DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING PRACTICES IN DIVISIONS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

by

KARA LEE FRESK

(Under the Direction of Richard H. Mullendore)

ABSTRACT

This study explored divisions of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising at medium and large private, not-for-profit institutions of higher education granting baccalaureate or advanced graduate degrees in the United States. Senior student affairs officers from 344 institutions received invitations to participate. A total of 66 responded (18.6%) to a questionnaire intended to (a) identify the extent to which student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities, (b) identify common development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices in student affairs units at private institutions, (c) identify fundraising and development activities in student affairs units at private institutions that are most successful in terms of average dollars raised, and (d) determine whether there is a difference between development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices in student affairs units at private and public institutions.

Findings revealed that student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising at private institutions is limited, with most of the represented institutions utilizing a centralized development and fundraising model. Inclusion in an institutional capital campaign was the only fundraising practice that influenced fundraising success in terms of dollars raised. Further

analysis of the findings revealed that institutional size and mission only minimally influenced development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices at the private institutions represented in the study. A comparison of data collected in this study and data collected in a previous study exploring the same topic at public institutions revealed significant differences attributed to institutional type, with public institutions being more likely to operate under a decentralized model of development and fundraising and more frequently engaged in all phases of the fundraising process.

The results of this study suggest several implications for practice, including (a) defining success based on identified needs, (b) championing for student affairs priorities to be included in capital campaigns, (c) maintaining strong relationships with institutional advancement, (d) increasing training and preparation for development and fundraising, and (e) utilizing available best practice models for development and fundraising in student affairs.

INDEX WORDS: Student Affairs, Development, Fundraising, Institutional Advancement, Private Institutions

DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING PRACTICES IN DIVISIONS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

by

KARA LEE FRESK

B.S., University of Minnesota, 2002

M.Ed., University of Minnesota, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

DEVELOPMENT AND FUNDRAISING PRACTICES IN DIVISIONS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

by

KARA LEE FRESK

Major Professor:	Richard H. Mullendore
Committee:	Merrily S. Dunn Mark G. Wilson

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2012

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my Grammy. She taught me the meaning of perseverance, the importance of character and integrity, and the value of embracing the qualities that make us all a little "weird." I miss her each and every day.

This dissertation is also dedicated to my amazing husband, Clayton. His constant love, support, and friendship over our past nine years of marriage drive me to be a better person. Sharing my life with him is truly a blessing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to so many people who supported me in achieving this dream. Whether helping me conceptualize an idea, offering words of encouragement, or understanding when I retreated away from the world around me, each and every person in my support system played an integral role in my doctoral journey.

Thank you to my family who shaped much of who I am today and continue to support me unconditionally. To my mom who showed me what it means to be authentic, imparted in me her compassionate disposition, and constantly nurtured my dreams even when they diverged from her own. To Jon who enriched my life in countless ways. To Brad Dad who shared with me his gentle heart and unconditional devotion. To my dad whose propensity to wear his heart on his sleeve despite his rough exterior taught me to look beyond the surface. To my aunts who inspire me with their giving souls. To my in-laws who welcomed me into their family without hesitation. And to all my other family members who provide constant love and encouragement.

Thank you to those who contributed to the quality of this dissertation. To Dr. Richard Mullendore, my advisor and committee chair, who patiently supported me through several transitions and encouraged me to thoughtfully explore my professional and personal interests. To Dr. Merrily Dunn who stimulated my passion for student development theory and connected with me in a way only a Midwesterner could. To Dr. Mark Wilson who took time away from his research interests to learn about student affairs and offered an invaluable perspective. To Dr. Peggy Crowe who generously shared her research with me, turned out to be one of my greatest cheerleaders, and became a mentor along the way.

Thank you to the other College Student Affairs Administration faculty and my classmates whose contributions in the classroom made this an invaluable experience. To Addae, Dallin, Darren, Christa, Jabari, Jeremy, Larry, Marc, Matt, Nikki, and Shannon who all challenged me to consider alternative perspectives. To the CSAA Master's class of 2011 who welcomed me to be part of their journey as I learned alongside them. And to the CSAA Master's class of 2012 who taught me so much as I attempted to teach them.

Thank you to my colleagues at the University of Georgia who remained flexible and patient as I attempted to balance my coursework and job responsibilities. To the OSC team, including Beau, Mark, Zoe, Jordan, Chrisy, and Elizabeth who made coming to work enjoyable and consistently provided words of encouragement. To TW and the CLS staff who helped me effectively integrate theory and practice. To Mitch, Jennifer, Stacy, and Nathan who provided me with opportunities to stay connected to campus recreation. And to Eric Atkinson and Beau Seagraves who offered me great opportunities, perspective, and guidance.

Thank you to the leaders of the University of Minnesota's Department of Recreational Sports who saw my potential as an undergraduate student and took a chance on me. To Beth Asfahl who supported my development as a young professional and advocated for me when I needed it most. To Dan Allen and Dr. Anthony Brown, who became great mentors. And to Dr. James Turman who trusted me enough to spearhead an unconventional program and motivated me to pursue my doctorate.

Thank you to my friends who provided welcome distractions when I needed them most, recognized when I needed to retreat, and reminded me of the value of genuine friendship. To Sara and Arminda who remain close at heart despite the miles. To Shannon and Lindsey who

became my confidants, sympathizers, and lifelong friends. And to all the others I've met along the way who extended a warm welcome and accepted me into their lives.

Most importantly, thank you to Clayton who willingly sacrificed so much to help make this dream a reality. Just as he vowed to do all those years ago, he has encouraged me in times of sickness and sorrow, celebrated with me in times of health and happiness, communicated with me through times of comfort and hardship, protected me in times of fear, and nurtured me in times of confidence. Clayton, thank you for all you are, all you do, and all you give. I love you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since their founding, American institutions of higher education have relied on private gifts. Whether given in the form of tangible goods, intangible services, or monetary contributions, private gifts are responsible for the establishment and continual evolution of even the oldest American colleges (Cohen, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965; Freeman, 1965; Romano, Gallagher, & Shugart, 2010; Sears, 1990; Strickland, 2007; Worth, 2002). Harvard College, the first institution of higher education in America, received its first contributions from John Harvard, including a sum of £ 395 and a library of approximately 300 books (Curti & Nash, 1965; Thelin, 2004). This early gift set a standard for American higher education that continues today—supplementing tuition and other revenue sources with private contributions.

Reliance on private gifts has reached critical levels as other revenue sources continually decrease and institutions look to keep tuition affordable. As the cost of administering higher education continued to increase throughout the twentieth century due to increased expectations for quality of programs, accountability, federal mandates, technology, and other amenities and services (Cohen, 1998; Lee & Clery, 2004; Sandeen & Barr, 2006; Schuh, 2003b; Thelin, 2004), institutions turned to increased tuition and government support to narrow the budgetary gap (Cohen 1998; Lee & Clery, 2004; Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). This strategy proved effective for only a short period of time. Between 2000 and 2010, average tuition rates for four-year institutions increased by 64% (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2011), raising concerns about access to higher education (Johnstone, 2005). Concerns about tuition

combined with a decrease in state and federal support (Claar & Scott, 2003; Cohen, 1998; Johnstone, 2005; Miller, 2010a) required institutions to look elsewhere to fund the difference (Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). Private giving, which contributed $30.30 billion to higher education in 2011 (Council for Aid to Education, 2012), is being sought as the solution (Elliott, 2006; Kopita & Royse, 2004; Shay, 1993).

Historically reserved for private institutions, public colleges and universities are increasingly dependent on securing private gifts (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Cohen, 1998). Founded as institutions supported by state and federal funds, and supplemented by tuition, public colleges and universities generally refrained from intentional fundraising efforts (Cohen, 1998; Sears, 1990). National economic crises and increasing attention toward other funding needs resulted in drastic decreases in local and state funding allocations to higher education. Nationally, allocations to public institutions from these funding sources are declining as evidenced in 2010 by a decrease of $500 per full-time equivalent student from the previous year (State Higher Education Executive Officers [SHEEO], 2011). Without stable state and federal funding support and legislative restrictions on increasing tuition, public colleges and universities have turned to private gifts (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Cohen, 1998; Kopita & Royse, 2004; Lee & Clery, 2004; Schuh, 2003a; Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000).

Public higher education's relatively recent interest in securing private gifts has resulted in a less discernible difference between funding models of public and private institutions (Cohen, 1998; Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). However, unlike their public counterparts, private institutions rely on tuition and private giving as their primary revenue sources (Altbach, 2000; Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Claar & Scott, 2003; National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities [NAICU], 2011; Patterson, 1974; Schuh, 2003b). While decisions to

raise tuition in private higher education reside within each institution, they must ensure they do not out-price themselves, which requires strategies involving low tuition rates (NAICU, 2011). Private gifts are critical in closing the gap between expenditure and revenue generated via tuition and fees, which averaged a difference of $28,253 in 2009-10 per full-time equivalent student at private, four-year institutions (NCES, 2012).

With the importance of private giving growing increasingly important to both public and private institutions, institutional administrators must engage in development and fundraising practices that prove effective. Although not historically involved in securing private gifts for the institution, student affairs units are emerging as valuable partners in comprehensive development and fundraising strategies (McAlexander & Koenig, 2001; Pumerantz, 2005; Raymond, 2008; Sun, Hoffman, & Grady, 2007; Thomas & Smart, 2005). Recent inclusion in development and fundraising efforts resides in student affairs' ability to build connections between the donor and the institution. Research indicates that motivation to give heavily relies on feelings of connection to the institution (Mann, 2007; McAlexander & Koenig, 2001; Pumerantz, 2005; Sun, Hoffman, & Grady, 2007). Whether connecting current students as potential future donors, or alumni, parents. and corporations as current prospects (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Miller, 2010a; Morgan & Policcello, 2010; Rissmeyer, 2010; Whitney, 2006), student affairs units are increasingly an integral part of securing private gifts.

