertise of the faculty and programs in various areas.

The central office does offer special expertise in planned giving and estate giving. In these areas, the deans would want to always be able to rely on a central office professional. They also believe that the central development officers are particularly skilled at "closing the deal". They would always want to work with a development officer who brought these abilities to the solicitation. But in corporate giving and individual giving, they stated firm convictions that more money could be raised if they had more freedom to become an integral part of the development process. The deans said that the central office comes between them and their corporate supporters, thereby derailing potential gifts to the University.

The potential animosity which the acting president mentioned displayed itself vividly in comments such as: "As you may have guessed, I'm not totally enthusiastic about this centralized system. In fact, quite the opposite. We've been told for

years that little boys should mind their manners and march on forward with the team and everything would come out well in the end. Well, it hasn't."

The deans believe that the goal of a centralized office is "raising money". They believe the goal of the schools is "raising money to do something with". The latter goal in their opinion leads to the establishment of more specific and attainable objectives and the presentation of more convincing cases for support. It therefore would bring more support.

The deans are convinced that centralization makes more work for their faculty. The central development officers are unfamiliar with the real expertise and the real needs of the schools. The central officers come up with ideas for proposals and ask the faculty to flesh them out. The deans believe that the schools and faculty should present the ideas to the central office and the central development officers should do the fleshing out.

One of the deans said that the vice president is clearly a highly skilled individual but the dean wonders if anyone in the central office understands his school well enough to represent its needs. When the Campaign began, the deans were asked to state



their schools' needs for the central development staff. Admitting to cynicism, the dean said he believes that when all the needs were reviewed, only the most flashy were given serious consideration. The problem, in his opinion, is that centralized, to a large degree, means secret. The deans never know the basis for the central office's decisions. "It's centralized and secret and that's what troubles me".

The central office also can accept a gift which changes a school's priorities. The deans referred to a gift accepted by the central office which "is something we need and someday will really need badly, so it isn't a total loss. But we weren't ready and it is driving other expenditures which is causing severe dislocations in our operating in the meantime. The expenditures are far in excess of the gift".

The deans believe that if the development officer were working for the school directly, gifts would be accepted more realistically, only when they would really help the school. It also would be easier to track expenditures from gift monies. They feel that it is impossible, under the centralized system to obtain timely reports on what gift money is available for them to use.

In a centralized system, the vice president has the authority to meet the

Neither academic unit has a volunteer board which is active in cultivation or solicitation of prospective donors. The deans stated that if they had a decentralized system, they would have a more incentive to build an effective volunteer structure.

One of the deans said that he thinks a major disadvantage to centralization is that it gives him an excuse to do nothing but complain about fund raising.

One of the deans said that he is not even actively communicating with alumni through events or a newsletter. He thinks he is not allowed to do it.

One of the deans stated some advantages to centralization. He thinks the recent Campaign is a credit to the central development office and that most universities would envy such success. The central office clearly knows what it's doing. "I guess I would be a lot happier with it if it were more open centralization or if it were reaching out to understand who we are, what we do, how to represent us, and then say, ok, but we'll coordinate centrally".

The vice president for development and associate vice president for development at University Y are convinced that centralization has more advantages than disadvantages. In a centralized system, the vice president has the authority to meet the

responsibilities of the office. In a decentralized system, the vice president has responsibility for university-wide fund raising but does not have the authority or control of resources necessary to assure that an effective and professional development operation is implemented. If resources are being used to support an ineffective development program at a school, the vice president has no means of recapturing and redirecting those resources.

The deans are interested in fund raising; they make their time available when the central office has a specific occasion and the opportunity for their input would be important.

A centralized development operation, according to the vice president, provides the institution with a single list of all prospective donors and a unified strategy for dealing with each of them. The development office staff, under the leadership of a senior development professional, can evaluate those prospects and match their interests with activities in the various colleges of the University. The central office starts with the prospects and their interests rather than starting with the colleges and their interests. The needs lists are the source of information about college interests and the central



staff tries to make good links between the colleges and the donors. The vice president believes that the central staff is adequate to help each of the colleges provide appropriate attention to each potential donor.

The vice president points out that information flow can be a complex issue in a large university. The central office needs to be kept informed of new initiatives and interests at the schools. The schools need to be kept informed of progress with potential donors. Sometimes there are departments within the schools that are very active on a development project and the dean of the whole unit is left out of the information loop either by the departmental leader or the development office. Such unintentional oversights cause major rifts in credibility which seem out of proportion to the error.

The vice president believes that communication with alumni and friends of the various schools could be improved. While maintaining centralized control of the fund raising staff, he might advise that the schools have a public relations officer who would initiate a newsletter, organize an annual alumni reunion, and staff a volunteer board for the school. Although University Y does not currently have such a structure, the vice president sees it as a reasonable

next step in improving university-wide development efforts. That person could also serve as liaison to the central development office thereby improving the internal flow of information.

### Summary of University Y Results

#### Advantages to Current System

Centralized management of development activities enables the University to coordinate and control the cultivation and solicitation of donors more easily and effectively than decentralization allows. A centralized management system can readily provide information on the status of each donor and prospective donor and on the status of each solicitation and gift. It assures that all development activities are under the leadership of an experienced professional development officer. It makes it easier for the University to present alternative proposals from several colleges to a potential donor. It increases the University's ability to present to potential donors those proposals which match the University's highest priorities for funding.

#### Disadvantages to Current System

In this centralized system, the deans believe that they are inadequately involved in development and they are dissatisfied with the development operation.

The energy which the deans might spend on cultivating or soliciting donors is going primarily to complaining about the process. The deans believe that they are outsiders to the development process and criticize many aspects of the process which they might not criticize if they felt more ownership of it. The central development officers have little opportunity to become well informed about the research and expertise of the faculty members. The deans and faculty have only occasional contact with the development officers and fail to understand the depth of their expertise. The deans have the impression that the development office will accept gifts even if they do not fit the priorities of the college to which the gifts are directed.

### Special Requirements of the Current System

The vice president for development in this centralized system must possess expertise both in organization and in interpersonal relations. The Vice president is responsible for organizing all of the development activities for a large institution with thousands of donors and prospective donors as well as thousands of gifts to be appropriately stewarded. He also must be able to involve the powerful academic leaders of the institution in the development process



without sharing with them the authority needed to maintain control of the process.

### Level of Satisfaction of the Academic and Development Leaders

The president and the vice president for development are satisfied with the centralized system which is in place. The academic deans are not.

### Case Study 3: University Z

University Z has a semi-decentralized development system. University Z manages its development office centrally but incorporates several aspects of decentralized management. All development offices report to the vice president for development and are paid from the central development office's budget. Each school has a development officer assigned to it. The academic unit development officer is jointly appointed by the vice president and the dean of the school. The development officer is located in the school and works closely with the dean, in much the same way as he or she would if the dean controlled the hiring and firing of the development officer. The academic unit development officers also have some university-wide responsibilities because each is assigned a geographical region and is responsible for

fund raising for the university as a whole from that region.

According to his staff, the president believes that centralized management of the development office is necessary in order to maintain adequate coordination and control of the prospect pool. Particularly when the institution is preparing for or conducting a Capital Campaign, the university must have a central source of information and of decision making concerning all approaches to prospective and current donors. This one advantage to a centralized system outweighs any disadvantages. The management system which the University has created takes advantage of most of the good aspects of decentralization without foregoing this essential advantage of centralization.

The deans of University Z generally are more satisfied with the management of development at the institution than they are dissatisfied with it. They described themselves as committed to fund raising and claim that commitment is absolutely critical to "understanding fund raising policies, procedures, operations and ultimately to being successful". However, the deans interviewed were not in total

agreement with each other on the desirability of the system in place.

Both deans consider it important to have a development officer in the college so there can be a working relationship between the dean and the development officer. One of the deans believes that the development officer should report directly to the dean. He believes that "the present arrangement at University Z is a poor substitute for the dean having his or her own development officer", but the University's system is better than the centralized systems he is familiar with at other institutions.

This dean believes that "good people can work successfully under less than ideal conditions". That is what he believes is happening at University Z. As the university becomes more sophisticated and experienced in fund raising, decentralization will become the structure of choice, in his opinion. He thinks the learning curve has centralization as the first stage, semi-decentralized as the second, and decentralized as the final. The best argument for semi-decentralization, in his opinion, is that it is an effective Campaign management model.

This dean sees coordination and control as management problems, not structural problems. They are



always necessary but since some universities with decentralized systems have great fund raising success, it is obvious that a university doesn't have to centralize to assure appropriate coordination and control.

This dean says that he has been cultivating major donors for years. He has been dropping hints about the college's needs and priorities for years. The donors have close ties to the college because he and others at the college have been paying attention to them and treating them well. When they are asked to make a gift, by the development officer assigned to the college or by a development officer from the central staff, the donors indicate their specific interest in this school. The development officer assigned to the college is asked to prepare a proposal. The school gets the gift. "It's because we have been doing our job and giving priority attention to fund raising and external relations all along."

This dean believes that the president must be involved in the ultimate ask. He is the captain of the team and the donors are university alumni not just alumni of the college. It is important to the donor to know that the president wants the gift and approves of its designation.

This dean has an alumni board but not a development advisory board. He wanted to establish a development board but it was not approved because the central development office did not want "ten mini-campaigns going on during the central campaign". The alumni board helps with external relations but not directly with fund raising.

This dean believes that a dean has a better chance than a central development officer to warn off a gift which will not fit with the expertise and priority of an individual college, without antagonizing the potential donor. "He can look the donor in the eye (they've been rejected before) and say I don't want to accept that gift exactly as described because the area has a bad image in our field. But I think we can do something which will fit your goals even better by .... ". A dean can describe to a donor with whom he has worked over the years and developed a good relationship what the needs and strengths of the college are. He can work with a donor to design a program which fits both of their visions of a better college.

The focal point of control is the relationship with the donor. If the college does its homework and builds relationships with its alumni and potential

donors, then the dean of that college can be relatively sure that the donor will turn to him to discuss the nature and purpose of any major gift.

The second dean interviewed at University Z was newer to the university than the first. He had previously worked for a university with a centralized development office which he considered to be an excellent office. He was more content with the semi-centralized system at University Z than was the first dean.

He considered it an advantage that little duplication of effort occurs in the semi-centralized system between what the college's development officer does and what the central development officers do. There is a single strategy for dealing with each donor. More than one development officer is not considering a specific donor at one time. Prospect identification is orderly and prospect management is focused on setting the best plan for each donor given the knowledge of the donor's interests.

He believes that the development officer who works with each college becomes part of the college and establishes his or her loyalty to that college. The evaluation of the development officer's success depends on how much support he or she brings in to



that college. The development officer works very closely with the dean and the faculty, getting to know the college well and being a spokesperson for it both with the central development office and with the donors.

The vice president for advancement describes the university's management of development as more centralized than decentralized, while calling it a hybrid system. The central office manages the college based development officers but their primary job is to keep the deans happy. The deans are encouraged to view the development officer as part of their staffs but the central development office really controls their time and their budgets. The deans are usually pleased with the arrangement so long as the development officer is successful in bringing gifts to the college. When a problem arises, and the development officer really is a good worker, it tends to be a personality difference and he or she can be reassigned within the university, without the institution having to lose a skilled professional.

The vice president believes that a research university needs "a cohesive systematic development program and a good prospect management system, where people are not running around willy-nilly calling on

everybody, and where there is a carefully planned strategy for raising money with development officers reporting back to a central office".

If a dean is particularly good at fund raising and particularly interested in it, he or she is more likely to want the development officer to report to him or her. An aggressive dean can resist the system as it exists at University Z. The vice president says that the problem has not yet arisen, but he sees the possibility for it.

In some colleges, the development officers have become fully integrated into the management team of the college. In others they are seen with more skepticism as a little outside the mainstream of the college. This depends greatly on the personalities and styles of the development officer and the dean. The vice president encourages the deans to recognize the development officers as peers of the associate and assistant deans. The more the development officer becomes a part of the college, the more effective he or she can be in representing the college to both internal audiences and to donors. The development officer who is involved in the full range of college activities will be better able to understand the

expertise and the needs of the college and better able to articulate those effectively.

The annual fund is managed by a central staff. The college development officers assist the annual fund staff with solicitations to the alumni of their colleges but are not responsible for annual fund. The solicitation encourages designation to the college. The college development officers review all gifts to assure that new donors and donors who are increasing their gifts will receive extra attention.

The deans at University Z are very powerful according to the vice president. In dealing with major donors, the deans are the academic authority. They are involved in all academic decisions and discussions. When the donor is ready to execute the gift, the president steps in to assure the donor that the gift is important to the institution as a whole, not just to one segment of the institution. The vice president believes that donors are pleased to have a combination of academic and administrative attention given to their gifts. They are more confident that their gift will receive sound fiscal management and will be used to achieve realistic academic goals because both the academic and administrative branches are involved in the process.



The development officers in the academic units at University Z agree that the system is a hybrid. They consider it to be highly centralized in terms of operations although decentralized in the sense that the development officers are dispersed throughout the university. As they see it, the central office drives and initiates the process of hiring a development officer for a school. The dean has minimal veto power over who is hired. The central office handles most major gift solicitation. The college's development officer is a generalist who works with mid-range donors.

University Z, as described by the college's development officers, has a tradition of strongly centralized development operations. It also has very powerful deans. The hybrid system now in place responds to these two power centers in the University.

The action in development is in the colleges, according to the college development officers. The central office is a holding company in the sense that it is an administrative not production branch of the institution. Donors make gifts to support students, faculty, and programs, all of which are located out in the colleges.

From the point of view of the college development officers, the primary advantage to their system is its ability to manage prospects and decrease the occurrence of multiple solicitations to individuals and organizational funding sources. The system encourages open discussion of prospects and their interests. No prospect is assigned without a public discussion and there is no secrecy about prospective donors.

The development officers point out that this advantage may not be as critical as others claim it to be. Since University Z is large and complex, it has many excellent programs, more than one of which may be of interest to the same potential donor. As the University's development program matures and donors become more involved in the various areas of the University where they have interest, the donors may become more willing to entertain multiple proposals. Also as the University's development program matures it will build a broader pool of prospective donors and a stronger volunteer structure so that the same people are not being asked time and again for gifts and assistance. At that point, the need for a centralized development operation will diminish and the

disadvantages of centralization may outweigh its advantages.