Despite an increasing inclusion of student affairs in institutional development and fundraising strategies, little understanding exists around student affairs fundraising practices. The first studies related to student affairs' role in development and fundraising occurred in the early to middle 1990s. These studies focused on a comparison of perceptions of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising from the student affairs' and development offices'

viewpoints (Kroll, 1991), the relationship between student affairs and development offices (Fygetakis, 1992), and institutions engaged in capital campaigns (Hendrix-Kral, 1995). Research conducted in the past decade continued to focus on a narrowly defined set of institutions or on specific aspects of development and fundraising practices. Some examined student affairs units demonstrating a high level of success in fundraising (Schoenecke, 2005; Sonn, 2010), others studied the relationship between institutional support characteristics and private gifts secured (Rovig, 2008), and others focused on a specific institution or institutional system (Eller, 2010; Hillman, 2002).

One recent study took a more comprehensive approach by examining (a) the organization of fundraising at the institutional and student affairs level, (b) the relationship between student affairs and institutional fundraising offices, (c) student affairs preparation for engaging in fundraising activities, (d) student affairs priorities for being involved in fundraising, and (e) effectiveness of identified practices based on the amount of private support secured at large, public institutions throughout the nation (Crowe, 2011). Despite the study's focus on one institutional type, the results provide perhaps the most thorough understanding of development and fundraising practices in student affairs to date. This study intended to advance that understanding by exploring the same topics at private institutions.

Statement of Problem

Research in the area of student affairs development and fundraising has primarily focused on student affairs role in securing private gifts, specific functions of development and fundraising practices, or specific institutional types. One recent study offers a more complete understanding by examining multiple aspects of development and fundraising practices at a national level, yet focuses on large, public institutions. This same level of understanding does

not exist for private institutions. Given their history of reliance on private gifts for continued survival, it is imperative to extend the research to include private institutions.

Purpose of Study

This study sought to extend research done at public institutions in order to gain an understanding of student affairs' development and fundraising practices at private institutions. Specifically, the purposes of this study were to (a) identify the extent to which student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities, (b) identify common development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices in student affairs units at private institutions, (c) identify fundraising and development activities in student affairs units at private institutions that are most successful in terms of average dollars raised, and (d) determine whether there is a difference between development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices in student affairs units at private and public institutions.

Research Questions

Examination of five research questions facilitated the exploration of this study's purpose:

RQ1: To what extent do student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities?

RQ2: What models, approaches, and practices are most common for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in development and fundraising practices?

RQ3: What models, approaches, and practices are most successful for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in fundraising and development activities, as estimated by average dollars raised?

RQ4: Does the relationship between institutional advancement and student affairs differ at private and public institutions?

RQ5: Do models, approaches, and practices differ between student affairs units at private and public institutions?

Operational Definitions

The following terms are defined and used throughout the study as follows:

Advancement. The functions of an institution of higher education that work to communicate with internal and external constituencies and involve external constituencies in the institution. Functional areas of advancement include alumni relations, development, fundraising, and marketing/communications (Kelly, 1998).

Development. The process of identifying institutional needs, communicating those needs with relevant constituencies, and cultivating and maintaining relationships to solicit private gifts to meet those needs (Kelly, 1998; Kopita & Royse, 2004).

Fundraising. Organized attempts to solicit and secure private gifts (Kelly, 1998; Kopita & Royse, 2004).

Private Institution. An institution of higher education whose operations are controlled by an individual or entity other than a publicly appointed official or governmental agency (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], n.d.). For the purposes of this study, a private institution is further defined by its status as a not-for-profit organization.

Private Gifts. Revenues in the form of funds, services, and goods provided to an institution of higher education through outright non-exchange transactions, bequests, or pledges (NCES, n.d.).

Public Institution. An institution of higher education controlled by a publicly appointed official or governmental agency and supported primarily by public funds (NCES, n.d.).

Senior Student Affairs Officer. The individual holding the highest-ranking title within a division or unit of student affairs who holds the responsibility for oversight and administration of the division or unit (Winston, Creamer & Miller, 2001).

Student Affairs. A named division or unit within an institution of higher education generally charged with supporting students outside of the classroom but in accord with the academic mission (Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006; Winston, Creamer & Miller, 2001).

Significance of Study

Student affairs' involvement in securing private gifts for higher education is a relatively recent evolution of traditional development and fundraising. Little information exists as to how student affairs units are involved in these efforts. Recent research provided an understanding as it relates to public institutions. This study progresses the current baseline knowledge by identifying development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices at private colleges and universities, thereby reducing the current gap in the literature.

In addition to reducing a gap in the literature, this study presents data to inform student affairs development and fundraising practices at private institutions. At a time when private gifts are more critical than ever to the survival of private higher education, it is imperative to engage in effective efforts to secure these gifts. Results of this study indicated that student affairs units involved in development and fundraising at private institutions engage only minimally in best practice activities. Further, the data failed to reveal a relationship between specific activities and success as determined by dollars raised. This study serves as a reminder for student affairs units to engage intentionally in a comprehensive development and fundraising process that utilizes all identified best practice activities in order to achieve success.

Further, this study serves as a way to identify significant differences in development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices at private and public institutions. A statistical comparison of data collected by Crowe (2011) and data collected in this study revealed significant differences in organizational models and activities utilized. Identification of these differences provides an understanding of the landscape of development and fundraising at both institutional types. Equipped with this knowledge, student affairs administrators can gauge how their involvement compares with that of their peers. This knowledge may prove effective in educating other institutional administrators as to the deficiencies or sophistication of their institution's student affairs development and fundraising efforts.

Finally, senior student affairs officers responding to this survey suggested several challenges associated with successfully engaging in development and fundraising, as well as the greatest needs for future success. Several themes emerged, indicating that student affairs units at private institutions face similar struggles. Identification of common issues illuminates a need and opportunity for student affairs administrators to work together to identify solutions or strategies that mitigate barriers to successful involvement in development and fundraising.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter provides a framework for understanding the role of development and fundraising in American higher education. A historical review of American higher education, student affairs, fundraising within higher education, and student affairs fundraising gives context to the need to expand research on development and fundraising practices in divisions of student affairs. The historical review of American higher education addresses both private and public sectors, with special attention given to private colleges and universities. The review of student affairs addresses the evolution of the profession and its current role within institutions of higher education. The review of higher education fundraising addresses its evolution from individuals embarking on uncoordinated solicitation efforts to complex organizations utilizing integrated strategies. Finally, the review of fundraising in student affairs addresses student affairs' role in securing private gifts and synthesizes the limited research that exists to date.

History of American Higher Education

An examination of the history of American higher education reveals its evolution from serving a selected elite to providing education to the masses. With its roots pre-dating the establishment of the United States, American higher education has grown along with the country, often playing a central role in its progression. Reviewing the evolution underscores the importance of higher education in the United States, which offers reason to study issues related to its continued development.

Founding Institutions

Higher education in America began as a private endeavor to educate an elite group of men in the English tradition of the classics. Predating the establishment of the United States of America, Harvard College was founded in 1636, followed soon thereafter by William & Mary and Yale (Cohen, 1998; Sears, 1990; Thelin, 2004; Westmeyer, 1997). These first institutions of higher education established in the colonies served men who aspired to become ministers (Burbacher & Rudy, 1976; Geiger, 2005). The curriculum included a limited range of information and was relayed to the students from a single point of view—that of the church (Geiger, 2005; Sears, 1990; Westmeyer, 1997).

As the number of colonies increased, so did the number of institutions. The establishment of a college served as a signal of a civilized community, resulting in the founding of nine institutions before 1781 (Cohen, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965; Thelin, 2004). All but one of these institutions existed to serve the elite. Dartmouth, the last colonial college, was founded in 1769 and opened its doors in the interest of educating the public.

Established as corporations recognized by the individual colonies, the first nine colleges functioned as private institutions (Sears, 1990; Worth, 2002). Lay boards of trustees with authority to manage regular operations of their institutions governed the institutions (Burbacher & Rudy, 1976; Cohen, 1998; Westmeyer, 1997). Three of the original nine—Harvard, William & Mary, and Brown—also gave some internal power to a select group of presidents and faculty (Cohen, 1998). This shared governance between an external lay board and an internal faculty senate later became the model for the operation of most private institutions (Westmeyer, 1997).

With control of the college grounded in private governance, Dartmouth stood out as an anomaly in its mission to serve the public rather than the elite. Questions arose as to whether a

private group of individuals should control an institution of public education. Several believed that public officials or representatives should determine the content of the education delivered to the public for fear that the education offered would contradict sentiments of the government. In 1819, the Supreme Court ruled that the government could not seize any corporation founded as a private entity (Brubacher & Rudy, 1876; Cohen, 1998; Geiger, 2005; Rudolph, 1990, Westmeyer, 1997). This meant that private institutions, regardless of the population they educated, would retain autonomy for all aspects of the institution's operations, including the appointment of trustees and creation of the curriculum. In addition to confirming Dartmouth's status as a private institution, the ruling also established a model for private education's role in serving the public.

Shifting Purpose of Higher Education

Following the establishment of the United States and the Dartmouth Supreme Court decision, American higher education began realigning itself with the ideals of the emergent country. Beliefs on who should be educated expanded to include those who aspired to be educators, statesmen, and businessmen (Cohen, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965). Eventually, the doors would open to women, various racial and ethnic groups, and other previously excluded populations (Curti & Nash, 1965; Geiger, 2005; Rudolph, 1990; Westmeyer, 1997).

In addition to shifting to meet the ideals of morality and public service, American higher education also evolved to meet the demands for a more practical curriculum (Cohen, 1998; Geiger, 2005; Thelin, 2004; Westmeyer, 1997). Propagation of religion became increasingly less central to the teaching of the colleges (Cohen, 1998; Rudolph, 1990). Instead, institutions assisted in advancing concepts of applied science, technology, and commerce to meet the workforce needs of the growing country (Curti & Nash, 1965; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004).

Changes in the curriculum, coupled with notions of truth and rational thought, initiated one of the most significant transformations in American higher education. Whereas the colleges were once places to disseminate a singular truth, they grew to become places where truth was discovered through inquiry (Rudolph, 1990). Integration of American colleges and German models of undergraduate and graduate programs and professional schools designed specifically for inquiry formed the American university (Geiger, 2005; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004; Westmeyer, 1997).

The landscape of higher education in America in the mid-1800s came to include small religiously affiliated colleges, medium-sized liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and everything in between. These institutions still operated under private governance, though the structures became increasingly complex and shifted toward administrative hierarchy and bureaucracy (Cohen, 1998). This was in part due to the considerable size and nature of universities, and in part to greater involvement of businessmen on governing boards (Cohen, 1998). As number and diversity of institutions continued to grow, so did the individuals served.

Introduction of Public Institutions

Despite paradigm shifts in the purpose of higher education and those it should serve, access remained an issue. In 1848 Edward Everett, then president of Harvard, appealed to the Massachusetts legislature to support higher education; "he suggested that a college education for more citizens would be advantageous to the state and that if the state provided funds more students could be induced" (Westmeyer, 1997, p. 24). Though his appeal did not result in action, sentiments such as these spurred states to begin chartering publicly supported institutions (Cohen, 1998; Geiger, 2005; Westmeyer, 1997).

Although several states chartered publicly supported and governed institutions prior to the passing of the Morrill Act of 1862, most public college and universities founded in the 1800s were established as a result of this revolutionary legislation (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Geiger, 2005; Rudolph, 1990; Thelin, 2004; Westmeyer, 1997). The Morrill Act provided public land and funding support for institutions focused on agriculture and mechanical arts curriculum (Geiger, 2005; Thelin, 2004; Westmeyer, 1997). By the early 1900s, the majority of states had capitalized on the provision thereby establishing the public sector of higher education (Sears, 1990).

Similar to their private counterparts, public institutions operated with a dual governance structure (Cohen, 1998). An external board was responsible for appointing a president and managing the operations of the institution, while an internal group made decisions related to curriculum and similar matters. Unlike their private counterparts, the external boards for public institutions were comprised of public officials (Westmeyer, 1997).

The formation of public colleges and universities fundamentally altered American higher education. Prior to the founding of the public sector, paradigm shifts related to access and curriculum were recognized but not necessarily realized. Public institutions served as the forum for closing the circle between acknowledgement and achievement (Rudolph, 1990). Federal and state funding, coupled with incentive from the Morrill Act to offer practical curriculum, resulted in institutions that were accessible and appealing to the masses (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976; Cohen, 1998; Rudolph, 1990).

Current Status of Private Institutions

Over time, enrollment at public institutions surpassed that of private institutions due in large part to the cost associated with attending a private college or university (Cohen, 1998).

Regardless of the discrepancy in enrollment numbers, private institutions remain vital to the landscape of American higher education. Today, over 1,600 private institutions enroll nearly 3.7 million students (NAICU, 2011). Ranging from small, church-affiliated colleges to major research universities, private institutions as a whole pride themselves on being diverse and accessible, and on promoting student success (NAICU, 2011; Zumeta, 2010).

Diversity in private higher education relates not only to the types of the institutions available, but also to the students these institutions educate. Contrary to the foundations of private higher education in America, today's private institutions serve students from a variety of backgrounds not just the elite. In 2008, nearly one-third of all students enrolled in private higher education identified as being a member of an underrepresented population (NAICU, 2011). This statistic matches that of the racial/ethnic composition of students enrolled in public institutions. In terms of socioeconomic background, the family income for 29% of students enrolled in private institutions exceeded $100,000 while another 22% had annual family incomes of less than $25,000 (NAICU, 2011).

With average posted tuition and fees totaling $34,604 in 2009-10 (NCES, 2011), the cost of private higher education can seem unattainable especially those with low to moderate family incomes. Adjusting the data to exclude the highest cost institutions reveals that over 60% of all private colleges and universities charge less than $25,000 annually (NAICU, 2011). Acknowledging that the cost may still deter access, private institutions provide over $19 billion in institutional aid each year (NAICU, 2011). Combined with federal support, students receiving grant aid can generally expect to pay less than half of the published cost (NAICU, 2011).

A large portion of the cost associated with attending a private institution is absorbed in the expenses associated with providing a personalized educational experience that ultimately

leads to student success (NAICU, 2011). Recent research indicates a relationship between student success and an institution's expenditures on instruction and student-to-faculty ratios (Pike, Smart, Kuh & Hayek, 2006). Low ratios promote regular interaction between students and their faculty, which ultimately increases college persistence and timely graduation (Astin, 1999; Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh & Whitt, 2005). Student-to-faculty ratios at private institutions average 12:1, representing an average of four less students per faculty member than is found at public institutions (NAICU, 2011).

When considering the cost of college, the length of time enrolled must factor into the equation. Although the annual costs for enrollment at private institutions may be higher than those found at public colleges and universities, the overall costs may be equivalent. National research surveying over 64,000 undergraduate students found that institutional type predicts time toward completion (Oseguera, 2005). The results indicated that students at private institutions are more likely to graduate sooner than their peers at public institutions. Recent data from the *Digest for Education Statistics* supports this research. For the cohort of students first enrolling in 2002, 51 percent of students enrolled at private institutions attained their degree within four years as compared with 29.9 percent of students enrolled at public institutions (NCES, 2011). In addition to being a consideration of success, decreased time to completion may mitigate the overall costs associated with a private education.

History of Development and Fundraising in Higher Education

Private gifts have supported colleges and universities since the founding of American higher education. Securing these gifts has evolved from being a disjointed acceptance of anything offered to a complex system of strategic solicitation. Exploring the evolution of

fundraising in American higher education provides context for introducing student affairs to development and fundraising.

Evolution from Accepting to Soliciting Gifts

The first gift to support American higher education was an unsolicited donation to Harvard College of £ 395 and a library containing approximately 300 volumes (Curti & Nash, 1965). In the years following, Harvard and the institutions founded soon thereafter accepted any gift offered, whether in the form of goods, services, or monetary donations (Curti & Nash, 1965; Sears, 1990). These contributions mirrored personal giving between two individuals, which while appreciated, may not have been in the best interests of the institution (Worth, 2002). After receiving an abundance of gifts that did not support the development of their institutions, college presidents began questioning the usefulness of engaging in this practice (Curti & Nash, 1965).

Realizing the advantages of accepting gifts that met the growing needs of the institution prompted colleges to consider planned efforts to secure private gifts. College presidents and boards expected that aligning gifts with institutional needs would be more advantageous to both parties; institutions would receive support for their priorities and donors would experience greater satisfaction in knowing their gifts made a difference (Curti & Nash, 1965; Sears, 1990). In addition, colleges would be better suited to plan for the future (Curti & Nash, 1965).

Driven by a desire to see their institutions survive, college boards and presidents began identifying planned solicitation efforts. These early approaches typically involved subscriptions to the institution, clergymen appealing to their congregations, canvassing the town surrounding the institutions, and organized alumni annual giving (Curti & Nash, 1965; Rudolph, 1990; Sears, 1990; Worth, 2002). Efforts such as these marked the introduction of intentional fundraising in American higher education.

Intentional Fundraising

Although institutions of higher education recognized the need to plan for fundraising, and were enjoying limited success, many struggled with developing successful and comprehensive strategies. In 1914, the "Ward Method," a model of strategic fundraising used by the YMCA, made its way to higher education (Worth, 2002). The method involved preparing lists of prospects based on potential connections to the institution and solicitations grounded in previously established relationships. Based on success enjoyed by employing this model in, Ward and several others established consulting firms to prepare strategic fundraising plans for colleges and universities (Curti & Nash, 1965; Worth, 2002).

Whether defined by consultants or established internally, institutions looked to individuals within the college to execute their fundraising strategies (Curti & Nash, 1965; Worth, 2002). Presidents assumed a primary role in both soliciting gifts from potential donors and recruiting others to assist in his endeavors (Worth, 2002). Faculty eventually assumed some of the responsibility for fundraising, as did board members, alumni, and other volunteers.

Institutional administrators ultimately came to realize that fundraising would remain integral to funding higher education (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Curti & Nash, 1965; Worth, 2002). Although the model of consultants serving as strategists and college officials serving as solicitors proved successful, the time spent on these efforts as opposed to other responsibilities revealed the value of hiring fundraising staff as members of the institution (Worth, 2002). By the middle of the twentieth century, several colleges and universities began investing in staff positions dedicated to fundraising (Cohen, 1998; Curti & Nash, 1965; Worth, 2002).