The disadvantage to the current system at University Z as perceived by the development officers in the colleges is that it is extraordinarily bureaucratic and, therefore, undermines the initiative of its best development officers. A good development officer will be entrepreneurial, will have a sense that he or she is representing the donor to the institution as much as representing the institution to the donor, will often act as a broker between the institution and the donor. People with these characteristics seldom choose an organization which requires them to report on every activity and conversation with a donor, or take direction from someone who knows the donor less well. The current system at University Z discourages the best development officers from wanting to work for this University. It favors the technocrat over the entrepreneur.

The development officers believe that the key to successful fund raising for the college is the dean's commitment to development activities. Furthermore they believe that the degree of commitment has a lot to do with who owns the development officer.



Therefore, the personality and style of the dean and the development officer are important. If the dean is willing to have a development officer as part of his team, even though the development officer really works for someone else, the mix may be right. If the development officer is able to convey to the dean that he or she is ultimately loyal to the college, even though the vice president is controlling salary and budget, then the fit may occur. But it is asking a lot of the system to find people who have such open attitudes.

The colleges' development officers also state that deans are very powerful at the University. They believe that a successful development operation increases the power and, to an extent, the prestige of a dean at their University.

There is some feeling on the part of the deans, as perceived by the college development officers, that the central development office should raise the money if it wants the control. However, the current degree of decentralization keeps that sentiment from getting totally out of control.

The system forces a development officer to move to another job when he or she becomes more experienced, according to the college development

officers. The largest gifts are managed and controlled by the central development officers. After a while, a development officer wants to work with major donors. The only way to do that within the system is to take a central job. The college development officers see that as a less desirable position because it would force them to relinquish direct contact with the "producers" in the organization, i.e. the faculty and the deans. Senior professionals, in their opinion, will be willing neither to stay at the college level nor to move to the central level. They will take their skills to other institutions.

A former member of the central development staff at University Z also was interviewed. He pointed out that deans and the college development officers usually work with prospects in the \$100,000 range and lower. The theory is that when the gift is larger than \$100,00 the donor will want proposals from more than one college and will want contact with the president and central development officers. Resentment builds among deans and school development officers when they have cultivated a donor until he reaches the \$100,000 level and then must turn him over to the central staff to manage for a big gift. A

further disadvantage is the possible impression to the donor that the dean's efforts have been less important and only the president can be involved with big gifts.

In this former employee's opinion, University Z's system for tracking prospective donors is too dependent on technology. This interviewee believes that development will always be "high touch" and that electronic tracking will always be inadequate. A tracking system must be flexible. It must not penalize a development officer for admitting that the college does not yet have a relationship with a potential donor but intends to establish one. It must allow for the fact that some organizations and individuals favor multiple solicitations and other do not. It must also allow for the entry of newcomers into the tracking system. The priority given to established relationships must be tempered in order to allow newcomers to build relationships.

### Summary of University Z Results

#### Advantages of the Current System

This hybrid system provides a prospect management process considered by all participants to be adequate and acceptable, although described by a former central development officer as too technical. The system promotes the involvement of deans and faculty members



in the development activities of the colleges and of the University. It provides a system for communication between the colleges and the central development office about development activities. It assures that a development officer will be familiar with the expertise and the priorities of each college and that a development officer will be adequately assimilated into the culture of each college so that he or she can articulate the college's priorities with credibility to donors who consider themselves part of that culture.

#### Disadvantages of the Current System

The system is bureaucratic and hierarchical. It does not encourage entrepreneurial activities by its participants. Each development officer has a defined function in the process. In order to take on additional responsibilities, a development officer must move to another part of the organization. The size of the gifts which can be solicited by college development officers is limited.

#### Special Requirements of the Current System

Systems using sophisticated hardware and software technology for prospect management and prospect tracking are important to assist with the major tasks of organizing the contacts by many development

officers with thousands of donors and prospective donors. This technological assistance must be tempered with human judgement grounded in professional experience so as to maintain the personal contact on which philanthropy thrives.

### Level of Satisfaction with the Current System

The president, vice president for development, and one of the deans are happy with the system. The other dean and the college development officers find it acceptable but believe that decentralization would be preferable.

### Survey Data

Additional data on the following issues, which were of particular concern to the participants in the case studies, were received from the final survey.

### Communication

The academic unit development officer plays a significant role in keeping the dean and the unit informed of events and trends both inside the institution and outside of it. On a continuum of unimportant to very important, the officer is ranked between neutral and very important as a source of information from within the institution by 53% of the respondents and of information from outside the

institution by 70% of the respondents. See Appendix 5, Tables 45 and 46.

Group comparisons show that most development officers in all groups rank the AUDO between neutral and very important as a source of outside information. When the information is about trends and events inside the university, AUDOS rank themselves as very important more often than CUDOs do.

The degree of decentralization also influences a development officer's perception of the importance of the AUDO as a source of information for the dean and the academic unit. AUDOS in fully decentralized institutions say the AUDO is very important as an information source more often than any other group does. See Appendix 5, Tables 47 and 48.

The central development office, although not quite as strongly as the AUDO, helps keep the deans and the units informed of events and trends both inside the institution and outside of it. See Appendix 5, Tables 49 and 50.

On a continuum from unimportant to very important, fifty percent of CUDOs see the central office as between neutral and very important as a source of information for the deans about trends and events within the university. Almost 60% of AUDOS see



the central office this way. On the other hand, 64% of CUDOs see the central office as between neutral and very important as a source of outside information and only 39% of AUDOs agree.

Only about 45% of development officers at each level of experience rank the CUDOs between neutral and very important as an inside information source. Over 60% of senior and 50% of mid-level and novice officers rank CUDOs between neutral and very important as a source of outside information. See Appendix 5, Tables 51 and 52.

When asked about communication concerning development activities such as prospect identification, cultivation, and solicitation between the academic units and the central development office, the respondents indicated that on a continuum from inadequate to adequate, it is closer to adequate than inadequate. Slightly more of the respondents believe that downward communication is closer to adequate than believe that upward communication is closer to adequate. See Appendix 5, Tables 53 and 54.

Perceptions about the adequacy of communication differ among the compared groups. CUDOs in fully centralized systems rate upward communication as

inadequate more often than they rate it as adequate, but downward communication as the opposite.

In fully decentralized systems, both CUDOS and AUDOS more often rate upward communication adequate than inadequate, although AUDOS think it is better than CUDOS think it is. The two groups disagree on downward communication with CUDOS saying it is closer to adequate and AUDOS saying the opposite.

In semi-decentralized systems, again both CUDOS and AUDOS rate upward communication as closer to adequate and both rate it much higher than their counterparts in other groups. Again the CUDOS and AUDOS disagreed on downward communication with CUDOS rating it closer to adequate and AUDOS rating it the opposite. See Appendix 5, Tables 55 and 56.

### Faculty Involvement

In characterizing the relationship between the faculty and the AUDOS, where one exists, 77% of the respondents rate it between neutral and cooperative on a continuum from uncooperative to cooperative. The relationship between the central development office and the faculty is rated as closer to cooperative by fewer respondents. See Appendix 5, Table 57.

When the comparison groups are analyzed, over 70% of CUDOS and over 80% of AUDOS see the relationship

between the faculty and the academic unit development officer as closer to cooperative than to uncooperative. Just over 50% of CUDOs but only about 20% of AUDOs see the relationship between the central development office and the faculty as cooperative. Many more AUDOs see the relationship as closer to uncooperative.

Over 75% of each experience level group sees the relationship between the academic unit development officer and the faculty as more cooperative than uncooperative. Less than 40% of each group sees the relationship between the central development office and the faculty between neutral and cooperative on the continuum. See Appendix 5, Tables 58 and 59.

#### **Policy on Accepting Designated Gifts**

At institutions represented by 47% of respondents, a major gift has in the past caused a significant shift in the academic priorities of an academic unit. The solicitation of this gift was managed jointly by the academic unit and the central office in the great majority of those cases: 67% said jointly, 7% said central, 26% said academic unit. In most cases the shift in priorities was readily accepted by both the academic unit and the central



administration: "by the academic unit", 94% said yes; "by the central administration", 95% said yes.

When analyzed by comparison groups, over 80% of CUDOS in fully centralized systems and over 70% of CUDOS in fully decentralized systems but only 47% of CUDOS in semi-decentralized systems indicated that a major gift had at some time caused a shift in the academic priorities of an academic unit. Fewer AUDOS noted such a shift: 52% of them in fully decentralized systems and 37% in semi-decentralized systems. With both AUDOS and CUDOS a shift was less common in institutions which are semi-decentralized than at those which are fully centralized or fully decentralized. Senior development officers noted shifts more often than mid-level or novice development officers. See Appendix 5, Table 60.

Shifts in priorities have occurred when the management of the gift was with the academic unit, the central office, or handled jointly, with a few more respondents indicating jointly. AUDOS in fully decentralized institutions most often indicated that a gift which caused a priority shift was managed by the academic unit. See Appendix 5, Table 61.

The shift was readily accepted by both the academic unit and the central administration in almost every case. See Appendix 5, Table 62.

### Volunteer Involvement

Most of the respondents' institutions have volunteer boards at their business and engineering schools. A higher percentage of the business schools have volunteer boards than of the engineering schools (90% at the former and 73% at the latter). Fifty-seven percent of the respondents said that the business school volunteer board was closer to very helpful than to not helpful with the unit's development efforts. Respondents perceived the engineering schools' volunteer boards as slightly less helpful. See Appendix 5, Table 63.

Comparison group analysis shows that business and engineering schools at institutions which are fully centralized are less likely to have volunteer boards than those at institutions with some level of decentralization. See Appendix 5, Table 64. Most respondents rate the boards as closer to very helpful than to not helpful with development efforts. CUDOs in fully centralized systems found the boards to be less helpful than other respondents. See Appendix 5, Tables 65 and 66.

### Coordination and Control

Most of the institutions have university-wide systems for tracking the cultivation of donors (80% said yes), for tracking the solicitation of gifts (87% said yes), and for preventing inappropriate multiple solicitations of donors (82% said yes). See Appendix 5, Table 67. The systems are perceived as moderately effective. On a continuum from ineffective to effective, 55% of the respondents consider their institutions' systems for tracking the cultivation of donors to be closer to effective than to ineffective. Sixty-one percent of them consider the tracking of solicitation of donors to be closer to effective than to ineffective, and 56% of them consider the system for preventing inappropriate multiple solicitations to be closer to effective. See Appendix 5, Table 68. Group comparisons show that more CUDOs than AUDOs rate the systems effective. See Appendix 5, Tables 69, 70, and 71.

### Power of the Deans

A high level of private support for an academic unit increases the dean's power among other deans according to 73% of the respondents. The level of private support increases the dean's power with the president according to 75% of respondents.



All groups of respondents agree. CUDOs in fully centralized systems were the least likely to see a relationship between a dean's power and the amount of private support for that dean's academic unit. See Appendix 5, Table 72.

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND

### NEEDS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The patterns of development activity now observable in large universities, particularly in the subunits of those universities, are the patterns of earlier institutions of higher education. Some universities have grown so large that their subunits are larger than other entire campuses, leading some of the presidents to decentralize management responsibilities. Some have delegated responsibility to deans and other subunit leaders for areas such as

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS,

#### NEED FOR FURTHER STUDY

unit heads. University-wide leaders set goals and strategies within the overall mission statement of the institution, and they monitor and guide implementation of the mission. They assume responsibility for areas in which economies of scale can be achieved, but the deans have a major role in management and have assumed a degree of independence not commonly seen among components of universities in earlier years.

Early universities might have been described by Aliso and Scott as bureaucracies, or by Simon as hierarchies, or by Clark as professional

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND NEEDS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The patterns of development activity now observable in large universities, particularly in the subunits of those universities, echo the patterns of earlier institutions of higher education. Some universities have grown so large that their subunits are larger than other entire campuses, leading some of the presidents to decentralize management responsibilities. Some have delegated responsibility to deans and other subunit leaders for areas such as faculty and student recruitment, budgeting and financial management, and curricular innovation and planning. These are all daily concerns of academic unit heads. University-wide leaders set goals and strategies within the overall mission statement of the institution, and they monitor and guide implementation of the mission. They assume responsibility for areas in which economies of scale can be achieved. But the deans have a major role in management and have assumed a degree of independence not commonly seen among components of universities in earlier years.

Early universities might have been described by Blau and Scott as bureaucracies, or by Simon as hierarchies, or by Clark as professional



organizations. Modern universities, however, have a great deal in common with the loosely coupled organizations and garbage can models described by Cohen, March, and Olsen, and Glassman, and Weick. The units are relatively independent of each other but held together and sharing some components for their mutual benefit.

Today's deans have some of the characteristics of early presidents. Having put in place the basics of a sound educational program, they are seeking additional resources to maintain and enhance their colleges. Like many early presidents, some deans have built friendships with wealthy individuals or with firms who make gifts in support of the deans' schools as much out of respect for the dean as out of interest in the institution. Deans have gone out on the circuit giving speeches and requesting support for their colleges. Some have hired agents to raise funds for their colleges. While continuing to play a key role in attracting support for their colleges, many deans now want a professionally staffed development operation to help them raise private support for their colleges.

The role of faculty in attracting private support also encourages deans to establish development offices for their colleges. Hofstader and Metzger (1955, p140)

described major donors as philanthropic entrepreneurs who are unaccustomed to passive roles and who often want to work with faculty whom they see as the productive members of institutions. Gifts from these donors are designated in support of specific faculty projects and programs. Since today faculty are often more closely affiliated with an academic unit and a dean than with the university as a whole and the president, donors who are interested in faculty centered programs are at least as likely to be in contact with deans as with presidents. Deans want professional development staffing to take advantage of these gift opportunities.

For the same reasons that university presidents established professional development offices for their institutions, many deans are establishing them for their colleges. As Goldman (1988), Muller (1978), and Rowland (1974) indicate, advancement officers cannot be adjuncts to the college, but must be integral members of it. They must be involved in the essential decisions which relate to the organization which they represent. They are responsible for communicating with both internal and external audiences and in order to do that effectively they must be highly visible in the organization's top management. Because of the

increased decentralization of the management of the university, deans see themselves as the chief executive officers of their subunits of the university and they see a need for professional development assistance. Some authors (Muller 1978; Rowland 1974) have said that decentralization of the development operations at universities is less effective because of the importance of the advancement officer's participation in top management activities. Deans who are establishing their own development offices can argue that decentralization is essential in order to assure that the development officer is part of the top management of the organization to which the donors are making their gifts, the academic units of the university.

Although it is true that a strong case can be made to have professional development offices in academic units, it is also true that a strong development office is essential to the well-being of the university as a whole. Gifts are given to support academic units, for purposes such as faculty research, curriculum development and enhancement, and assuring diversity among students entering a given field of study. But many gifts continue to be given for university-wide purposes, such as to enable access to



higher education for all groups in our society, for inter-departmental programs, and for overall enhancement of the university. The sizes of gifts to academic units and to the university as a whole are comparable. The numbers of such gifts are comparable. The value of such gifts to the institution is comparable. The management problem facing universities is organizing their development offices to succeed with both types of gifts.

There is arguably a need for mature professional development programs both at the university level and at the academic unit level. The data produced by this study document the problems which universities encounter when they retain a single, centralized development office on the model advocated by the Greenbrier Conference of 1958. They document equally strongly the problems which universities encounter when they establish development offices both at the university-wide level and at the academic unit level. The data do not enable the formulation of a prescription for a single, ideal management system for all institutions. Each of the systems studied responded well to certain management needs and less well to others. But, the data do enable conclusions about the specific hypotheses tendered initially and

they do suggest recommendations for making the management system which a university chooses operate with increased effectiveness.

### Conclusions

#### Conclusion 1:

#### There is a Trend Toward Decentralizing the Management of Advancement Activities in Research and Doctorate-granting Universities.

The data from the initial survey indicate that a trend exists but only at institutions classified as research or doctorate-granting institutions by the Carnegie taxonomy. Of those institutions, 50% have some degree of decentralization. The final survey confirms the initial data. Of the 156 institutions responding to the final survey, 61% have development officers for their academic units. Another 13% indicated that they planned to hire an academic unit development officer within two years.

The trend is relatively recent. The initial survey indicated that 58% of the institutions with an academic unit development officer had hired that officer within the past three years. The final survey data indicate that 42% of the academic unit development officers have been hired in the past three years.

Because of this trend, executives of research universities are seeking information about the advantages and disadvantages of various degrees of decentralization. They are eager to know if one management structure clearly has more merit than others. Guidelines which will assist with implementing an effective development management structure are needed more than in the past.

### Conclusion 2:

#### Specific Characteristics Identify the Institutions at which Decentralization is Occurring.

In addition to being research or doctorate-granting institutions, a university is more likely to have an academic unit development officer for the business school if the school is accredited by the AACSB.

The data from the initial survey also indicate that public universities are more likely to have academic unit development officers than are private universities. This may be because the development offices at public institutions have been established more recently, and these institutions already were large enough to have decentralized other management operations. Many private universities established their development offices earlier than their public



counterparts and therefore had centralized development programs as a consequence of the Greenbrier Conference. This study does not present adequate data to state with confidence reasons for this difference.

### Conclusion 3:

A Consensus Exists Among All Development Officers Concerning a Specific Set of Responsibilities Which Should Appropriately be Assigned to the University's Central Development Office Regardless of the Degree to which the Management of Development Activities is Decentralized at the University.

A majority of respondents to the final survey agree that, both in non-campaign and campaign fund raising, the central development office should have primary responsibility for the annual fund (54% and 59%), for the alumni database (85% and 86%), and for gift records (91% and 86%). During a campaign, the majority agree that major individual gifts and major foundation gifts primarily should be a central office responsibility. Almost as many also believe that major corporate gifts should be a central responsibility.

These data indicate that the chief university development officer should have strong support in establishing an efficient and effective development services program within the central office. Few will

resist the allocation of resources to implement a database management and record keeping system which serves all development officers and supports all development activities.

The consensus is weaker on the assignment of responsibility for the annual fund. From statements made during the case studies, a conclusion can be drawn that the disagreement over responsibility for the annual fund program does not concern its design, implementation, or supervision. All comments indicated that the central development office was best equipped to run the annual fund with professional skill and economies of scale. The dissention concerned the designation of money raised from the annual fund appeal. Assuming that the respondents to the final survey are influenced by the same concerns as those in the case studies, development officers will assign responsibility for annual fund to the central office at institutions where all annual fund receipts are clearly earmarked for the unrestricted fund, as well as at institutions where donors are given clear control over the designation of their gifts. In cases where donors are encouraged to give to the unrestricted fund, but their designation to another fund is accepted when the donor insists,

responsibility is more likely to be assigned by academic unit development officers to the academic unit. In the case studies, academic unit leaders were willing to take responsibility for running the annual fund if they believed it could substantially increase the amount of money designated for their units. There was disagreement between the deans and some development officers over the relative effectiveness of appeals for unrestricted funds and for funds designated for the unit from which an alumnus graduated.

The consensus on the assignment of responsibility for major individual, corporate, and foundation gifts shows a strong belief that the central office must play a major role. Few of those who withhold primary responsibility from the central office are willing to assign it to the academic unit office. Instead they claim it should be evenly held.



#### Conclusion 4A:

The Range of Responsibility of an Advancement Officer Affects the Officer's Evaluation of Management Issues, of the Division of Development Responsibilities, and of the Factors Contributing to the Success of an Academic Unit Development Office.

AUDOs and CUDOs give very different evaluations of the management issues identified as common to all institutions. Chi-square tests were used to determine if the differences in evaluations could be caused by random disagreement within the groups or if the differences have at least a .05 alpha level of assurance of being attributable to the respondents' membership in one group or the other. The tests show that the differences are real between the groups, that is, they show that an AUDO is very likely to give one response while a CUDO is very likely to give another response in the following areas.

#### CUDOs versus AUDOs Concerning Management Issues

The importance of the AUDO as a source of information within the university.

AUDOs place a much higher value on their role of keeping the dean informed about internal events than do CUDOs. At least one of the deans interviewed in the case studies agrees. He said that his development

officer, by working regularly with faculty and her development colleagues on campus, brought him more current information about the mood and activity of the campus than he could ever hope to gather through formal channels. In consequence, he believes that his response to faculty and community issues is greatly enhanced.

The relationship between the development officers and the faculty.

Since many of the major gifts given to a research university are in support of specific academic programs or research, the involvement of faculty in the development process is essential. The survey data indicate that AUDOs have a strong relationship with faculty while the relationship between CUDOs and faculty is more tenuous. The case study data indicate that deans and presidents believe it is very difficult for CUDOs to have adequate knowledge of the various academic programs in a large university to explain them appropriately to potential donors who are involved in the field. Consequently CUDOs may find themselves always on the defensive when preparing case statements and proposals, or even when cultivating donor interest.

The adequacy of communication from the central development office to the academic units.

The case study data indicate that communication from the central development office to the academic units in fully centralized systems is inadequate and a cause of much of the dissatisfaction which the deans express toward the development program of the university. The survey data shows that CUDOs in centralized programs tend to recognize this problem, since fewer than half of them rated downward communication as adequate.

In decentralized systems, both the case study data and the survey data show that AUDOs and CUDOs are not even communicating about communication. More than 65% of CUDOs say that downward communication is adequate but fewer than 38% of AUDOs agree.

This perception of less than adequate downward communication means that deans and AUDOs are not as well integrated into the development program as CUDOs think they are and that their expertise and skill could be better used than is currently the fact.



The effectiveness of university-wide systems for tracking donor related activities.

CUDOs consider the tracking systems to be more effective than AUDOs consider them to be. AUDOs should be integrally involved in improving these systems.

CUDOs versus AUDOs Concerning the Division of Development Responsibilities

Since chi-square tests show that AUDOs and CUDOs disagree about who currently has primary responsibility for each of the development activities listed, it can be concluded that these responsibilities could be carried out with greater efficiency. Duplicate efforts are probably taking place in some areas and inadequate programs in others.

Additionally, the chi-square tests show that a development officer's evaluation of the ideal division of responsibility for all development activities both during campaign and during non-campaign fund raising depends on his or her position as a CUDO or an AUDO. As a consequence it is clear that discussion is essential of who will have each duty and, once a decision has been made, who does have each duty.

the importance of interaction with the university's primary voluntary board, (b) the importance of interaction with the academic unit's voluntary board,

### CUDOs versus AUDOs Concerning Factors Contributing to AUDO Success

Where decentralization has occurred, the development officers' evaluations of many factors important to the success of the academic unit development office also are dependent on their positions. AUDOs and CUDOs have significant disagreements about the importance of each of the following:

- (a) being paid by the dean,
- (b) reporting to the dean,
- (c) being physically located in the unit,
- (d) having interaction with students,
- (e) having an academic title,
- (f) having a good rapport with the president, and
- (g) having a good rapport with the CUDO.

In each case, except the last, the ratings given to these factors indicate that AUDOs consider them more important than do CUDOs. The opposite is true of the last factor listed.

AUDOs and CUDOs agree on only five factors: (a) the importance of interaction with the faculty, (b) the importance of interaction with the university's primary volunteer board, (c) the importance of interaction with the academic unit's volunteer board,

(d) the importance of being part of the management team of the unit, and (e) the importance of having a dean who is committed to the development effort.

The experiences of the AUDOs may have caused them to place added value on some factors. CUDOs should seek clarification of the perceived importance of the factors and assist the AUDOs as much as possible in having what will help them succeed.

#### Conclusion 4B:

The Data Do Not Reliably Indicate that the Level of a Development Officer's Experience Affects Evaluation of Management Issues, of the Division of Responsibilities, or of the Factors Contributing to the Success of an Academic Unit Development Office.

Although it is true that chi-square tests on data from the final survey indicate that senior, mid-level, and novice development officers differ significantly in their responses, these data may not be reliable. Eighty-two percent (82%) of all CUDOs are self-reported to have senior level experience and only 39% of all AUDOs are self-reported at the senior level. Responses by senior level officers disproportionately reflect the thinking of CUDOs. Similarly 44% of AUDOs are rated mid-level and 39% are rated novice level, while only 14% and 4% of CUDOs give themselves these



levels. Thus, both the mid and novice level responses disproportionately reflect the thinking of AUDOs.

In only one case where experience level seems to affect the response is this inconsistent with expectations based on the percentage of AUDOs and CUDOs in each experience level group. A large percentage (62%) of development officers with senior level skills and experience claim that a gift has caused a shift in academic priorities at an institution where they have worked. Only 49% of CUDOs and 43% of AUDOs answered "yes" to this question. The longer the officer is in the business, the more likely he or she apparently is to observe such an occurrence.

#### Conclusion 4C:

Within the Overall Group of CUDOs, Chi-square Tests Show that Significant Differences in Responses Occur Depending on Whether the Development Officer Works at an Institution with a Centralized, Decentralized, or Semi-Decentralized Management Structure. Within the Overall Group of AUDOs, Significant Differences Seldom Occur Between Those at Fully Decentralized and those at Semi-Decentralized Institutions.

The varying responses concerning the adequacy of communication indicate that some systems are better than others at promoting communication. CUDOs at fully

centralized institutions find communication from the academic units upward to the central office closer to inadequate than to adequate. Those at fully decentralized institutions are somewhat less likely to find it inadequate. But those at semi-decentralized institutions seldom indicate that it is inadequate. Having a development officer who has one foot in the central office and the other in the academic unit greatly assists the CUDO in learning about the development activities of the academic unit. However this does not offer a clear mandate for semi-decentralization since almost half of AUDOs in each fully and semi-decentralized systems rate downward communication as closer to inadequate.

CUDOs in centralized, decentralized, and semi-decentralized systems differ when indicating who should ideally have responsibility for annual fund; for major individual and corporate gifts, for prospect identification, for preparation of the case statement and of proposals when not in a campaign; and, for major foundation gifts when in a campaign. AUDOs in decentralized and semi-decentralized systems differ on none of these items.

Similarly, the responses of CUDOs in differing management systems vary when asked who currently is

responsible for setting development priorities, identifying prospective donors, cultivating donor interest in supporting an academic unit, orchestrating solicitations, acknowledging designated gifts, staffing the alumni relations and public relations programs, and soliciting annual gifts from the alumni of an academic unit. The responses of AUDOs in fully and semi-decentralized systems do not vary significantly on these items. In part, the variety of responses by CUDOs should be expected since a CUDO in a fully centralized system would not assign major development duties to an academic unit with no development staff. But the results show that responses also vary greatly between CUDOs at fully and semi-decentralized institutions. More variation occurs among CUDOs than among AUDOs on all items.

#### Conclusion 5:

Identifiable Management Issues, Both Operational Issues and Autonomy Issues, are Common to Advancement Undertakings at all Universities.

Balance of Power Between the Institution and its Donors

The autonomy of the institution, its ability to set its own priorities, might theoretically be affected by a donor whose gift carries contingent



conditions. This issue is discussed by many authors including Curti and Nash (1965), Hofstadter and Metzger (1955), Rudolph (1962), and Veysey (1965). None of those interviewed during the case studies believed that this was a significant problem as long as priorities are clearly set. They were convinced that the academic and development leaders working with the potential donor would and could either influence the donor to designate the gift for a priority program or that the institution would and could walk away from the gift.

Incentives for obtaining philanthropic support are great, but they are not disproportionately greater in either a centralized or decentralized development structure. In balancing its power with that of its donors the university and the subunit have similar problems and concerns.

There was, however, concern that potential recipients might have differing views of institutional priorities. One dean gave the example of a gift, accepted for his unit by the central office, which was designated for a program which was not a current priority and was draining resources from more important programs. One vice president gave an example of a major gift accepted by an academic unit for a

program which was low on the university's priority list. Neither the dean nor the vice president indicated that the gift should have been rejected by the institution because of the problems, just that the situations were less than ideal. The fact is that private gifts can be used by those within the university to alter institutional priorities.

### Balance of Power Between the President and the Deans

Many of those interviewed believe that an academic unit with an effective development officer gains power within the institution. Academic unit development offices may promote at least the perception that an institution's units are only loosely coupled to each other. As Lutz (1982) points out, loose coupling favors the status quo and those with the most power. An effective academic unit development officer will not only help the unit increase its private support but the volunteer structure put in place for fund raising and the information gathered to prepare credible proposals and a case statement can also indirectly help the unit receive a larger share of internal resources.