Similar to many other areas within higher education, fundraising eventually became a professionalized function (Elliott, 2006; Kelly, 1998). The increasing number of dedicated

higher education fundraisers and the increasing complexity of the strategies they employed warranted the establishment of an association whereby standards for the profession could be set and fundraisers could learn from one another (Worth, 2002). The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) was founded in 1974 to satisfy these needs. Soon thereafter, a small number of institutions began offering degree or certificate programs to assist in training and preparation of higher education fundraisers (Elliott, 2006).

Current Status of Fundraising in Higher Education

Today, fundraising in higher education is part of a complex set of functions known collectively as institutional advancement. Designed to procure support from internal and external constituencies, institutional advancement offices are typically comprised of alumni relations, development, fundraising, and marketing/communications functions (Kelly, 1998). While each of the functions serve the institution uniquely, all exist for the ultimate purpose of securing private gifts.

Similar to its umbrella of advancement, the function of development and fundraising has grown increasingly complex (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Kelly, 1998). Development—which focuses on the preparatory work involved in securing private gifts—and fundraising—which focuses on soliciting private gifts—now involve specialty areas dedicated to annual fund gifts, corporate and foundation relations, planned giving, prospect research, major gifts, and stewardship. While the organizational structure of these functions depends on the size and bureaucracy of the institution, all are now essential for a comprehensive development and fundraising program.

The complexity of development and fundraising today has prompted critical examination of the field. In 1998, Kelly noted, "fund raising's body of knowledge consists primarily of

intuitively based, untested principles generated by practitioners" (p. 105). Though a large body of research currently exists related to economics of fundraising, motivations for giving, and giving patterns (Levy, 2004; Lindahl & Conley, 2002), most studies examining development and fundraising in higher education explore a narrow problem providing a breadth rather than depth of knowledge. Most of the current literature that addresses the broad issues of development and fundraising, such as organizational structure, training and preparation, and effective approaches and strategies, still resides in practitioner intuition and experience (Kelly, 1998).

A limited number of studies to date explore the organizational structure of development and fundraising within institutions (Lindahl & Conley, 2002). Some colleges and universities maintain central offices, with development officers and fundraisers securing gifts for all units in the institution. Others place dedicated development officers or fundraisers in specific units, though a central office generally works to coordinate these efforts. Known as the decentralized model, the latter model is most common at institutions with large enrollments and expansive graduate programs (Grunig, 1995). Studies related to the effectiveness of one model over the other reveal mixed findings, but some consensus exists as to the benefit of involving the staff of a particular unit in fundraising efforts for that unit (Grunig, 1995; Hall, 1992; Miller, 2010b).

Aside from statistics published by professional organizations and individual institutions, limited data exists related to the training and preparation of development and fundraising professionals. Most currently enter the field with limited preparation. They enter the field through volunteerism that leads to an interest in the work or by falling into the work through opportunities that present themselves (Levy, 2004). These individuals gain the bulk of their knowledge through experience and professional development programs (Kelly, 1998; Levy, 2004; Worth, 2002). Calls for professionalization and a growing body of fundraising literature

and research suggest a movement toward more formal preparation and an increase in the number of individuals who intentionally pursue fundraising as a career (Levy, 2004).

Many of the studies related to effective fundraising approaches focus on a specific strategy rather than the overall approach. Literature written based on practitioner experience focuses more broadly on effective approaches. One of the most comprehensive examinations of a successful fundraising approach is Hank Rosso's fund raising cycle (Seiler, 2003). Components of the cycle include (a) developing a case for support, (b) analyzing the market, (c) preparing case statements, (d) defining fundraising objectives, (e) involving volunteers in planning, (f) validating case statements, (g) evaluating the private giving market, (h) selecting fundraising methods, (i) identifying donor prospects, (j) preparing a comprehensive fundraising plan, (k) preparing a plan to communicate case statements and fundraising objectives to prospective donors, (l) activating volunteers for cultivation and solicitation, (m) soliciting gifts, and (n) stewarding donors. Movement through the cycle persists indefinitely as the fundraiser works to continually engage new donors and secure private gifts.

History of Student Affairs

Three distinct philosophies have guided student affairs work in higher education: student services, student development, and student learning (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006; Schuh, Jones, & Harper, 2011). In its earliest days, the provision of student services defined student affairs. The evolution of higher education in the middle of the twentieth century prompted a critical examination of the administration of those services and resulted in a philosophical shift toward promoting student development. A reconsideration of student affairs place within academe toward the end of the twentieth century compelled its professionals to redefine their work in terms of student learning. Examining the three paradigms of student affairs

demonstrates the ability of the profession to adapt to meet institutional needs, and reveals that the philosophy guiding the profession today positions student affairs to play an active role in development and fundraising.

Student Affairs as a Student Service

Structures of higher education institutions began as simple organizations. Faculty members, tutors, and the college president performed all major functions of the institution in the early history of higher education. These individuals shouldered the responsibility of *in loco parentis*, essentially serving in the place of parents for the young men and women attending their colleges (Dungy & Gordon, 2011; Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). In addition, they spent a their time managing the regular operations of the institution, including admitting and enrolling students, accounting for the finances of the institution, and responding to external stakeholders.

As colleges and universities enrolled increasing numbers of students, administrators assumed additional responsibility, and students took interest in activities unrelated to their academic studies, this model of dual responsibility for caring for students and the institution became increasingly ineffective. Expanding demands on faculty and president time required the addition of individuals dedicated to student welfare (American Council on Education [ACE], 1949; Dungy & Gordon, 2011). Institutions hired deans of men and women to fulfill this role, with the first full-time dean of men appointed by Harvard in 1890 and the first Dean of Women appointed two years later at the University of Chicago (Dungy & Gordon, 2011; Sandeen & Barr, 2006; Winston, Creamer, & Miller, 2001).

In the forty years following the first appointments of deans of men and women, the scope and function of their work intensified and they collectively became known as student personnel (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). Commissioned by the American Council on Education, the

Student Personnel Point of View aimed to provide direction to the work of these individuals. This seminal document charged student personnel with considering students as whole individuals and encouraged coordination within and between institutions to ensure that students were receiving proper attention both within and outside of their academic endeavors (ACE, 1937). The second iteration of the document, released in 1949, advised student personnel to promote the development of students into balanced, active citizens (ACE, 1949).

A variety of student-centered enterprises were introduced to academe during this same time period marking the era of student services as central to student affairs work (Dungy & Gordon, 2011; Winston, Creamer, & Miller, 2001). This collection of the student services were developed and offered without consideration to the total student experience (Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006). Instead, each service attempted to satisfy a specific student need and institutions continued adding them ad hoc until eventually the services became disparate enough to warrant specialty areas that operated independently of one another (Sandeen & Barr, 2006).

Student Affairs and Student Development

Following the *Student Personnel Point of View's* appeal for an integrated student experience designed to acknowledge the whole student in 1949, student affairs professionals—formerly known as student personnel—realized the need for a new philosophical foundation. Student development became the new foundation, guiding the profession through the end of the twentieth century (Dungy & Gordon, 2011; McEwen, 2005).

From a theoretical standpoint, student development addresses the increasing integration and differentiation of self (McEwen, 2005). This perspective required student affairs professionals to examine something different than learning and growth; the focus was on the complexities of students as individuals. Beginning in the 1950's, student affairs scholars

embarked on a mission to research the development of students (McEwen, 2005). The findings resulted in several seminal theories for the field that describe the psychosocial (e.g. Chickering & Reisser, 1993) and cognitive-structural (e.g. Perry, 1999) development of college students. Additional theories, related to social identity development, student success, and the integration of multiple facets of development (e.g. Astin, 1999; Baxter Magolda, 2001) expanded the body of knowledge used to guide the profession (McEwen, 2005; Sandeen & Barr, 2006).

The practical application of the student development paradigm resulted in a comprehensive out-of-classroom experience for students (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). Instead of thinking of student services as a disparate set of functions, student affairs professionals worked to make connections between them. Additionally, student affairs professionals gave significant attention to the development students achieved through participation in programs, services, and activities offered outside the academic curriculum. Approaching student affairs work from this perspective meant designing and administering a plethora of integrated extracurricular opportunities to promote student development.

Student Affairs Role in Student Learning

Student affairs work faced considerable scrutiny in the last decade of the twentieth century. Questions about the legitimacy of the profession and student affairs' contributions to the academic mission prompted a reexamination of student development as the guiding tenet for the profession (Bloland, Stamatakos, & Rogers, 1994). While most agreed that student development theories should still serve as a foundation for the field, the focus or mission of the profession needed to shift toward the support of student learning (Manning, Kinzie & Schuh, 2006; Sandeen & Barr, 2006).

The Student Learning Imperative, commissioned by the American College Personnel Association, implored student affairs professionals to serve as partners in student learning (American College Personnel Association [ACPA], 1996). The student learning movement required student affairs professionals to consider how to integrate the functions of student affairs into the broader institution to deliver a holistic student experience (ACPA, 1996; Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). Success in this endeavor would require collaboration across all areas of the institution (ACPA, 1996; Sandeen & Barr, 2006).

Student learning serves as the paradigm guiding student affairs work today (Dungy & Gordon, 2011; Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). Partnership with academic and business affairs is central to achieving total student learning. Whether working with faculty to design integrated classroom and experiential curriculum, or partnering with external affairs to cultivate donations that support student scholarships, student affairs strives to support student learning.