Blau's (1964) theories of social exchange contribute to this discussion. An organization which receives a larger amount of philanthropic support than

its peers is in a position to be able to contribute disproportionately more to its constituents---more research, better prepared alumni, increased community service. The philanthropically rich institution is more powerful than its peers and as its societal contributions become out of balance with societal input to the institution, its input will likely increase since social exchange seeks balance. Thus philanthropic support is likely to leverage base support, more students, more public support, more prestige.

Within an institution which has decentralized its development operation, a parallel phenomenon occurs. As the subunit receives more philanthropic support, it is able to contribute more to the university as a whole. Other subunits, which have only base university support or have less philanthropic support to add to their base support cannot contribute as much. The richer subunit becomes more powerful as it contributes more prestige, more successful alumni, more publications, more service to the university, and to the community which the university serves. It can then command a larger share of the base support pie as well. The enhanced ability of a richer academic unit to contribute to the measurable achievements of the



university will command increased support for the unit over competing institutional components.

The president of the institution may have mixed feelings about a management system which grants deans the mechanism for enhancing their power. If development is centrally controlled, this power base belongs to the president. The president is likely to be concerned about shifting the balance of power among the deans and between himself and the deans.

### Clear and Effective Communication

Academic and development leaders both talked about the need for clear and candid communication. Many but not all deans nor all development officers criticized the processes at their institutions for sharing information about development activities. There were harsh critics at the academic unit level and harsh critics at the university level. There were individuals at both levels who were complimentary of their institution's communication processes. Although many authors discuss the importance of communication in organizations (Argyris 1964; Etzioni 1964; Likert 1967; Odiorne 1965), few compare communication in centralized and decentralized organizations. Drucker (1954) claims decentralization improves the timeliness and effectiveness of communication. This study

produced some evidence to corroborate Drucker's claim. Respondents from semi-decentralized systems were more satisfied with communication both upward and downward within the university than were respondents from either fully centralized or fully decentralized systems.

Information is one of the keys to power (Mintzberg, 1983) and therefore communication has important implications within the university. People who have information are more powerful than those who do not. Development officers both at the academic unit level and at the central office level will communicate their information more willingly when it is clear that they enhance their power by doing so. They are likely to actively or passively resist giving up information if the sharing diminishes their power or fails to enhance it. The management system must recognize that no one will turn over information without receiving a compensating return, just as no one turns over dollars without receiving a return on the investment.

### Coordination and Control

Several of those interviewed were concerned about coordination of development activities to avoid multiple or inappropriate solicitations. Some of the academic unit development officers and one of the

deans in decentralized institutions thought the issue was exaggerated. But others, in centralized institutions, believed this was the single most important issue and that a management system should be designed with coordination as its primary goal. These opinions recall Martin and Moore's (1985) discussion of the importance of coordination and control in maintaining unified movement within centralized management models. They also claim that control is less important in decentralized models and that in those models, coordination can be horizontal as well as vertical.

### Attracting and Retaining Experienced Professional Development Officers

#### Advantages of decentralization.

Attracting and keeping effective development officers is a major concern of both chief university development officers and deans. A decentralized structure is particularly attractive to experienced officers who want to lead a program but are not eager to take on the administrative duties of a chief development position. The AUDO controls a relatively large program, often as large as an independent institution. Many academic units have 3,000 or more students; 15,000 or more alumni; and faculty of 100 or



more. The challenge of leading a development office for this size program is adequately interesting to attract an experienced development person. In addition the senior academic unit development officer has a built-in group of colleagues with whom to share concerns and successes. The isolation of senior development executives in independent institutions of the same size as the academic unit is avoided. Some senior development officers resist becoming a chief institutional development officers because of the increase in administrative duties and the decrease in development duties. They do not equate moving up the bureaucratic ladder with professional enhancement. For these development officers a leadership position with an academic unit is ideal.

Deans believe that a development officer who will be successful in working with an academic unit must be adequately familiar with the various academic areas in the college to represent them well to potential donors. Some deans believe that academicians and practitioners in the field form a type of subculture with its own language and criteria for judging expertise. They questioned whether a generalist development officer could understand the subculture or work well within it.

Many deans want a senior, rather than a more junior, development officer working with the academic unit. One of the attractions for deans of a fully decentralized system is that the development officer is more likely to be a senior person.

Deans want the development officer to work directly with faculty and be accepted by them as a full member of the unit's top management. Faculty members tend to value years of experience as highly as expertise and productivity. The tenure system creates classes of professionals. Junior untenured faculty are not peers of senior tenured faculty. Newly minted PhDs may have more expertise than their senior colleagues, but they are not granted senior status until they have spent at least the five or six years on the job necessary to meet minimum tenure standards. And they must prove that they have the respect of their peers at other, prestigious institutions.

Academic unit development officers are measured by faculty against these standards as well as against administrative standards. The academic unit development officer will be most successful in building a relationship with faculty if he or she meets faculty criteria for being an expert---productivity, peer respect, and years of experience.

The dean is unlikely to expect the faculty to accept a development officer as a full member of the unit's management team if that officer has fewer than five years experience, no record of peer recognition, or a soft record of productive solicitation. It may help for a development officer to have advanced degrees and be eligible for an academic title such as assistant or associate dean. On the other hand, if the development officer's degree is in the academic field of the unit, faculty are likely to consider it a sign of weakness for the officer to move out of research and teaching into administration. If the officer's degree is in another academic area, the faculty will consider it inferior and not worthy of serious note. Nevertheless a degree, a publication, and presentation record help indirectly by winning peer acclaim which faculty acknowledge, respect, and demand of their leaders.

Deans also want a development officer who can work directly with a volunteer board. They are unwilling to allow a junior officer to represent them or to have full access to their most important outside friends. Some deans have volunteer boards in place and others do not, but all interviewed thought that a volunteer board enhances the academic unit's opportunity for success in philanthropic endeavors.



Several mentioned the importance of having a development officer to provide staff support for volunteers.

In a semi-decentralized system, the academic unit development officer is less likely to be a senior development officer. Therefore, the dean is less likely to afford him or her as much authority to represent the unit, just as the dean would be less likely to have a junior professor represent the unit.

The development structure needs to fit university culture, where even highly skilled junior people must earn their spurs before representing senior colleagues.

#### Advantages of centralization.

Despite the preference which many deans have for fully decentralized development systems, such systems have several disadvantages in recruiting and retaining expert development officers. One of the issues seldom mentioned by deans is that donors' interests are not always wholly in one academic field. The same potential donor can be involved in the humanities, the fine arts, business, engineering, a medical concern, and athletics. Some donors' interests include a global perspective on the value of diversity of the student body, access for all students, and the teaching of

values to college students who will soon become societal leaders. A gift to the university as a whole may be more appropriate for such a donor. The development system of a university should encourage a multiplicity of donor interest and involvement. Segmentation of the development office by decentralization makes reaching this goal difficult.

Senior development officers understand the possibility of multiple donor interests. They enjoy having broad based as well as high level responsibility. The advantages of decentralization which deans praise as attracting senior development officers become disadvantages if the broad vision of some donors and the broad interests of good development officers cannot be accommodated.

Experienced development officers also value clear communication within an organization. The data indicate that decentralization does not promote candid communication. They value a system of coordination which protects their efforts with a donor and encourages serious planning of cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship activities. The case study data indicate that coordination tends to be more difficult in a decentralized system.

Many experienced, professional development officers find centralized and semi-decentralized systems to be more attractive. As a leader in one of these models, the development officer has more control over the resources necessary to succeed in the position. Many experienced officers prefer working at the university level, participating in the management of the larger institution, working with the president and the university's top volunteer board, leading and guiding the overall development program of the institution.

#### Conclusion 6:

This Study Does Not Provide Data to Show that One Management System is Preferable to the Others. Results Do, However, Indicate Some Advantages and Disadvantages of Each System.

#### Fully Centralized Management

A fully centralized system for managing development activities provides effective coordination and control of the development activities. It attracts experienced development professionals to the top positions and provides opportunities for less experienced professionals to learn. It divides the responsibilities for development clearly.



The centralized management system does not provide clear and effective lines of communication and information flow between the academic units and the central development office. It does not provide maximum incentive and opportunity for all academic unit leaders to effectively participate in development activities. It does not provide staffing for academic unit volunteer boards.

#### Fully Decentralized Management

The fully decentralized system of managing development activities of a university attracts and retains experienced and effective development professionals to positions throughout the university. It provides maximum incentive and opportunity for all institutional leaders to participate in development activities. It provides academic unit development officers with the essential elements of success. It provides adequate staffing for the academic unit volunteer boards.

The fully decentralized system tends not to provide effective coordination among various institutional leaders who seek private support. It does not provide clear lines of communication and information flow between the academic units and the central development office. It does not provide a

clear division of responsibilities for development activities. It does not take full advantage of the experience and skill of the senior academic unit development officers.

### Semi-Decentralized Management

The semi-decentralized system of managing development programs provides effective coordination and control of development activities. It provides clear lines of communication and information flow between the academic units and the central development office. It provides opportunities for all institutional leaders to participate in development activities. It provides some guidelines for the division of responsibilities for development activities. It provides adequate staffing for the academic unit volunteer boards.

In the semi-decentralized system academic unit development positions are less attractive to senior officers because they do not provide full leadership to their programs. The system is less attractive than a fully decentralized system to deans and faculty because it is less likely to attract a senior academic professional to their units.

The Development Council will help to overcome these disadvantages. It should meet regularly to

### Recommendations

The recommendations take into account the advantages and disadvantages of each management system.

#### Recommendation 1:

If a University Chooses to Fully Centralize its Development Programs, a Deans' Development Council Should be Established and Chaired by the Chief University Development Officer.

Centralized systems effectively: (a) provide coordination and control of cultivation and solicitation, (b) attract experienced development officers to the top positions in the organization, (c) provide structured learning opportunities for less experienced development officers, and (d) divide the responsibility for various development activities clearly. Centralized systems do not provide clear and effective lines of communication with the deans and their academic units. They provide less incentive for deans and faculty members to participate in cultivation and solicitation activities, and they usually cannot provide adequate staffing for academic unit volunteer boards.

The Development Council will help to overcome these disadvantages. It should meet regularly to



discuss overall strategic and tactical planning. Prospect identification, cultivation, and solicitation should be discussed as well as appropriate stewardship of gifts. Deans should participate in the development planning and should set specific objectives for their units' roles in achieving the goals set for each major prospect.

### Recommendation 2:

If a university chooses to establish a fully decentralized system for managing its development programs, both an Executive Development Council and a Development Committee should be established.

Fully decentralized systems have the advantage of often attracting experienced development officers throughout the institution, at both the central office and the academic unit office levels. They provide maximum incentive for the deans and faculty to participate in development activities. The factors necessary for AUDO success are in place. Staffing is available for a volunteer board.

On the other hand, fully decentralized systems are less effective than other systems at coordinating and controlling cultivation and solicitation. They do not provide clear and effective lines of communication. They do not clearly divide the

responsibility for development activities. Also, they can fail to take full advantage of the skills of the AUDOs by not using them for solicitations which include more than one academic unit.

The purpose of the recommended Executive Development Council and Development Committee would be to create a development team which would unify the development process of the university without forgoing the advantages of having relatively independent academic unit development offices.

The Executive Development Council would be chaired by the chief university development officer and have as its members all senior level development professionals at the institution. As junior development officers gain quantity and quality of experience they should be added to the Council. The Council should set overall university development goals, blending the goals of the academic units with those which are university-wide, and should make strategic and tactical plans for achieving the goals. It should give particular attention to setting objectives for achieving university-wide development goals which could not be met by achievement of all academic unit development goals. Particular attention should also be given to setting strategies for

involving donors whose interests overlap with more than one component of the university.

The Development Committee should be chaired by the chief university development officer or a high level designee. Membership should include all mid-level and novice development officers. The Committee should set objectives for the achievement of academic unit and university-wide goals. It should provide guidance, advice, and mentoring for junior development officers as well as assistance with implementation of programs.

Information about academic unit development activities and central office development activities should be shared at both the Council and the Committee meetings.

### Recommendation 3:

If a University Establishes a Semi-Decentralized System for Managing its Development Programs, the Chief University Development Officer Should Augment Efforts to Share Information Concerning Central Office Development Activities With the Academic Units and Should Clarify Expectations Concerning Implementation of Programs.

The semi-decentralized system provides effective coordination and control of cultivation and



solicitations and clear lines of communication. It provides incentive for the deans and faculty to participate in development activities and at least guidelines for the division of development responsibilities. Staffing for academic unit volunteer boards is usually good.

This system is less attractive to experienced development officers who want to work at the academic unit level because the AUDO has less autonomy. It is less attractive to deans and faculty who prefer to work with a senior development officer.

In addition to being particularly concerned about communication and expectations, this system will benefit by seeking AUDOs with a less strong need for autonomy.

#### **Further Research Needs**

This study included academic unit development officers only if they were affiliated with business or engineering schools. Research on development programs of other academic units would contribute to a broader vision of the issues examined here.

Additional case studies should be conducted to gather data on mechanisms used in universities with each management arrangement to assure adequate coordination and control, adequate communication

concerning development activities, effective relationships between faculty and development officers, and effective tracking of cultivation and solicitation activities.

Additional research also is needed to explore the role of deans and faculty in development activities, the attractiveness of various management arrangements to development officers with varying degrees of experience and skill, the importance of avoiding multiple solicitations and the value of cultivation of a potential donor by more than one unit of a university.

There is a growing international interest in the "privitization" of higher education. Research concerning the methods used by American universities to manage development activities, and particularly fund raising activities, may be useful to European and Australian institutions which are adopting American prototypes.

The initial survey in this study indicated that private universities are more likely to have a more centralized management pattern and public universities are more likely to have a more decentralized pattern. An investigation of the reasons for this result might be useful.

This study did not attempt to examine the relationship between the degree of centralization of the development program at a university and the amount contributed to the university as a whole or to the academic units of the university. In order to compare results of fund raising efforts at various institutions, it is necessary to compare the cost of raising each dollar. Currently no standard guidelines for calculating the costs are in general use. CASE and the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) are now testing guidelines which they developed as part of a joint project. The opportunity to conduct research which measures the performance of the various management systems will be greatly enhanced by the adoption of the new guidelines by a large number of universities and colleges. Significant comparative research on the effectiveness of various management arrangements will be important to future decision makers.



# APPENDIX 1: Case Study Questions

- During the case studies, presidents were asked:
1. Do your business and engineering deans place a high priority on fund raising for their colleges? What are the indicators of the priority they give to fund-raising?
  2. What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages to having (or not having) development officers with specific responsibility for managing advancement for your business and engineering schools? Does your Capital Campaign affect your thinking regarding how development should be structured at your university?
  3. A major institutional concern in development work is that donors will, through their gifts, skew the priorities of the university. Do you think that having a decentralized fund-raising operation increases the danger of donors' inappropriately affecting the direction of the programs of the University?
  4. In what ways, if any, does it increase the deans' power within the institution to have their own fund raisers?

## APPENDIX 1: Case Study Questions

During the case studies, presidents were asked:

1. Do your business and engineering deans place a high priority on fund raising for their Colleges? What are the indicators of the priority they give to fund raising?

2. What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages to having (or not having) development officers with specific responsibility for managing advancement for your business and engineering schools? Does your Capital Campaign status affect your thinking regarding how development should be structured at your university?

3. A major institutional concern in development work is that donors will, through their gifts, skew the priorities of the University. Do you think that having a decentralized fund raising operation increases the danger of donors' inappropriately affecting the direction of the programs of the University?

4. In what ways, if any, does it increase the deans' power within the institution to have their own fund raisers?

Deans were asked:

1. How high a priority do you place on development activities for your school? What types of development activities do you undertake for your school?

2. Does the institutional planning process allow your school to set its own academic priorities? its own development priorities?

3. Do you have a Board of volunteers who can help you with cultivation and solicitation of donors?

4. Do you have enough flexibility in resource allocation to spend money on development activities?

5. A major institutional concern in development work is that donors will, through their gifts, skew the priorities of the University. Do you think that having a decentralized fund raising operation increases the danger of donors' inappropriately affecting the direction of the programs of the University?

6. In what ways, if any, does it increase the deans' power within the institution to have their own fund raisers?

7. What do you consider to be the advantages and disadvantages of having development officer with



primary responsibility for one academic unit within the university?

8. What structures has the University put in place to avoid the disadvantages?

9. Do you believe that the system you have is the best system for your University? If no: Why do you have this system? Does your Capital Campaign status affect your thinking regarding how development should be structured at your University?

The vice presidents for advancement were asked:

1. How are the various constituencies---alumni, non-alumni, parents, corporation, foundations---cultivated and solicited in your system?

2. How are the various levels of gifts are cultivated and solicited?

3. Do your business and engineering deans place a high priority on fund raising for their Colleges? What are the indicators of the priority they give to fund raising?

4. What do you believe are the advantages and disadvantages to having academic unit development officers? Does your Capital Campaign status affect your thinking regarding how development should be structured at your University?

5. A major institutional concern in development work is that donors will, through their gifts, skew the priorities of the University. Do you think that having a decentralized fund raising operation increases the danger of donors' inappropriately affecting the direction of the programs of the University?

6. In what ways, if any, does it increase the deans' power within the institution to have their own fund raisers?

7. What structures has the University put in place to provide for coordination and control of various development activities? Do they work?

Academic unit development officers were asked:

1. How committed is your dean to development activities for the school? What are the indicators of this commitment?

2. Does your College have a volunteer board? Did the Board exist before there was an academic unit development officer?

3. Does your dean have adequate control of resource allocation to spend money on development activities?

4. A major institutional concern in development work is that donors will, through their gifts, skew

the priorities of the University. Do you think that having a decentralized fund raising operation increases the danger of donors' inappropriately affecting the direction of the programs of the University?

5. In what ways, if any, does it increase the deans' power within the institution to have their own fund raisers? Vertical power? Horizontal power?

6. What do you consider to be the major advantages and disadvantages of decentralized management of fund raising?

7. What structures has the University put in place to avoid the disadvantages? Do they work?

As a liberal arts college with a 180 year tradition of scholarly achievement, Mount Saint Mary's is planned to be a partner in this research effort. Margaret B. Hall, the author of the study, is a senior development executive with almost 12 years of experience in both the public and private sectors and in both research and liberal arts institutions. She knows what questions need to be answered and I believe has posed a reasonable survey.

I hope you will participate.

Sincerely,

Robert B. Wickschuler



## APPENDIX 2

## Lead Letter for Final Survey

July 29, 1988

Dear :

In all areas of higher education we as leaders need both skill and a basis in theory to succeed. Student life, academic excellence, curriculum development, finance, and law have often been topics for research and examination as well as the bases of articles on how to achieve our goals. Although philanthropic support has been essential to higher education in America since colonial times, less study has been undertaken in this area than in others.

Within two weeks you will be asked to participate in a study of the management of offices of institutional advancement. I urge you to join this study.

Experience and the writings of articulate and successful practitioners have taught us a great deal about the skills necessary to encourage private giving. But the theory underlying this essential management function is neither adequately broad nor adequately deep. I believe that the study being prepared by Mount Saint Mary's Vice President for Advancement will be a useful addition to our knowledge base.

As a liberal arts college with a 180 year tradition of scholarly achievement, Mount Saint Mary's is pleased to be a partner in this research effort. Margarete R. Hall, the author of the study, is a senior development executive with almost 12 years of experience in both the public and private sectors and in both research and liberal arts institutions. She knows what questions need to be answered and I believe has posed a reasonable survey.

I hope you will participate.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Wickenheiser

## APPENDIX 3

## Cover Letter for Final Survey

August 5, 1988

Dear :

As you learned last week from Robert J. Wickenheiser, President of Mount Saint Mary's College, I am preparing a study of the management of development offices in research universities. I write to ask you to answer the enclosed survey and participate in the study. In pretests the survey took less than 10 minutes to complete. The project is part of my PhD program at the University of Maryland, College Park, where I served as Director of Foundation Relations and then Director of Development of the College of Business and Management for the 10 years prior to coming to Mount Saint Mary's last January.

The purpose of this study is:

- to determine trends in the management of development offices at research universities;
- to identify factors which have led to the decentralization of the management of development activities at some institutions;
- to identify management issues related to various organizational structures, and;
- to analyze mechanisms which institutions use to address these management issues.

I am sending the survey to the chief development officer and to the academic unit development officers in business and engineering schools at each of the 207 universities identified by Carnegie classification as research or doctoral institutions. The surveys are coded so that I can pair multiple responses from single institutions. All responses will be kept confidential and anonymous. No individuals or institutions will be identified in subsequent publications or discussions of the results.

I will share the results of the survey with all participants. I hope you will take part in the effort.

Gratefully,  
Margarete R. Hall





1A.	Does your university have a development officer whose primary responsibility is fund raising for:			
	the business school	_____ yes	_____ no	
	the engineering school	_____ yes	_____ no	
If you answered NO to both, please answer 1B, then go directly to question 12				
If you answered YES to either, please skip 1B and proceed.				
1B.	Do you anticipate having such a development officer within the next two years? _____ yes _____ no			
2.	To whom do the academic unit development officers report?			
		business	engineering	
	the dean	_____	_____	
	central development	_____	_____	
	joint reporting	_____	_____	
3.	Out of which budget are the academic unit development officers paid?			
		business	engineering	
	the dean's office	_____	_____	
	central development	_____	_____	
	jointly	_____	_____	
4.	For how long have these positions existed?			
		business	engineering	
	less than 1 year	_____	_____	
	1 to 3 years	_____	_____	
	4 to 6 years	_____	_____	
	7 to 10 years	_____	_____	
	more than 10 years	_____	_____	
5.	You are the:			
		_____ central development officer		
		_____ business development officer		
		_____ engineering development officer		
6.	Indicate the number of years of experience each officer has in development:			
		Bus DO	Eng DO	Chief DO
	0 to 3	_____	_____	_____
	4 to 8	_____	_____	_____
	9 or more	_____	_____	_____
7.	How do you rank the skill level of these development officers (DO)?			
		Bus DO	Eng DO	Chief DO
	senior level	_____	_____	_____
	mid level	_____	_____	_____
	novice level	_____	_____	_____
	not applicable or I don't know	_____	_____	_____
8.	How important is <b>each</b> of the following in helping the academic unit development officer to successfully plan and execute a development program for the unit?			
	1 = essential	2 = helpful	3 = unimportant	
	1	2	3	Being paid by the dean
	1	2	3	Reporting to the dean
	1	2	3	Being physically located in the academic unit
	1	2	3	Being part of the management team of the unit
	1	2	3	Having easy access to the dean
	1	2	3	Having a high level of interaction with the faculty
	1	2	3	Having interaction with students
	1	2	3	Interacting with the academic unit's volunteer board
	1	2	3	Interacting with the university's primary volunteer board
	1	2	3	Having a good rapport with the chief development officer
	1	2	3	Having a good rapport with the university president
	1	2	3	Having an academic title (Assistant, Associate Dean)
	1	2	3	Having a dean who is committed to the development effort

9. The establishment of academic unit development offices has:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ tended to increase total philanthropic support reported by the university  
 \_\_\_\_\_ tended to decrease total philanthropic support reported by the university  
 \_\_\_\_\_ had no significant effect on the university's total philanthropic support

10. How important is the academic unit development officer as a source of information for the dean and academic unit?  
 about trends and events within the university?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 unimportant very important

about trends and events outside the university?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 unimportant very important

11. Check **each** level of gifts which the academic unit development officer manages:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ to \$1,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$1,000 to \$10,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$10,001 to \$50,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$50,001 to \$100,000  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$100,001 to \$1M  
 \_\_\_\_\_ More than \$1M

**Begin here if you answered NO to both parts of 1A**

12. How important is the central development office as a source of information for the deans and academic units:  
 about trends and events within the university?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 unimportant very important

about trends and events outside the university?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 unimportant very important

13. How would you characterize the relationship between the faculty and the academic unit development office?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_ NA  
 uncooperative cooperative  
 between the faculty and the central development office?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 uncooperative cooperative

14. Has a major gift ever caused a significant shift in the academic priorities of an academic unit?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 If yes, the solicitation of that gift was managed by:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ the academic unit  
 \_\_\_\_\_ the central development office  
 \_\_\_\_\_ jointly  
 If yes, the shift in priorities was readily accepted:  
 by the academic unit:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 by the central administration:  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

15. How adequate is upward communication from the academic units to the central development officers concerning the planning and execution of development activities for the units—activities such as prospect identification, cultivation, and solicitation?  
 1 \_\_\_\_\_ 2 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 \_\_\_\_\_ 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 \_\_\_\_\_  
 inadequate adequate



16.	How adequate is downward communication from the central development officers to the academic units concerning the planning and execution of university development activities?			
	1	2	3	4
	inadequate		adequate	
17.	When the university <b>IS NOT</b> in a capital campaign, indicate who you believe should have primary responsibility in each area:			
		academic unit	central office	evenly held
	annual fund	_____	_____	_____
	major individual gifts	_____	_____	_____
	major corporate gifts	_____	_____	_____
	major foundation gifts	_____	_____	_____
	maintaining alumni database	_____	_____	_____
	maintaining gift records	_____	_____	_____
	prospect identification	_____	_____	_____
	case statement preparation	_____	_____	_____
	proposal preparation	_____	_____	_____
	development priority setting	_____	_____	_____
	stewardship of gifts	_____	_____	_____
18.	When the university <b>IS</b> in a capital campaign, indicate who should have primary responsibility in each area:			
		academic unit	central office	evenly held
	annual fund	_____	_____	_____
	major individual gifts	_____	_____	_____
	major corporate gifts	_____	_____	_____
	major foundation gifts	_____	_____	_____
	maintaining alumni database	_____	_____	_____
	maintaining gift records	_____	_____	_____
	prospect identification	_____	_____	_____
	case statement preparation	_____	_____	_____
	proposal preparation	_____	_____	_____
	development priority setting	_____	_____	_____
	stewardship of gifts	_____	_____	_____
19.	For the business and engineering schools, who does each of the following?			
		primarily academic unit	primarily central office	evenly held
	sets fund raising priorities	_____	_____	_____
	prepares the case statement	_____	_____	_____
	identifies prospective donors	_____	_____	_____
	cultivates interest in supporting the academic unit	_____	_____	_____
	orchestrates face-to-face solicitations for major designated gifts, i.e., when to solicit and who will ask	_____	_____	_____
	orchestrates face-to-face solicitations for smaller designated gifts	_____	_____	_____
	acknowledges designated gifts	_____	_____	_____
	assures gifts are used as intended	_____	_____	_____
	maintains records of designated gifts	_____	_____	_____
	maintains the alumni database	_____	_____	_____
	staffs the alumni relations program	_____	_____	_____
	staffs public relations program	_____	_____	_____
	solicits annual gifts from unit alumni	_____	_____	_____
20.	Do the academic units have volunteer boards?			
		business	engineering	
	yes	_____	_____	
	no	_____	_____	
	I don't know	_____	_____	



21. How helpful are the volunteer boards with the unit's development efforts?

business	1	2	3	4	5
	not helpful			very helpful	
engineering	1	2	3	4	5
	not helpful			very helpful	

22. At your institution, does a university-wide system exist for:

	yes	no
tracking the cultivation of donors?	_____	_____
tracking the solicitation of gifts?	_____	_____
preventing inappropriate multiple solicitations of donors?	_____	_____

If yes, how effective is the system for:

tracking the cultivation of donors?	1	2	3	4	5
	ineffective		effective		
tracking the solicitation of donors?	1	2	3	4	5
	ineffective		effective		
preventing inappropriate multiple solicitations?	1	2	3	4	5
	ineffective		effective		

23. In your university, does the amount of private support for an academic unit increase the power of its dean:

	among deans?	with the president?
yes	_____	_____
no	_____	_____

24. Indicate the gender of each development officer, if your university has each position:

business development officer	Female	Male
engineering development officer	_____	_____
chief university development officer	_____	_____