Development and Fundraising in Student Affairs

Development and fundraising associated with student affairs is a relatively new endeavor. Whether administered through a centralized or decentralized model, student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising continues to grow. Examining the limited research and literature that currently exists around student affairs development and fundraising confirms the need to extend this line of inquiry.

Case for Student Affairs' Involvement in Development and Fundraising

Although student affairs has had limited involvement in development and fundraising for decades, active participation began emerging in the 1990s (Elliott, 2006; Gold, Golden, & Quatroche, 1993; Kroll, 1991; Miser & Mathis, 1993; Rovig, 2008). In the earliest days of involvement, student affairs professionals pointed primarily to division needs to make a case for

student affairs' role in development and fundraising while generally ignoring the needs of the institution. Citing survival of student affairs programs and services, student affairs professionals appealed to institutional advancement to include their offices in the development and fundraising strategies of the college or university (Gold, Golden ,& Quatroche, 1993; Gordon, Strode, & Brady, 1993; Miser & Mathis, 1993; Schuh, 2003a; Schuh, 2003b; Woodard, Love, & Komives, 2000). Institutional advancement offices with adequate resources responded to some degree, but generally, student affairs remained a low priority. Academic initiatives and institutional goals took precedent.

Over time, student affairs realized that appealing to institutional advancement offices based on personal need was ineffective. Some attempted to connect their desire for involvement to a greater institutional need (Claar & Scott, 2003; Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993), but the rationale remained unclear. The beginning of the twenty-first century introduced research that legitimized student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising.

Scholars seeking to identify motives for giving to higher education discovered engagement beyond the classroom as a critical component in fostering affinity (McAlexander & Koenig, 2001; Sun, Hoffman, & Grady, 2007; Thomas & Smart, 2005). With previous research showing that affinity is associated with inclination to give (Pumerantz, 2005; Sun, Hoffman & Grady, 2007), student affairs now has a strong argument for being involved in an institution's development and fundraising. As McAlexander & Koenig (2001) noted, "consideration should be given to investments in 'student life'…should be viewed appropriately as more than simply expenses to increase short-term student enjoyment and satisfaction, but also as investments into building present and future bonds with implications for long-term loyalty" (p. 38).

Understanding Student Affairs' Involvement

Despite the strong case for student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising, limited research currently exists in relation to student affairs actual participation. Reviewing what does exist, reveals some commonly explored factors that may be linked to institutional support of student affairs' involvement or levels of success. Crowe (2011) identified these factors as (a) relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement offices, (b) organization of the institution, (c) level of student affairs staff involvement, (d) training and preparation for engaging in development and fundraising, (e) degree of development and fundraising effectiveness, and (f) successful approaches or strategies.

Several studies indicate that student affairs units involved in development and fundraising maintain a positive relationship with their institutional advancement offices. Collegial relationships free of competition have remained important for nearly two decades (Crowe, 2011; Fygetakis, 1992). Additionally, a shared respect for advancing the institution as a whole and a shared level of trust and responsibility characterize these relationships between student affairs and institutional advancement (Kroll, 1991; Hillman, 2002).

Regardless of relationship, researchers found that the central strategy of institutional advancement was an important factor in determining student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. Inclusion of student affairs funding priorities in comprehensive campaigns and the origin of the identification of those priorities was a central issue examined in relation to involvement (Hendrix-Kral, 1995; Rovig, 2008; Schonecke, 2005). Findings suggest that identification should occur within student affairs and then promoted to institutional advancement for inclusion in the comprehensive campaign.

Questions surrounding individual staff involvement tend to address (a) whether student affairs has a dedicated development and fundraising officer, (b) the degree to which senior student affairs officers engage in development and fundraising, and (c) the level of involvement by other student affairs staff. Previous research indicates that involvement in all three areas continues to increase over time (Crowe, 2011; Hendrix-Kral, 1995; Hillman, 2002; Schonecke, 2005). The number of both part-time and full-time development officers assigned to student affairs is vastly greater than the early years of development and fundraising in student affairs (Crowe, 2011). Findings related to the reporting structures for these dedicated development officers reveal a tendency toward joint reporting with primary supervision in student affairs (Crowe, 2011; Schonecke, 2005). Whether supporting the efforts of dedicated development officers, or taking full responsibility for development and fundraising in student affairs, increasing numbers of student affairs staff are now involved (Crowe, 2011; Hillman, 2002)

As the number of student affairs staff members involved in development and fundraising has increased, so has the need for greater development and fundraising preparation. While identified as important from the earliest days of student affairs fundraising, research suggests that preparation is still lacking. Kroll's findings in 1991 urged student affairs and higher education graduate programs to include fundraising topics within the curriculum. Three years later, a survey of public institutions indicated that both student affairs and institutional advancement officers realized a need for specific development and fundraising training (Hendrix-Kral, 1995). In 2011, Crowe found that training and preparation had increased over time, but remained an area that required additional attention.

While the primary purpose of many of the studies conducted to date was to understand the level of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising, many also endeavored

to identify best practices. Two studies found that funding priorities influenced effectiveness. Crowe (2011) found that those student affairs units with clearly articulated fundraising priorities were also more likely to be involved in the meetings of institutional advancement staff . In terms of defining those priorities, Schonecke (2005) found that contrary to their academic counterparts, student affairs units were more effective when soliciting donors for programs rather than for scholarships or bricks and mortar needs.

A positive relationship and cooperation between student affairs and institutional advancement has remained constant over time in terms of its positive relationship with amount of funds secured (Fygetakis, 1992; Rovig, 2008). Recent findings also suggest a positive relationship between dollars raised and a dedicated development officer for student affairs fundraising (Rovig, 2008). Additional strategies or approaches identified as linked to success align with Rosso's general fundraising best practices (Seiler, 2003), and include supporting institutional goals (Sonn, 2010), researching donor prospects, hosting stewardship events, establishing development and fundraising advisory boards, and maintaining a donor prospect database (Crowe, 2011).

Crowe (2011) discovered an overall increase in student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising practices when examining large, 4-year, public institutions. The researcher recommended extending the study to examine private institutions. Similarly, Sonn (2010) recommended a comprehensive study to examine student affairs' involvement in fundraising at private institutions after examining successful programs at a select number of private institutions. Both suggested that this line of inquiry would enrich the literature by offering comparative, national data for both immediate use and as a checkpoint for longitudinal

examination of the evolution of student affairs development and fundraising. This study will attempt to accomplish that aspiration.

Chapter Summary

A review of the history of American higher education reveals an evolution paralleling the shifting ideals of the country. Institutions of higher education began as a forum for advancing the work of the church. Today, the varied missions of colleges and universities represent the diversity of thought that characterizes the United States. Despite these sweeping changes, private institutions remain essential to the strength and vitality of higher education in America.

Whether private or public, American colleges and universities rely on private gifts to support their missions and to ensure institutional survival. Giving to higher education began as a simple transaction prompted by an individual's desire to support the institution by whatever means that individual chose. Today, strategic plans educate prospective donors about the needs of an institution and cultivate movement toward a gift in support of those needs. The complexity now inherent in development and fundraising has prompted a growing body of literature for the field, yet most remains grounded in experience rather than research.

Similar to the evolution of American higher education, student affairs continues to transform itself to meet the shifting needs of institutions and their students. Student affairs began as a way to deliver disparate services to students. Today, student affairs attempts to promote student learning through the support of institutional missions and goals. While dedicated to the guiding philosophy of student learning, student affairs is also prepared to support higher education as institutional goals shift toward survival through external funding.

Student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising is a relatively recent practice. Due to its emerging status, little research currently exists around this topic. The

majority of what does exist points to the rationale for student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. Some research examines the extent to which student affairs is involved, but it is limited in scope. This study extends that baseline knowledge.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter begins with a review of the research design selected for this study. The design is followed by a description of the process, participant selection, data collection, instrumentation, and data analysis methods utilized. The chapter concludes by addressing limitations of the research.

Design

Quantitative designs allow researchers to explore a topic by measuring variables and using statistical analysis to make inferences (Creswell, 2009; Gay & Airasian, 2003). The quantitative approach does not seek to understand the reasoning behind a topic or phenomenon; it simply intends to describe the situation (Tuckman, 1994). Since the purpose of this study was to identify and describe student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising at private institutions, a quantitative design was employed.

The quantitative strategy that best aligned with the purpose of this study is a survey method. Designed to gather responses for questions that explore the problem or topic, surveys provide an economical solution to obtaining data from a large sample in a relatively short time period (Creswell, 2009). A survey strategy provided an opportunity to conduct this study on a national level.

Process

This study builds upon previous research conducted to identify student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising at large, public institutions (Crowe, 2011). To

ensure appropriate comparison across the two data sets, the process used in this study mimics the former study's process. A professional courtesy call to the original researcher confirmed approval to replicate the study at private institutions (P. Crowe, personal communication, April 6, 2012).

A questionnaire designed to be completed by senior student affairs officers was administered at private institutions throughout the United States. Descriptive data gathered from the questionnaire provided information related to common student development and fundraising practices at private institutions. Examining relationships among the descriptive data provided opportunities to make inferences about practices that are most effective in terms of dollars raised. Finally, comparing the descriptive data from this study of private institutions with the data formerly collected by Crowe (2011) at public institutions lends insight into the differences between student affairs development and fundraising practices at private and public institutions.