25. Indicate the salary range of each development officer (DO):

	Bus DO	Eng DO	Chief DO
to \$25K	_____	_____	_____
\$26K to \$40K	_____	_____	_____
\$41K to \$55K	_____	_____	_____
\$56 K to \$70K	_____	_____	_____
\$71K to 85K	_____	_____	_____
\$86K to \$100K	_____	_____	_____
\$101K to \$125K	_____	_____	_____
more than \$125K	_____	_____	_____
N/A or I don't know	_____	_____	_____

Please mail your completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to:

Margarete R. Hall  
 Vice President for Advancement  
 Mount Saint Mary's College  
 Emmitsburg, MD 21727  
 [301] 447-5772

## APPENDIX 5

Table 1

## Age of Academic Unit Development Offices

Engineering schools	Years AUDO has existed		
13%	<1	year	N=9
38%	1 to 3	years	N=26
23%	4 to 6	years	N=16
16%	7 to 9	years	N=11
10%	>9	years	N= 7
Business schools	Years AUDO has existed		
14%	<1	year	N=12
30%	1 to 3	years	N=25
33%	4 to 6	years	N=27
10%	7 to 9	years	N= 8
13%	>9	years	N=11

Table 2

## Self-Reported Salaries of Development Officers

Bus	Eng	CUDO	Salaries
6%	4%	0%	0 to \$25,000
31	32	3	26,000 to 40,000
33	50	9	41,000 to 55,000
21	11	22	56,000 to 70,000
7	3	33	71,000 to 85,000
2	0	18	86,000 to 100,000
1	0	11	101,000 to 125,000
0	0	5	>125,000

Table 3

## Years of Experience of Development Officers

	AUDO		CUDO	
	%	#	%	#
0-3 yrs	37%	84	13%	14
4-8 yrs	33%	76	18%	20
9+ yrs	30%	9	69%	75

Legend: E = essential; H = helpful; U = unimportant



Table 4

## Self-Reported Skill Level of Development Officers

	AUDO		CUDO	
	%	#	%	#
novice	16%	88	4%	90
mid-level	44%	100	14%	15
senior	39%	36	82%	4

Table 5

## Factors in AUDO Success: Aggregate Results

N = 145

Factors	E	H	U
Paid by dean	21%	39%	40%
Report to dean	47	33	21
Located in unit	58	30	12
Part of unit mgmt	66	30	4
Access to dean	89	10	1
Interact w/ faculty	51	47	2
Interact w/ students	10	62	28
Interact w/ AU volntrs	82	16	2
Interact w/ Un volntrs	21	66	14
Rapport w/ CUDO	69	29	1
Rapport w/ pres	27	62	11
Academic title	12	43	45
Dean committed to dev	95	5	0

Note. E = essential; H = helpful; U = unimportant

Table 6

## Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses

## Being Part of the Management Team of the Unit

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			
2(N=24)	50%	42%	8%
3(N=44)	52	43	5
Group B			
4(N=30)	83	13	3
5(N=43)	74	23	2
Group C			
6(N=68)	51	42	6
7(N=73)	78	19	3
Group D			
8(N=71)	68	29	3
9(N=43)	70	23	7
10(N=26)	54	42	4

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 7

## Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses

## Having Easy Access to the Dean's Faculty

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			
2(N=24)	79%	21%	0%
3(N=44)	88	9	2
Group B			
4(N=30)	90	10	0
5(N=43)	93	7	0
Group C			
6(N=68)	85	13	1
7(N=73)	92	8	0
Group D			
8(N=71)	88	12	0
9(N=43)	88	12	0
10(N=26)	38	10	2

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group B.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 8

## Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses

## Having a High Level of Interaction With the Faculty

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			
2(N=24)	50%	46%	4%
3(N=44)	47	49	4
Group B			
4(N=30)	47	53	0
5(N=43)	58	42	0
Group C			
6(N=68)	48	47	4
7(N=73)	53	47	0
Group D			
8(N=71)	44	52	3
9(N=43)	58	40	2
10(N=26)	46	54	0

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group A.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 9**  
**Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Interacting with the Academic Unit's Volunteer Board**

Group	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			0%
2 (N=24)	96%	4%	2
3 (N=44)	91	7	
Group B			3
4 (N=30)	72	24	2
5 (N=43)	74	23	
Group C			1
6 (N=68)	93	6	3
7 (N=73)	73	23	
Group D			3
8 (N=71)	85	12	0
9 (N=43)	86	14	4
10 (N=26)	65	31	

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups B & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 10**  
**Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Interact with Univ's Primary Volunteer Brd**

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A		64%	12%
2(N=24)	20%	65	16
3(N=44)	19		
Group B		70	16
4(N=30)	13	63	12
5(N=43)	23		
Group C		66	15
6(N=68)	19	66	15
7(N=73)	19		
Group D		64	12
8(N=71)	25	63	16
9(N=43)	21	69	19
10(N=26)	12		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for no Group.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



**Table 11**  
**Factors in AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Having a Dean who is Committed to Development**

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			0%
2(N=24)	95%	5%	2
3(N=44)	91	7	
Group B			0
4(N=30)	97	3	0
5(N=43)	95	5	
Group C			1
6(N=68)	93	6	0
7(N=73)	96	4	
Group D			1
8(N=71)	96	3	0
9(N=43)	93	7	0
10(N=26)	96	4	

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for no Group.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 12  
Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses  
Being Paid by the Dean

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			54%
2 (N=24)	4%	42%	67
3 (N=44)	0	36	
Group B			0
4 (N=30)	60	40	19
5 (N=43)	25	56	
Group C			63
6 (N=68)	1	36	10
7 (N=73)	42	48	
Group D			42
8 (N=71)	19	39	37
9 (N=43)	19	44	42
10 (N=26)	27	31	

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups B & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 13  
Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses  
Reporting to the Dean

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A		46%	33%
2 (N=24)	21%	42	45
3 (N=44)	14		
Group B		10	0
4 (N=30)	90	33	7
5 (N=43)	60		
Group C		43	40
6 (N=68)	16	23	4
7 (N=73)	73		
Group D		31	26
8 (N=71)	43	37	9
9 (N=43)	53	27	27
10 (N=26)	46		

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group B, C, D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 14

## Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses

## Being Physically Located in the Academic Unit

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			
2 (N=24)	46%	42%	12%
3 (N=44)	33	42	25
Group B			
4 (N=30)	83	17	0
5 (N=43)	72	21	7
Group C			
6 (N=68)	37	42	21
7 (N=73)	77	22	4
Group D			
8 (N=71)	51	37	11
9 (N=43)	65	26	9
10 (N=26)	64	28	8

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 15**  
**Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Having Interaction With Students**

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A		58%	42%
2(N=24)	0%	51	37
3(N=44)	12		
Group B		60	20
4(N=30)	20	77	16
5(N=43)	7		
Group C		54	39
6(N=68)	7	70	18
7(N=73)	12		
Group D		54	36
8(N=71)	10	72	21
9(N=43)	7	69	19
10(N=26)	12		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 16**  
**Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Having a Good Rapport With the CUDO**

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A		17%	0%
2 (N=24)	83%	14	2
3 (N=44)	84		
Group B		47	3
4 (N=30)	50	40	0
5 (N=43)	60		
Group C		15	1
6 (N=68)	83	42	1
7 (N=73)	56		
Group D		26	3
8 (N=71)	71	35	0
9 (N=43)	65	31	0
10 (N=26)	69		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 17

## Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses

## Having a Good Rapport With the University President

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			
2 (N=24)	25%	54%	21%
3 (N=44)	30	51	19
Group B			
4 (N=30)	23	70	6
5 (N=43)	28	67	5
Group C			
6 (N=68)	28	52	19
7 (N=73)	26	59	5
Group D			
8 (N=71)	26	60	14
9 (N=43)	26	67	7
10 (N=26)	35	54	12

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 18**  
**Factors In AUDO Success: Group Responses**  
**Having an Academic Title**

Groups	Essential	Helpful	Unimportant
Group A			58%
2(N=24)	8%	33%	67
3(N=44)	2	30	
Group B			21
4(N=30)	31	48	33
5(N=43)	10	57	
Group C			64
6(N=68)	4	31	28
7(N=73)	18	53	
Group D			46
8(N=71)	15	39	44
9(N=43)	17	44	42
10(N=26)	8	50	

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 19

## Ideal Division of Responsibilities:

## Aggregate Responses

N = 216

Responsibility	AU		CO		EH	
	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC
annual fund	23%	26%	59%	54%	19%	20%
major ind'ls	17%	26%	50%	43%	33%	31%
major corp	14%	25%	49%	42%	37%	33%
major fnd	13%	19%	52%	49%	35%	31%
alumni data	3%	4%	86%	85%	11%	11%
gift records	2%	2%	89%	91%	9%	6%
prospect id	5%	10%	30%	24%	66%	66%
case statem't	15%	31%	42%	28%	43%	41%
proposal prep	24%	36%	27%	16%	49%	48%
priorities	17%	26%	35%	27%	48%	47%
stewardship	18%	23%	33%	29%	49%	48%

Notes. AU = primarily academic unit

CO = primarily central office

EH = evenly held

CC = Capital Campaign

NoCC = No Capital Campaign

Groups are defined as Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 13.



Table 20  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Maintaining Alumni Data Bases

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A					6%	5%
1(N=61)	0%	0%	94%	95%	4	4
2(N=24)	4	4	92	92	7	5
3(N=44)	0	0	93	95		
Group B					14	18
4(N=30)	17	18	69	64	25	27
5(N=43)	5	0	70	73		
Group C					6	5
6(N=68)	1	1	93	94	20	23
7(N=73)	10	7	70	70		
Group D					8	10
8(N=71)	6	5	86	85	19	20
9(N=43)	5	2	76	78	16	9
10(N=26)	8	9	76	82		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C when there is no capital campaign and for Groups B and C when there is a capital campaign. *It is also significant for Groups B and C when there is a capital campaign.*

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 21  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Maintaining Gift Records

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1(N=61)	0%	0%	97%	95%	3%	5%
2(N=24)	0	0	96	96	4	4
3(N=44)	0	0	93	97	7	3
Group B						
4(N=30)	10	11	80	66	10	22
5(N=43)	5	0	85	80	10	20
Group C						
6(N=68)	0	0	95	96	5	4
7(N=73)	7	4	83	75	10	21
Group D						
8(N=71)	5	3	90	88	5	4
9(N=43)	2	0	86	20	15	80
10(N=26)	4	4	88	87	8	9

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C both when there is a capital campaign ongoing and when there is no capital campaign ongoing. It is also significant for Group D when there is a campaign.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 22

## Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

Groups	Prospect Identification					
	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1(N=61)	0%	2%	44%	48%	56%	51%
2(N=24)	4	0	13	16	83	84
3(N=44)	5	3	27	37	68	61
Group B						
4(N=30)	17	11	7	11	76	79
5(N=43)	30	10	10	17	60	73
Group C						
6(N=68)	2	2	33	38	65	60
7(N=73)	25	10	8	14	67	75
Group D						
8(N=71)	14	5	18	30	68	74
9(N=43)	15	7	10	20	76	73
10(N=26)	24	9	12	9	94	83

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A and C when there is no capital campaign ongoing and for Group C when there is a capital campaign.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.



Table 23  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Case Statement Preparation

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A					48%	40%
1 (N=61)	3%	4%	49%	57%	41	54
2 (N=24)	25	4	33	42	36	32
3 (N=44)	33	16	30	53		
Group B					41	48
4 (N=30)	52	26	7	26	30	37
5 (N=43)	57	24	13	39		
Group C					43	40
6 (N=68)	17	7	40	52	35	41
7 (N=73)	55	24	10	35		
Group D					38	37
8 (N=71)	39	17	23	46	27	46
9 (N=43)	58	24	15	29	45	57
10 (N=26)	32	17	23	26		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C both during a capital campaign and when no campaign is ongoing.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 24

## Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group comparison

Groups	Proposal Preparation					
	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1(N=61)	11%	8%	23%	36%	66%	56%
2(N=24)	17	8	21	29	62	63
3(N=44)	38	23	21	8	41	42
Group B						
4(N=30)	69	57	3	11	28	32
5(N=43)	56	32	10	15	34	54
Group C						
6(N=68)	21	13	22	34	57	53
7(N=73)	61	42	7	13	18	45
Group D						
8(N=71)	45	27	11	23	43	50
9(N=43)	51	31	11	17	43	51
10(N=26)	56	45	16	23	28	32

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A and C when no capital campaign is ongoing and for Group C when there is a capital campaign.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 25

## Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

Groups	Annual Fund					
	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1(N=61)	3%	2%	81%	88%	16%	10%
2(N=24)	35	36	39	44	26	20
3(N=44)	17	18	63	66	20	16
Group B						
4(N=30)	38	50	42	21	20	29
5(N=43)	41	35	36	37	23	38
Group C						
6(N=68)	14	14	67	73	19	14
7(N=73)	40	41	38	31	22	28
Group D						
8(N=71)	36	35	41	44	23	21
9(N=43)	37	32	39	41	24	27
10(N=26)	29	27	46	55	25	18

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A and C.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19..

Column headings are defined on Table 19.



Table 26  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Major Individual Gifts

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1(N=61)	3%	1%	77%	79%	19%	20%
2(N=24)	8	0	46	65	46	35
3(N=44)	15	11	55	63	30	26
Group B						
4(N=30)	62	44	7	7	31	46
5(N=43)	55	34	8	17	38	49
Group C						
6(N=68)	8	4	64	71	27	25
7(N=73)	58	38	7	13	35	48
Group D						
8(N=71)	27	16	33	45	39	38
9(N=43)	51	34	12	20	37	46
10(N=26)	40	26	36	43	24	30

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A, C and D when there is no capital campaign ongoing and for Group C when there is a capital campaign.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 27

## Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

## Major Corporate Gifts

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1 (N=61)	2%	2%	73%	75%	26%	23%
2 (N=24)	0	0	50	56	50	44
3 (N=44)	15	8	57	61	28	32
Group B						
4 (N=30)	62	41	3	7	34	51
5 (N=43)	52	24	7	22	39	54
Group C						
6 (N=68)	6	3	60	67	34	30
7 (N=73)	57	30	6	16	37	53
Group D						
8 (N=71)	30	15	33	42	37	43
9 (N=43)	41	24	15	20	44	56
10 (N=26)	40	22	36	52	24	26

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A and C when no capital campaign is ongoing and Groups C and D when there is a campaign ongoing.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 28  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Major Foundation Gifts

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1 (N=61)	6%	2%	77%	74%	17%	25%
2 (N=24)	4	23	46	57	50	43
3 (N=44)	10	8	65	61	25	32
Group B						
4 (N=30)	55	41	17	19	28	41
5 (N=43)	35	20	20	32	45	49
Group C						
6 (N=68)	7	9	66	63	27	27
7 (N=73)	43	28	19	26	38	45
Group D						
8 (N=71)	20	15	44	47	36	40
9 (N=43)	34	22	22	27	44	51
10 (N=26)	32	22	44	57	24	22

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C and for Groups A and C when a capital campaign is ongoing.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.