Sample

The population for this study included all 4-year, non-profit, private institutions in the United States with a division of student affairs. Proprietary institutions were excluded from this study due to their funding structures that minimize the need to secure private gifts. A purposive sample of the population was selected to align with the former study. Considered non-probability sampling, a purposive sample gives the researcher an opportunity to explore the topic with a sample that meets a predefined set of characteristics (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

According to the Carnegie Classification System of Higher Education, institutions of higher education reside in one of five categories: very small institutions with less than 500 students enrolled, small institutions with enrollments between 500 and 1,999; medium institutions with enrollments between 2,000 and 4,999; large institutions with enrollments

between 5,000 and 9,999; and very large institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more students (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.). This study intended to compare the data collected with data collected from a study of large and very large public institutions. Since very small and small private institutions tend to have organizational structures unlike those found at large and very large public universities, they were not included in the population. Therefore, this study included only medium, large, and very large private institutions.

The defining characteristics of the purposive sample for this study included senior student affairs officers at medium, large, and very large, private, not-for-profit institutions granting baccalaureate or advanced graduate degrees. The sample was identified by cross-referencing the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) directory and official institutional directories. The NCES database generated a list of 385 institutions meeting the qualifications of the purposive sample. It is important to note that the database generated a list that included institutions with enrollments exceeding 2,500 students. Therefore, medium institutions with enrollments between 2,000 and 2,500 were not included. Puerto Rican institutions were removed from the list since Puerto Rico does not currently hold statehood within the United States, bringing the number of institutions to 368. The list was checked against official institutional directories to obtain the names, titles, and contact information of senior student affairs officers. In 14 cases, institutions were removed from the list because a senior student affairs officer could not be located or contact information was unavailable. The final sample included 354 institutions, resulting in N=354 for this study.

Data Collection

A questionnaire administered through the Qualtrics web-based survey system was used to collect data. A web-based questionnaire was ideal because (a) the sample for the study was

large, (b) the sample list was well-defined, (c) an interaction with the respondent was not necessary or desired, and (d) a timely response was preferred (Evans & Mathur, 2005). By administering the questionnaire via an online system, responding to the study became more convenient for the participants given their multitude of responsibilities and limited time.

An initial email was sent to all selected participants (Appendix A). The email included an introduction to the study, an invitation to participate, a web link to the questionnaire, a deadline for completion, and an offer to receive a copy of the research results upon completion. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire within three weeks.

Upon completion, participants received information directing them to email the researcher should they wish to obtain a copy of the study results. Since this information was available only after the participant had completed the study, these individuals were not included in reminder emails. With the exception of these individuals, reminder emails were sent to everyone on the initial list because no individually identifiable information was collected from respondents making it unfeasible to distinguish between those who had and had not completed the questionnaire.

Reminder emails were sent at the beginning of the second and the middle of the third week of data collection to remind recipients of the opportunity to participate. The reminders asked those who had already completed the questionnaire to disregard the email and provided an opportunity for them to opt out of any future emails. After the third week of data collection, the study was extended an extra week in hopes of increasing the response rate. As a result, a fourth and final email was sent two days prior to the close of the study.

A total of 81 participants responded, but only 66 completed the questionnaire by selecting "submit responses for inclusion in the study" on the final question. Analysis included all

respondents who completed the questionnaire, resulting in n=66 for this study. The final response rate was 18.6% with 66 of 354 potential participants included in the study.

Confidentiality and Security

Prior to entering the questionnaire, participants reviewed a cover letter that included participant rights, risks of participation, and a warning related to security threats associated with electronic communications (Appendix B). All responses were stored in a dedicated, password-protected folder hosted by the Qualtrics system.

Within two months of the conclusion of data collection, all data was removed from the Qualtrics system. The data resided in a password protected electronic file on the researcher's computer. No IP addresses of respondents were retained after the data is migrated to the researcher's files.

Instrumentation

A locally designed instrument created to identify development and fundraising practices within student affairs at public institutions was used for this study (Appendix C). The author of that instrument granted permission to utilize the instrument (P. Crowe, personal communication, April 6, 2012). Divided into six sections, the instrument measures six major sets of variables: (a) institutional profile and organizational arrangements, (b) preparation for development and fundraising, (c) student affairs priorities and monies raised, (d) development and fundraising practices, (e) relationship with institutional advancement staff, and (f) challenges and needs.

The section on institutional profile and organizational arrangement includes questions related to institutional characteristics, institutional engagement in a capital campaign, locus of development and fundraising control, and student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. Per the questionnaire author's recommendation, an additional question was

included to better measure organizational arrangement (P. Crowe, personal communication, April 6, 2012). Additionally, the question related to state contributions was reworded to reflect the funding structure of private institutions. The section on preparation for development and fundraising includes questions related to previous experience, types of training and preparation utilized, and intentions related to division-specific training. The section on student affairs priorities and monies raised includes questions related to programs and activities identified as fundraising priorities, estimates on private gifts secured, and overall fundraising success. The section on development and fundraising practices identifies twenty-four activities typically associated with development and fundraising and asks participants to indicate which activities they utilize. The section on relationship with institutional advancement staff includes scales to measure various aspects of the relationship between institutional advancement and student affairs, in addition to an overall assessment of the relationship. Finally, the open-ended comments/responses section asks participants about challenges and needs, and provides opportunity for comments on any topic related to student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising.

Validity

Face and content validity describe the extent to which the questions measure the intended concepts (Gay & Airasian, 2003). Expert examination of question selection establishes content validity. Similarly, agreement from numerous experts related to appropriate instrument design and question selection establishes face validity. The author of the instrument established face and content validity of the questionnaire by consulting an expert panel and piloting the instrument with the same sample.

Data Analysis

Three statistical analysis methods were utilized based on each research question. The methods included descriptive analysis to generate summaries, chi-square tests to estimate interdependence of selected variables, and chi-square tests and t-tests to compare data collected at private and public institutions. In order to compare data collected at private and public institutions, the researcher from the original study shared the raw data collected at public institutions. An alpha level of .05 determined significance for all statistical tests in this study; further analysis included examination at alpha levels of .01 and .001 to determine whether further levels of significance emerged.

Research questions (RQ) and corresponding null hypotheses (H_0) were analyzed as follows.

RQ1: To what extent do student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities?

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for questions related to student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising (questions 7-13).

RQ2: What models, approaches, and practices are most common for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in development and fundraising practices?

Frequencies and percentages were calculated for questions related to locus of development and fundraising control (questions 14-17), as well as all questions in the major variable categories of preparation for development and fundraising (questions 18-22), development and fundraising practices (question 26a-x), and relationship with institutional advancement staff (questions 27a-q and 28). Additionally, means were calculated for variables related to relationship with institutional advancement staff (questions 27a-28). Chi-square tests

examined the relationships between development and fundraising practices (questions 26a-x) and (a) institutional size (question 3), (b) institutional mission (question 4), and (c) organizational model (question 17).

RQ3: What models, approaches, and practices are most successful for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in fundraising and development activities, as estimated by average dollars raised?

Chi-square tests examined the relationships between all fundraising practices (questions 26a-x) and measure of success in terms of dollars generated (question 24).

RQ4: Does the relationship between institutional advancement and student affairs differ at private and public institutions?

$H_0$1: There will be no differences in the locus of organizational control of development and fundraising.

Chi-square tests were conducted for questions regarding locus of organizational control (questions 14-17).

$H_0$2: There will be no differences in relationship with institutional advancement staff.

Chi-square and t-tests were conducted for questions regarding relationship with institutional advancement staff (questions 27a-q and 28).

RQ5: Do models, approaches, and practices differ between student affairs units at private and public institutions?

$H_0$1: There will be no differences in the level of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising.

Chi-square tests were conducted for questions regarding student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising (questions 7-13).

$H_0$2: There will be no difference in development and fundraising preparation.

Chi-square tests were conducted for questions regarding development and fundraising preparation (questions 18-22).

$H_0$3: There will be no difference in development and fundraising practices utilized.

Chi-square tests were conducted for questions regarding development and fundraising practices (questions 26a-x).

Limitations of Study

The primary limitation of any quantitative study resides in its purpose to seek description rather than explanation. Through analytical statistics, this study reports on the extent to which student affairs is involved in development and fundraising and attempted to find relationships among the variables. While these statistics are important in moving forward this line of research, they do not reveal any underlying explanation.

Utilizing a purposive sample also limits the study. Enrollment of 2,500 or more students is required for inclusion in this study's sample. This represents approximately twenty-five percent of the over 1,600 private, non-profit institutions of higher education in the United States. Institutions of smaller sizes are likely to have much different staffing models and institutional involvement in development and fundraising. Therefore, the results of this study are only representative of the selected sample.

Response bias may influence the generalizability of the study. Those with a great interest in the topic may be more apt to complete the questionnaire than those with little interest. Furthermore, some may find the topic irrelevant and ignore the study. Response bias could have affected the results, making it difficult to know if the results are representative of the selected

sample. Generalizability is further compromised by utilizing a questionnaire without established reliability.

Finally, the comparisons for the original and current study were made based on self-reports of different periods of time. The original study asked participants to respond for the 5-year period of 2002-2007. This study asked participants to respond for the 5-year period of 2007-2012. Differences in the national economy and giving patterns during these time-periods may have affected the results.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purposes of this study were to (a) identify the extent to which student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities, (b) identify common development and fundraising models, approaches, and practices in student affairs units at private institutions, (c) identify fundraising and development activities in student affairs units at private institutions that are most successful in terms of average dollars raised, (d) determine whether there is a difference between development and fundraising activities in student affairs units at private and public institutions, and (e) determine whether successful development and fundraising activities in student affairs units differ between private and public institutions.