Table 29  
Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Development Priority Setting

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A						
1 (N=61)	10%	7%	44%	46%	47%	48%
2 (N=24)	8	8	29	33	63	58
3 (N=44)	5	5	43	59	53	37
Group B						
4 (N=30)	62	39	0	7	38	54
5 (N=43)	56	30	3	18	40	52
Group C						
6 (N=68)	8	7	40	47	52	46
7 (N=73)	58	34	2	13	40	53
Group D						
8 (N=71)	29	21	29	38	42	41
9 (N=43)	41	17	12	22	46	61
10 (N=26)	36	35	12	26	52	39

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

and D. Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

**Table 30**  
**Ideal Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison**  
**Stewardship of Gifts**

Groups	AU		CO		EH	
	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC	NoCC	CC
Group A					45%	44%
1(N=61)	6%	7%	48%	49%	70	67
2(N=24)	4	4	26	29	49	46
3(N=44)	15	14	36	41		
Group B					45	48
4(N=30)	45	40	10	11	42	55
5(N=43)	48	29	10	16		
Group C					51	49
6(N=68)	9	8	40	43	43	52
7(N=73)	46	34	10	14		
Group D					42	46
8(N=71)	29	19	29	35	66	63
9(N=43)	24	23	10	15	30	43
10(N=26)	52	38	17	19		

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups C and D when no capital campaign is ongoing and Group C when there is a capital campaign.

Groups are defined on Table 18.

Column headings are defined on Table 19.

Table 31

## Current Division of Responsibility: Aggregate Response

N = 216

Responsibilities	AU	CO	EH
Set fund raising priorities	76%	13%	15%
Prepares case statement	52%	20%	29%
Identifies prospective donors	26%	1%	52%
Cultivates interest in unit	53%	12%	36%
Solicits for major gifts	33%	38%	29%
Solicits for small gifts	56%	25%	19%
Ackldg designated gifts	26%	25%	49%
Assures gift use	46%	27%	27%
Records designated gifts	7%	69%	23%
Maintains alumni database	6%	84%	10%
Staffs alumni relations	28%	54%	17%
Staffs public relations	29%	55%	16%
Solicits annual gifts	33%	48%	20%

Note. AU = primarily the academic unit or Group A & B.

CO = primarily the central office

EH = evenly held

Subgrp 1: CUOs central	Subgrp 6: all CUOs
Subgrp 2: CUOs decentral	Subgrp 7: all AUOs
Subgrp 3: CUOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUOs decentral	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 32  
Current Division of Responsibility: Group Comparison  
Setting Development Priorities

	AU	CO	EH
Group A	48%	26%	26%
1(N=61)	71	8	21
2(N=24)	25	6	70
3(N=44)			
Group B	93	3	3
4(N=30)	88	5	7
5(N=43)			
Group C	37	11	51
6(N=129)	90	4	6
7(N=73)			
Group D	73	12	15
8(N=71)	88	2	10
9(N=43)	88	8	4
10(N=26)			

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups A & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 33

Current Division of Responsibility: Group Comparison  
Preparing the Case Statement

	AU	CO	EH
Group A			
1(N=61)	22%	40%	38%
2(N=24)	40	20	40
3(N=44)	45	18	38
Group B			
4(N=30)	89	7	3
5(N=43)	70	7	22
Group C			
6(N=129)	34	28	38
7(N=73)	79	7	14
Group D			
8(N=71)	57	16	27
9(N=43)	73	7	20
10(N=26)	60	16	24

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 34  
Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

	Cultivates	Donor Interest	
	AU	CO	EH
Group A	16%	24%	59%
1(N=61)	58	0	42
2(N=24)	40	18	43
3(N=44)			
Group B	86	3	10
4(N=30)	83	5	12
5(N=43)			
Group C	38	7	55
6(N=129)	84	4	12
7(N=73)			
Group D	64	9	27
8(N=71)	78	5	17
9(N=43)	63	4	33
10(N=26)			

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups A & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 35  
Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Orchestrating Solicitations for Smaller Gifts

	AU	CO	EH
Group A	12%	63%	24%
1 (N=61)	74	4	21
2 (N=24)	63	23	15
3 (N=44)			
Group B	79	3	17
4 (N=30)	78	9	15
5 (N=43)			
Group C	43	37	21
6 (N=129)	79	6	16
7 (N=73)			
Group D	69	13	18
8 (N=71)	85	7	7
9 (N=43)	65	4	30
10 (N=26)			

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups A % C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 36

Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

Maintaining Gift Records

Group A	AU	CO	EH
1(N=61)	0%	90%	10%
2(N=24)	4	70	26
3(N=44)	3	79	18
Group B			
4(N=30)	21	46	32
5(N=43)	15	51	34
Group C			
6(N=129)	2	82	16
7(N=73)	17	49	33
Group D			
8(N=71)	8	70	22
9(N=43)	13	58	30
10(N=26)	16	44	40

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 37  
Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Maintaining the Alumni Database

	AU	CO	EH
Group A	0%	96%	4%
1(N=61)	13	83	4
2(N=24)	5	87	8
3(N=44)			
Group B	18	64	18
4(N=30)	2	80	17
5(N=43)			
Group C	4	90	6
6(N=129)	9	74	17
7(N=73)			
Group D	9	83	8
8(N=71)	7	80	13
9(N=43)	4	84	12
10(N=26)			

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 38

**Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison**  
**Staff Support for Alumni Relations**

Group A	AU	CO	EH
1(N=61)	6	92	2
2(N=24)	39	43	17
3(N=44)	30	49	22
Group B			
4(N=30)	55	34	10
5(N=43)	34	29	37
Group C			
6(N=129)	21	67	12
7(N=73)	43	31	26
Group D			
8(N=71)	41	35	24
9(N=43)	39	39	22
10(N=26)	24	52	24

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 Groups A, B,C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 39

**Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison**  
**Staffing for Public Relations**

	AU	CO	EH
Group A			
1(N=61)	8%	92%	0%
2(N=24)	43	43	14
3(N=44)	22	49	30
Group B			
4(N=30)	59	31	10
5(N=43)	35	35	30
Group C			
6(N=129)	20	66	13
7(N=73)	45	33	22
Group D			
8(N=71)	40	37	24
9(N=43)	44	38	18
10(N=26)	25	54	21

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups A & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 40  
Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Soliciting Gifts from Unit Alumni

	AU	CO	EH
Group A	2%	80%	18%
1(N=61)	48	35	17
2(N=24)	28	50	22
3(N=44)			
Group B	59	21	21
4(N=30)	50	28	22
5(N=43)			
Group C	21	60	20
6(N=129)	54	25	22
7(N=73)			
Group D	45	34	21
8(N=71)	46	34	20
9(N=43)	39	39	22
10(N=26)			

Notes. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups A & C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOS centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOS
Subgrp 2: CUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOS
Subgrp 3: CUDOS semi-dec	
Group B	Group D
Subgrp 4: AUDOS decentrl	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 5: AUDOS semi-dec	Subgrp 9: mid level
	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 41

Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Identifying Prospective Donors

Group A	AU	CO	EH
1(N=61)	6%	42%	52%
2(N=24)	8	8	84
3(N=44)	18	23	60
Group B			
4(N=30)	66	0	34
5(N=43)	50	13	37
Group C			
6(N=129)	1	28	61
7(N=73)	57	7	36
Group D			
8(N=71)	31	18	51
9(N=43)	49	2	49
10(N=26)	35	4	61

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A, C, D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 42

Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

Acknowledges Designated Gifts			
Group A	AU	CO	EH
1 (N=61)	2%	46%	52%
2 (N=24)	9	23	68
3 (N=44)	29	29	42
Group B			
4 (N=30)	55	7	38
5 (N=43)	45	3	52
Group C			
6 (N=129)	13	35	52
7 (N=73)	49	4	46
Group D			
8 (N=71)	31	27	42
9 (N=43)	44	5	51
10 (N=26)	40	4	56

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A, C, D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 43

**Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison  
Orchestrates Solicitation of Major Designated Gifts**

Group A	AU	CO	EH
1(N=61)	2%	70%	28%
2(N=24)	21	36	42
3(N=44)	25	46	26
Group B			
4(N=30)	62	7	31
5(N=43)	66	10	24
Group C			
6(N=129)	14	55	31
7(N=73)	64	9	27
Group D			
8(N=71)	33	36	31
9(N=43)	66	12	22
10(N=26)	48	20	32

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A, C, D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 44

## Current Division of Responsibilities: Group Comparison

Assures Gifts Are Used As Intended				
Group A	AU	CO	EH	
1(N=61)	26%	46%	28%	
2(N=24)	2	29	29	
3(N=44)	39	37	24	
Group B				
4(N=30)	69	7	24	
5(N=43)	61	7	32	
Group C				
6(N=129)	34	39	27	
7(N=73)	64	7	29	
Group D				
8(N=71)	45	32	23	
9(N=43)	61	10	29	
10(N=26)	60	12	28	

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Groups C & D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 45

## AUDO as Source of Inside Information: Aggregate Response

Response	Closer to Neutral	Closer to Unimp	Closer to Very imp
	N = 155		
Closer to Neutral			
Unimportant			
20%	27%		73%

Table 46

## AUDO as Source of Outside Info: Aggregate Response

	N = 155		
Closer to Neutral			
Unimportant			
6%	24%		70%

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A and C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDCs central	Subgrp 6: all CUDCs
Subgrp 2: CUDCs decentral	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDCs semi-dec	Group B
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentral	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 47

## AUDO as Source of Inside Information: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Unimp	Neutral	Closer to Very Imp
Group A			
2 (N=24)	33%	24%	43%
3 (N=44)	26	32	42
Group B			
4 (N=30)	6	21	73
5 (N=43)	19	32	49
Group C			
6 (N=129)	30	28	42
7 (N=73)	14	27	59
Group D			
8 (N=71)	24	22	54
9 (N=43)	19	23	58
10 (N=26)	20	44	36

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A and C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 48

## AUDO as Source of Outside Info: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Unimp	Neutral	Closer to Very Imp
Group A			
2 (N=24)	14%	34%	52%
3 (N=44)	9	28	63
Group B			
4 (N=30)	11	14	75
5 (N=43)	5	23	72
Group C			
6 (N=129)	11	14	75
7 (N=73)	3	19	78
Group D			
8 (N=71)	7	21	72
9 (N=43)	2	24	74
10 (N=26)	12	36	52

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group A.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 49

## CUDO as Source of Inside Information: Aggregate

## Response

N = 216

Closer to	Neutral	Closer to
Unimportant		Very Important
23%	30%	47%

Table 50

## CUDO as Source of Outside Info: Aggregate Response

N = 216

Closer to	Neutral	Closer to
Unimportant		Very Important
14%	29%	57%

Note: Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group A.

Group A	Group B
Subgrp 1: CUDOs central	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentral	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group B
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentral	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 51

## CUDO as Source of Inside Information: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Unimp	Neutral	Closer to Very Imp
Group A			
1(N=61)	20%	27%	53%
2(N=24)	18	37	45
3(N=44)	16	44	50
Group B			
4(N=30)	18	32	50
5(N=43)	24	34	42
Group C			
6(N=129)	21	29	50
7(N=73)	26	15	59
Group D			
8(N=71)	23	33	44
9(N=43)	21	35	44
10(N=26)	24	28	48

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group A.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 52

## CUDO as Source of Outside Info: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Unimp	Neutral	Closer to Very Imp
Group A			
1 (N=61)	17	30	53
2 (N=24)	9	46	45
3 (N=44)	3	18	79
Group B			
4 (N=30)	24	40	36
5 (N=43)	16	43	41
Group C			
6 (N=129)	11	25	64
7 (N=73)	19	42	39
Group D			
8 (N=71)	15	19	66
9 (N=43)	9	39	52
10 (N=26)	10	38	52

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group A.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 53

## Upward Communication: Aggregate Response

N = 216		
Closer to Inadeq	Neutral	Closer to Adequate
28%	29%	43%

Table 54

## Downward Communication: Aggregate Response

N = 216		
Closer to Inadeq	Neutral	Closer to Adequate
25%	30%	47%

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group = 4 B.