This chapter provides detailed results of data collected from 66 senior student affairs officers at medium, large, and very large private, not-for-profit institutions of higher education regarding their divisions' involvement in fundraising and development practices. Specifically, this chapter includes statistical analysis of questions designed to address five research questions:

- RQ1: To what extent do student affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities?
- RQ2: What models, approaches, and practices are most common for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in development and fundraising practices?
- RQ3: What models, approaches, and practices are most successful for those student affairs units at private institutions that engage in fundraising and development activities, as estimated by average dollars raised?

- RQ4: Does the relationship between institutional advancement and student affairs differ at private and public institutions?
- RQ5: Do models, approaches, and practices differ between student affairs units at private and public institutions?

Respondent Characteristics

A total of 354 senior students affairs officers at private, not-for-profit institutions of higher education in the United States enrolling 2,500 or more students received invitations to participate in this study. Of that sample, 66 respondents completed the questionnaire. Instructions for the questionnaire indicated that only the senior student affairs officers should respond, yet a different individual completed the questionnaire in three cases. One of these individuals identified as the institutions' Executive Director of Student Services and Dean of Students and another as the institution's Associate Dean of Students. The third did not disclose a title. Analysis included data collected from these individuals.

Respondents represented institutions located in 24 states, including California (8), Colorado (1), Connecticut (1), District of Columbia (1), Florida (5), Illinois (2), Indiana (2), Iowa (3), Kentucky (1), Louisiana (1), Massachusetts (6), Michigan (3), Minnesota (2), Missouri (2), New Jersey (1), New York (8), Ohio (6), Oklahoma (1), Pennsylvania (7), Rhode Island (2), South Carolina (1), Texas (3), Tennessee (1), Wisconsin (3).

To generate a profile of the represented institutions, the questionnaire included items related to institutional size, mission, and percentage of funding coming from tuition and fees. Table 1 presents frequencies for the population, study sample, and return sample by institutional size and mission. Table 2 presents funding information by institutional size and mission.

The majority of respondents work for medium (2,500-9,999) institutions (80.3%) with missions not centered on research (76.9%). Cross-referencing institutional size of the population, study sample, and return sample reveals that the return sample is generally representative of the population and study sample.

Table 1

NCES, NCES with SSAO Identified, and Return Sample Institutional Characteristics

	NCES (N=368)		NCES with SSAO Identified (N=354)		Return Sample (N=66)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Institutional Size						
Medium	309	84	298	84.2	53	80.3
Large	59	16	56	15.8	13	19.7
Institutional Mission						
Major Research	—	—	—	—	15	23.1
Other	—	—	—	—	50	76.9

Note: NCES: National Center for Education Statistics; SSAO: Senior Student Affairs Officer. Carnegie Classification sizes of large and very large collapsed into one category defined as large due to the limited number of very large institutions represented in the study and return samples. Institutional Size: medium (2,500-9,999); large (10,000+). —: data not available in NCES report used to define the sample.

Regardless of institutional size and mission, the majority of respondents relied on tuition and fees to fund more than 60% of their institutional budget (87.9%). Among the medium institutions, the vast majority reported generating over 60% of their budget from tuition and fees (90.6%) with only one institution receiving less than 30% of the institutional budget from tuition and fees (1.9%). Among the large institutions, none reported receiving less than 30% of the budget from tuition and fees, with the majority generating more than 60% from tuition and fees (76.9%). An examination of the relationship between institutional size and tuition and fee funding indicates no significant difference [$\chi^2(2, N = 66) = 2.840, p = .242$].

While the majority of both research institutions and those with other missions generated 60% or more of their funding from tuition and fees, major research institutions did so at a lower frequency (66.7%) than institutions focused on other missions (94%). An examination of the relationship between institutional mission and tuition and fee funding indicated that funding significantly differed between major research institutions and those with missions focused elsewhere [$\chi^2(2, N = 65) = 8.893, p = .012$].

Table 2

Tuition and Fees Funding for Return Sample by Institutional Size and Mission

	Up to 30% %	31-60% %	Over 60% %	df	X^2
Institutional Size					
Medium (N=53)	1.9	7.5	90.6	2	2.840
Large (N=13)	0	23.1	76.9		
Institutional Mission					
Major Research (N=15)	6.7	26.7	66.7	2	8.893*
Other (N=50)	0	6	94		

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Research Question One

To what extent do Student Affairs units at private institutions engage in development and fundraising activities?

The questionnaire contained seven questions designed to understand institutional and student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. The first set of questions addressed institutional capital campaigns. Tables 3 and 4 include frequencies and percentages of involvement in capital campaigns by institutional size and by institutional mission. Table 5 presents frequencies and percentages for the second set of questions, which focus on the individual responsible for student affairs fundraising.

Almost three-quarters of participants reported that their institutions engaged in a capital campaign in the previous five years (71.2%). The majority of institutions established goals up to $199 million (65.3%), with the most frequently reported capital campaign goal ranging between $100 million and $199 million (19.6%). Of those participants that responded to a prompt regarding students affairs inclusion in the capital campaign (N=44), more than half reported that campaign goals included student affairs priorities (68.2%). All of the 21 institutions reporting campaign goals of less than $100 million were medium institutions with missions focused outside of research. All six of the institutions reporting campaign goals of $1billion or more were major research institutions.

Table 3

Institutional Capital Campaign Initiatives by Institutional Size

	Medium		Large		Total
	N	%	N	%	%
Institutional Capital Campaign (N=66)	37	56.1	10	15.2	71.2
Approx. Campaign Goal (N=46)					
$1B or more	2		4		13
$500M-$999M	1		3		8.7
$200M-$499M	4		2		13
$100M-$199M	8		1		19.6
$75M-$99M	3		0		6.5
$50M-$74M	3		0		6.5
$25M-$49M	9		0		19.6
Less than $25M	6		0		13
Student Affairs included in Campaign (N=44)	24	54.5	6	13.6	68.2

Table 4

Institutional Capital Campaign Initiatives by Institutional Mission

	Major Research		Other		Total
	N	%	N	%	%
Institutional Capital Campaign (N=66)	11	16.7	36	54.5	71.2
Approx. Campaign Goal (N=46)					
$1B or more	6		0		13
$500M-$999M	3		1		8.7
$200M-$499M	1		5		13
$100M-$199M	1		8		19.6
$75M-$99M	0		3		6.5
$50M-$74M	0		3		6.5
$25M-$49M	0		9		19.6
Less than $25M	0		6		13
Student Affairs included in Campaign (N=44)	7	23.3	23	76.7	68.2

Slightly less than half of the respondents reported that institutional advancement assigned a development officer to assist with student affairs development and fundraising (42.4%). Very few of the institutions represented in this study employ a fundraiser in student affairs (6.1%). A slightly higher number of respondents indicated plans to hire a fundraiser dedicated to student affairs priorities within the next five years (15.4%).

Senior student affairs officers and institutional advancement officers are the most frequently reported primary fundraisers for divisions of student affairs, with 45.5% reporting the senior student affairs officer and 31.8% reporting the institutional advancement officer. Only one institution (1.5%) reported a dedicated student affairs development officer as the primary fundraiser. Of the ten respondents reporting a primary fundraiser other than those listed, two indicated that development and fundraising was a joint partnership between the division and institutional advancement, one reported that the institution's athletic director served as the

primary fundraiser, five indicated that their division of student affairs does not engage in fundraising activities, and two did not provide clarification.

Table 5

Primary Fundraiser in Student Affairs (N=66)

	N	%
Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO)	30	45.5
Associate or Assistant SSAO	2	3
Department Head or Director	2	3
Institutional Advancement Officer	21	31.8
Student Affairs Development Officer	1	1.5
Other	10	15.2

More than half of the respondents indicated capital campaign activity at their institutions within the past five years, but just over one-third reported that student affairs priorities had been included in those campaigns. Generally, the respondents' student affairs divisions did not employ a dedicated fundraiser. The most frequently reported primary fundraiser for student affairs was the senior student affairs officer.

Research Question Two

What models, approaches, and practices are most common for those Student Affairs units at private institutions that engage in development and fundraising practices?

An analysis of responses to questions related to organizational model, preparation and training for development and fundraising, relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement, and development and fundraising activities produced a portrait of common models, approaches, practices utilized in student affairs.

Models

Categories of organizational model include decentralized (student affairs maintains locus of control), centralized (institutional advancement maintains locus of control), or collaborative (control and responsibility is shared). Organizational model was examined in terms of selection, hiring, funding, and reporting responsibilities.

Table 6 presents frequencies and percentages of organizational model used for selection, hiring, funding, and reporting of the staff member responsible for student affairs development and fundraising. Table 7 includes information related to organizational model by institutional size, and Table 8 presents similar information by institutional mission.

In all four categories examined, the most frequently reported model was a centralized model. Half (50%) reported that institutional advancement selected the individual responsible for development and fundraising, while 26.5% reported student affairs and 23.5% reported a joint responsibility for selection. Nearly two-thirds reported that hiring authority resides in institutional advancement (62.5%), followed respectively by student affairs (28.1%) and a joint arrangement (9.4%). Over three-quarters (76.7%) reported that funding for student affairs development and fundraising came from the institutional advancement office. Another 23.3% reported funding from student affairs. No respondents reported a joint responsibility for funding. Reporting frequencies closely aligned with the frequencies reported for hiring authority, with 61.3% reporting institutional advancement as responsible, 25.8% reporting student affairs as responsible, and 12.9% reporting a joint responsibility.