Group A	Group B
Subgrp 1: CUDOs central	Subgrp 6: All women
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentral	Subgrp 7: All men
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group C
Group B	Subgrp 8: men
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentral	Subgrp 9: All women
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: All men

Table 55

## Upward Communication: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Inadequate	Neutral	Closer to Adequate
Group A			
1(N=61)	41%	26%	33%
2(N=24)	29	38	33
3(N=44)	3	27	68
Group B			
4(N=30)	21	29	50
5(N=43)	23	23	54
Group C			
6(N=129)	30	46	24
7(N=73)	22	26	52
Group D			
8(N=71)	17	25	58
9(N=43)	20	25	55
10(N=26)	25	37	38

Note. Chi-square significant at .05 for Group A & B.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



Table 56

## Downward Communication: Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to	Neutral	Closer to
	Inadequate		Adequate
Group A			
1 (N=61)	13%	42%	45%
2 (N=24)	4	30	65
3 (N=44)	8	21	71
Group B			
4 (N=30)	46	29	25
5 (N=43)	46	17	37
Group C			
6 (N=129)	10	33	57
7 (N=73)	46	22	32
Group D			
8 (N=71)	23	23	54
9 (N=43)	37	12	51
10 (N=26)	26	44	30

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 57

## Relationship Between Development Officers and Faculty:

## Aggregate Response

		N = 216			
		Closer to		Closer to	
		Cooperative		Uncooperative	
		2%		21%	
		2%		77%	
		17%		47%	
Group A		4		88	
Group B		0		80	
Group C		3		72	
Group D		2		83	
Group E		3		77	
Group F		5		78	
Group G		9		74	

Notes: Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentral	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentral	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

Table 58

## Relationship Between the AUDO and the Faculty:

## Group Comparison

Groups	Uncooperative	Neutral	Cooperative
Group A			
2 (N=24)	9%	31%	64%
3 (N=44)	0	24	76
Group B			
4 (N=30)	4	8	88
5 (N=43)	0	20	80
Group C			
6 (N=129)	3	25	72
7 (N=73)	2	15	83
Group D			
8 (N=71)	2	21	77
9 (N=43)	5	17	78
10 (N=26)	0	26	74

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centr1	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices



**Table 59**  
**Relationship Between the CUDO and the Faculty**  
**Group Comparison**

Group A	Uncooperative	Neutral	Cooperative
1(N=61)	5%	28%	66%
2(N=24)	4	53	43
3(N=44)	13	27	60
Group B			
4(N=30)	36	40	24
5(N=43)	37	45	18
Group C			
6(N=129)	10	36	54
7(N=73)	37	43	21
Group D			
8(N=71)	20	42	38
9(N=43)	33	36	31
10(N=26)	17	44	39

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group C.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 60**  
**Occurrence of Shifts in Academic Priorities**

Group Comparison		Yes	No
Group A			
1 (N=61)		81%	19%
2 (N=24)		71	29
3 (N=44)		47	53
Group B			
4 (N=30)		52	48
5 (N=43)		37	63
Group C			
6 (N=129)		49	51
7 (N=73)		43	57
Group D			
8 (N=71)		62	38
9 (N=43)		34	66
10 (N=26)		45	55

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Group D.

Group A	Group C
Subgrp 1: CUDOs centrl	Subgrp 6: all CUDOs
Subgrp 2: CUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 7: all AUDOs
Subgrp 3: CUDOs semi-dec	Group D
Group B	Subgrp 8: senior
Subgrp 4: AUDOs decentrl	Subgrp 9: mid level
Subgrp 5: AUDOs semi-dec	Subgrp 10: novices

**Table 61**  
**Manager of Priority Shifting Gift**

Group	Group Comparison			
	Academic Unit		Central Office	Joint Management
Group A				
1 (N=61)	10%		10%	80%
2 (N=24)	13		47	40
3 (N=44)	13		31	56
Group B				
4 (N=30)	57		7	36
5 (N=43)	29		7	64
Group C				
6 (N=129)	12		27	62
7 (N=73)	43		7	50
Group D				
8 (N=71)	24		24	62
9 (N=43)	42		16	42
10 (N=26)	11		33	56

Note. Groups are defined on Table 60.



**Table 62**  
**Acceptance of Shift in Priority**  
**Group Comparison**

Group	Yes		No	
	AU	CO	AU	CO
Group A				
1 (N=61)	88%	92%	12%	8%
2 (N=24)	100	100	0	0
3 (N=44)	94	94	6	6
Group B				
4 (N=30)	92	100	8	0
5 (N=43)	100	92	0	8
Group C				
6 (N=129)	93	95	7	5
7 (N=73)	96	96	4	4
Group D				
8 (N=71)	97	97	3	3
9 (N=43)	92	91	8	9
10 (N=26)	100	100	0	0

Note. Groups are defined on Table 60.

Table 63

## Helpfulness of Volunteer Boards:

## Aggregate Response

	No Help	Neutral	Very Help
Business	21%	22%	57%
Engineering	25%	28%	47%

Table 64

## Existence of Volunteer Boards: Group Comparison

Groups	Yes		No	
	Bus	Eng	Bus	Eng
Group A				
1 (N=61)	75%	55%	25%	45%
2 (N=24)	96	81	4	19
3 (N=44)	98	84	2	16
Group B				
4 (N=30)	95	90	5	10
5 (N=43)	95	85	5	15
Group C				
6 (N=129)	87	73	13	27
7 (N=73)	95	87	5	13
Group D				
8 (N=71)	95	78	5	22
9 (N=43)	96	90	4	10
10 (N=26)	97	90	3	10

Note. Groups are defined on Table 60.

**Table 65**  
**Helpfulness of Business Volunteer Boards**  
**Group Comparison**

Groups	Not Helpful	Neutral	Very Helpful
Group A			
1 (N=61)	36%	21%	43%
2 (N=24)	24	19	57
3 (N=44)	15	27	58
Group B			
4 (N=30)	4	22	74
5 (N=43)	16	18	66
Group C			
6 (N=129)	25	23	52
7 (N=73)	11	29	69
Group D			
8 (N=71)	20	24	56
9 (N=43)	15	23	62
10 (N=26)	10	19	71

Note. Groups are defined on Table 60.



**Table 66**  
**Helpfulness of Engineering Volunteer Boards**  
**Group Comparison**

Groups	Not Helpful	Neutral	Very Helpful
Group A			
1 (N=61)	27%	37%	36%
2 (N=24)	29	28	43
3 (N=44)	16	25	59
Group B			
4 (N=30)	25	17	58
5 (N=43)	27	33	40
Group C			
6 (N=129)	22	29	49
7 (N=73)	26	29	45
Group D			
8 (N=71)	29	20	51
9 (N=43)	25	52	43
10 (N=26)	13	31	56

Note. Groups are defined on Table 60.

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 only for Group B, tracking solicitations.

Groups are defined on Table 60.

**Table 67**  
**Existence of Tracking Systems**  
**Group Comparison**

Groups	YES			NO		
	CULT	SOLI	MULT	CULT	SOLI	MULT
Group A						
1(N=61)	83%	90%	84%	17%	10%	16%
2(N=24)	77	88	72	23	12	28
3(N=44)	86	90	88	14	10	12
Group B						
4(N=30)	62	69	72	38	31	28
5(N=43)	83	93	88	17	7	12
Group C						
6(N=129)	83	90	83	17	10	17
7(N=73)	74	83	81	26	17	19
Group D						
8(N=71)	82	87	79	18	13	21
9(N=43)	69	83	83	31	17	17
10(N=26)	88	92	79	12	8	21

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 only for Group B, tracking solicitations.

Groups are defined on Table 60.

Table 68  
Effectiveness of Tracking Systems

Groups	Class	Aggregate Response		
		Ineffective	Neutral	Effective
Cultivation	Ineffective	15%	32%	53%
Solicitation	Ineffective	12%	27%	61%
Multiples	Ineffective	20%	24%	56%
2(N=241)	15	15	18	73
3(N=44)	8	17	17	66
Group B		17	17	66
4(N=30)	21	17	17	66
5(N=43)	32	17	17	66
Group C		30	24	46
6(N=129)	18	24	24	46
7(N=73)	29	24	24	46
Group D		25	25	50
8(N=71)	12	25	25	50
9(N=43)	19	25	25	50
10(N=261)	39	25	25	50

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups C and D.

Groups are defined on Table 69.



**Table 69**  
**Effectiveness of Tracking Cultivation**

		Group Comparison				
Groups	Closers to		Neutral		Closers to	
	Ineffective				Effective	
Group A						
1(N=61)	8%	8%	38%	20%	54%	61%
2(N=24)	15	5	30	52	55	41
3(N=44)	9	5	18	24	73	71
Group B						
4(N=30)	21	19	37	19	42	13
5(N=43)	33	24	17	21	50	25
Group C						
6(N=129)	10	8	30	28	60	68
7(N=73)	29	23	24	26	47	31
Group D						
8(N=71)	12	13	25	30	63	67
9(N=43)	19	11	25	23	56	66
10(N=26)	39	28	26	48	35	26

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups C and D.

Groups are defined on Table 60.

Table 70  
Effectiveness of Tracking Solicitation  
Group Comparison

Groups	Closer to Ineffective	Neutral	Closer to Effective
Group A			
1(N=61)	8%	29%	63%
2(N=24)	5	52	43
3(N=44)	5	24	71
Group B			
4(N=30)	29	28	43
5(N=43)	24	21	55
Group C			
6(N=129)	6	28	66
7(N=73)	25	24	51
Group D			
8(N=71)	13	20	67
9(N=43)	11	23	66
10(N=26)	26	48	26

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups C and D.

Groups are defined on Table 60.

**Table 71**  
**Effectiveness in Preventing Multiple Solicitations**  
**Group Comparison**

Groups	Closer to Ineffective	Neutral	Closer to Effective
Group A			
1(N=61)	15%	25%	60%
2(N=24)	38	29	33
3(N=44)	11	26	63
Group B			
4(N=30)	23	27	50
5(N=43)	23	23	54
Group C			
6(N=129)	18	26	56
7(N=73)	23	41	36
Group D			
8(N=71)	21	19	60
9(N=43)	14	24	62
10(N=26)	41	38	21

Note. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A, B, C, and D.

Groups are defined on Table 60.



Table 72  
Increasing the Power of the Deans  
Group Comparison

Groups	With Deans		With Presidents	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Group A				
1 (N=61)	57%	43%	60%	40%
2 (N=24)	87	13	71	29
3 (N=44)	70	30	75	25
Group B				
4 (N=30)	76	14	88	12
5 (N=43)	88	12	93	7
Group C				
6 (N=129)	67	33	67	33
7 (N=73)	82	18	91	9
Group D				
8 (N=71)	84	16	79	21
9 (N=43)	74	26	83	17
10 (N=26)	77	23	86	14

Notes. Chi-square is significant at .05 for Groups A and C with deans and Group C with presidents.

Groups are defined on Table 60.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Alford, J. D. (1978). Management of planning. In A. W. Korten (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional development* (pp. 145-163). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alford, J. D., Jr. (1979). *Power and conflict in the transformation of social life in nineteenth-century New England*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- American College Public Relations Association. (1971). *The advancement of understanding and support of higher education*. Washington, D. C.: American College Public Relations Association.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Alford, J. D. (1964). *Integrating the individual and the organization*. New York: Wiley.
- Alford, J. D. (1971). *Power and conflict in the university*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Alford, J. D. (1983). Knowing our place. *Currents*, January, 18-21.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blau, P. M. & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. San Francisco: Chandler.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, J. J. (1978). Management of planning. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 455-463). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Allmendinger, D. F., Jr. (1975). Paupers and scholars: The transformation of student life in nineteenth-century New England. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- American College Public Relations Association. (1958). The Advancement of understanding and support of higher education. Washington, D. C.: ACPRA.
- Argyris, C. (1964). Integrating the individual and the organization. New York: Wiley.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blaney, J. P. (1988). Knowing our place. Currents, January, 18-21.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blau, P. M. & Scott, W. R. (1962). Formal organizations: A comparative approach. San Francisco: Chandler.



- Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Boulding, K. (1956). General systems theory: The skeleton of science. Management Science, April, 200-202.
- Broce, T. E. (1986). Fund raising: The guide to raising money from private sources (2nd ed.). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Brubacher, J. S. and Rudy, W. (1958). Higher education in transition, an American history: 1636-1956. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty organization and authority. In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.), The study of academic administration, October, 37-51.
- Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cohen, M. D. & Olsen, J. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 1-25.
- Cremin, L. A. (1970). American education: The colonial experience, 1607-1783. New York: Harper & Row.

- Cremin, L. A. (1980). American education: The national experience: 1783-1876. New York: Harper & Row.
- Curti, M. & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Cummings, L. L. (1981). State of the art: Organizational behavior in the 1980s. Decision Sciences, 12, 365-377.
- Dale, E. (1960). The great organizers. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dalton, D., Todor, W. D., Spendolini, M. J., Fielding, J.G., & Porter, L. W. (1980). Organizational structure and performance: A critical review. Academy of Management Review, January, 9-64.
- Desmond, R. L. and Ryan, J. S. (1985). Serving people needs. Currents, March, 43-44.
- Dittman, D. A. (1981). Criteria for judging staff size and functions. In F. C. Pray (Ed.) Handbook for educational fund raising (pp. 226-231). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Drucker, P. F. (1954). The practice of management. New York: Harper & Row.

- Drucker, P. F. (1974). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, and programs. New York: Harper & Row.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Franz, P. J., Jr. (1981). Trustees must lead by example. In F.C. Pray (Ed.), Handbook for educational fund raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goldman, R. (1988). Partners at Pomona. Currents, January, 10-17.
- Grunig, J. E. (1975a). A Multi-system theory of organizational communication. Communication Research, 2, 99-136.
- Grunig, J. E. (1975b). Toward a multi-purpose public relations theory. Public Relations Journal, 31(1), 12-14.
- Hall, M. R. (1984). Breaking into the foundation big time. Currents, July/August, 18-23.
- Hall, P. D. (1981). Social change and community. History of Education Quarterly, XI, 123-128.



- Hofstadter, R., and Metzger, W. (1955). Academic freedom in the age of the college and the university. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1968). The academic revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Katz, D., and Kahn, R. L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley.
- Likert, R. (1967). The human organization: Its management and value. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lutz, F. W. (1982). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 27, 653-669.
- Martin, R. & Moores, B. (1985). Management structures and techniques. Oxford, England: Philip Allan.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Bros.
- McDonald, J. (1950). Strategy in poker, business and war. New York: W.W. Norton.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Mintzberg, H. (1983). Power in and around organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.
- Muller, S. (1978). The definition and philosophy of institutional advancement. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 1-12). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Odiorne, G. S. (1965). Management by objectives. New York: Pitman.
- Peterson, M. W. (1985). Emerging developments in postsecondary organization theory and research: Fragmentation and integration. Educational Researcher, 14(3), 5-12.
- Pickett, W. L. (1981). Prerequisites for successful fund raising. In F. C. Pray (Ed.), Handbook for educational fund raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pray, F. C. (1981). Handbook for educational fund raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reck, W. E. (1946). Public relations: A program for colleges and universities. New York: Harper & Row.
- Reichley, R. A. (1978). The alumni movement: An overview". In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Rowland, A. W. (1974). The management of the institutional advancement program. College and University Journal, 13(2), 4-12.

Rudolph, F. (1962). The American college and university--A history. New York:Knopf.

Sandberg, J. R. (1985). Organizing your operation. Currents, March, 45-49.

Simon, H. A. (1960). The new science of management decision. New York: Harper & Bros.

Swearer, H. R. (1988). A more perfect union. Currents, January, 8-9.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). The emergence of the American university. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21(1), 1-19.