Table 6

Selection, Hiring, Funding, and Reporting of Staff Member Responsible for Student Affairs Development and Fundraising

	Selection (N=34)		Hiring (N=32)		Funding (N=30)		Reporting (N=31)	
Organizational Model	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student Affairs	9	26.5	9	28.1	7	23.3	8	25.8
IA	17	50	20	62.5	23	76.7	19	61.3
Joint	8	23.5	3	9.4	0	0	4	12.9

Note: IA: Institutional Advancement; Hiring includes both full-time and part-time appointments.

Medium and large institutions did not significantly differ in the organizational model used for selection, hiring, funding, and reporting responsibilities. In terms of institutional mission, the organizational model used for hiring responsibility significantly differed between research institutions and those with mission focused elsewhere [$\chi^2(3, N = 32) = 9.052, p = .029$].

Table 7

Selection, Hiring, Funding, and Reporting of Staff Member Responsible for Student Affairs Development and Fundraising by Institutional Size

	Medium		Large			
	N	%	N	%	df	X^2
Selection (N=34)					2	1.108
By Student Affairs	8	30.8	1	12.5		
By Institutional Advancement	12	46.2	5	62.5		
Joint	6	23.1	2	25		
Hiring (N=32)					3	5.148
Full-time Student Affairs	8	32	1	14.3		
Part-time Student Affairs	0	0	0	0		
Full-time Institutional Advancement	16	64	4	57.1		
Part-time Institutional Advancement	0	0	0	0		
Full-time joint	1	4	1	14.3		
Part-time joint	0	0	1	14.3		
Funding (N=30)					1	.418
By Student Affairs	6	26.1	1	14.3		
By Institutional Advancement	17	73.9	6	85.7		
Joint	0	0	0	0		
Reporting (N=31)					2	2.211
To Student Affairs	7	29.2	1	14.3		
To Institutional Advancement	15	62.5	4	57.1		
Joint	2	8.3	2	28.6		

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Table 8

Selection, Hiring, and Funding of Staff Member Responsible for Student Affairs Development and Fundraising by Institutional Mission

	Major Research		Other			
	N	%	N	%	df	X^2
Selection (N=34)					2	3.085
By Student Affairs	1	10	8	33.3		
By IA	5	50	12	50		
Joint	4	40	4	16.7		
Hiring (N=32)					3	9.052*
Full-time Student Affairs	1	11.1	8	34.8		
Part-time Student Affairs	0	0	0	0		
Full-time IA	5	55.6	15	65.2		
Part-time IA	0	0	0	0		
Full-time joint	2	22.2	0	0		
Part-time joint	1	11.1	0	0		
Funding (N=30)					1	1.074
By Student Affairs	1	11.1	6	28.6		
By IA	8	88.9	15	71.4		
Joint	0	0	0	0		
Reporting (N=31)					2	5.232
To Student Affairs	1	11.1	7	31.8		
To IA	5	55.6	14	66.7		
Joint	3	33.3	1	4.5		

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Approaches

To determine common approaches to fundraising, the questionnaire included items related to training and preparation of the individual responsible for student affairs fundraising and relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement staff.

Training and preparation. Table 9 presents frequencies and percentages of training and preparation for student affairs fundraising, with Table 10 presenting the same items by institutional size and Table 11 presenting the items by institutional mission. Table 12 reports on frequencies of specific training and preparation activities utilized by respondents' institutions.

A majority of respondents indicated previous experience in development and fundraising or some level of knowledge as a prerequisite for employment (62.5%). Further, 78.1% of respondents reported that the staff member responsible for student affairs development and fundraising received training or preparation in order to fulfill their role. Half of the respondents (50%) reported sharing development and fundraising training and preparation with division department heads, and 50% indicated plans to implement training within the next five years. A chi-square test examining training and preparation by institutional size revealed no significant differences between medium and large institutions. Similarly, no significant differences emerged based on institutional mission.

Table 9

Training and Preparation for Student Affairs Fundraising (N=32)

	N	%
Experience/knowledge required for responsible staff	20	62.5
Responsible staff received training/preparation	25	78.1
Training/preparation shared with Student Affairs department heads	16	50
Future plans to implement training	16	50

Table 10

Fundraising Training/Preparation Activities by Institutional Size (N=31)

	Medium		Large			
	N	%	N	%	df	X^2
Experience/knowledge required for responsible staff	15	65.2	5	62.5	1	.019
Responsible staff received training/preparation	18	78.3	7	87.5	1	.325
Training/preparation shared with Student Affairs department heads	12	54.5	4	44.4	1	.261
Future plans to implement training	11	50	5	55.6	1	.079

Table 11

Fundraising Training/Preparation Activities by Institutional Mission (N=31)

	Major Research		Other			
	N	%	N	%	df	X^2
Experience/knowledge required for responsible staff	7	77.8	13	59.1	1	.974
Responsible staff received training/preparation	9	100	16	72.7	1	3.044
Training/preparation shared with Student Affairs department heads	5	55.6	11	52.4	1	.026
Future plans to implement training	5	55.6	11	52.4	1	.026

Professional workshops or institutes about development and fundraising were the most commonly reported training and preparation activity (N=19). Consultation with other practitioners, on-the-job training, and training from institutional advancement staff were the next most commonly reported, with 17 participants reporting engaging in each. The third most commonly reported training and preparation activity was reading books, articles, and published research (N=12). The two respondents who selected "other" were uncertain of the specific training and preparation activities utilized.

Table 12

Training and Preparation Activities for Student Affairs Fundraising

Training/preparation activities	N	Rank
Credit-bearing fundraising/development courses	6	
Professional workshops/institutes	19	1
Books, articles, published research	12	3
Consultation with other practitioners	17	2
Professional student affairs conference presentations	6	
On-the-job training	17	2
From institutional advancement staff	17	2
Other	2	

Relationship. To gauge student affairs relationship with institutional advancement, participants responded to a series of relationship indicators on a six-point scale with one indicating strong agreement and six indicating strong disagreement. Additionally, respondents rated the strength of the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement on a scale ranging from excellent to non-existent. Table 13 provides descriptive statistics for the relationship indicators, including means and standard deviations.

Participants generally indicated that trust ($\bar{x}$=2.34) rather than tension ($\bar{x}$=4.71) existed between student affairs and institutional advancement offices on their campuses. They further reported that some level of communication occurred, by generally disagreeing that no communication occurs between the offices ($\bar{x}$=5.00). Responses indicated that this communication tended to occur more through informal interactions ($\bar{x}$=2.47) than through formal channels ($\bar{x}$=3.41).

Respondents only somewhat agreed that the two offices assisted one another in raising funds for student affairs priorities, with a mean of 3.03 for institutional advancement assisting student affairs and a mean of 2.81 for student affairs assisting institutional advancement. Examining specific practices for student affairs fundraising revealed that respondents tended to neither agree nor disagree that the offices share responsibilities, with means ranging from 3.06 to 3.91. Similarly, participants neither agreed nor disagreed that the offices understood one another's work: respondents reported a mean of 2.86 for student affairs' understanding of institutional advancement and a mean of 3.38 for institutional advancement's understanding of student affairs.

In terms of the intended locus of control for development and fundraising responsibilities, respondents generally indicated that the responsibilities should be shared ($\bar{x}$=2.28). Furthermore,

they indicated that the sole responsibility should not lie solely within institutional advancement ($\bar{x}$=4.53) or within student affairs ($\bar{x}$=5.09).

Table 13

Relationship between Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement Staff

Relationship Indicator	N	Mean	SD
IA staff assists SA staff in development and fundraising efforts for SA priorities	64	3.03	1.380
SA staff assists IA staff in raising funds for SA	64	2.81	1.390
Trust exists between the IA and SA divisions	64	2.34	1.116
The IA staff encourages SA staff involvement in development and fundraising	64	3.28	1.578
Tension exists between the offices	63	4.71	1.250
President is supportive of development and fundraising efforts by staff in the SA division	61	2.82	1.478
IA staff members share current development and fundraising information with SA staff	64	3.06	1.457
Prospect data (e.g. donor databases) are shared	64	3.91	1.498
Solicitations are shared between SA and IA	64	3.80	1.503
IA staff members understand the roles of SA staff and how they contribute to fundraising	63	3.38	1.325
SA staff members understand the roles of IA staff in university development and fundraising	64	2.86	1.283
Communication occurs formally	64	3.41	1.433
Communication occurs informally	64	2.47	1.126
Communication between does not occur at all	64	5	1.084
The IA office should have sole responsibility for SA development and fundraising priorities	64	4.53	1.154
Fundraising and development responsibilities for SA should be shared between the offices	64	2.28	1.105
SA should have sole responsibility for SA development and fundraising priorities	64	5.09	.938

Note: SA: Student Affairs; IA: Institutional Advancement.

On average, respondents perceived the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement to be good ($\bar{x}$=2.34, SD=.747). No significant differences in strength of the relationship appeared in terms of institutional mission $\chi^2(3, N = 64) = 1.454, p = .693$.

However, strength in relationship significantly differed between medium and large institutions $\chi^2(6, N = 65) = 16.996, p = .009$.

Practices

Participants' responses related to specific development and fundraising activities provides a description of practices utilized by student affairs. Table 14 presents the frequency with which institutions engaged in or intended to engage in identified development and fundraising activities. Data appears in order of most to least commonly practiced activities. Tables 15 and 16 report this information by institutional size and mission, respectively.

Respondents reported that the most frequently practiced development and fundraising activities included collaboration with institutional advancement staff (N=47), application for federal, state, or local government grants (N=46), solicitation of funds from private donors (N=43), and application for private grants (N=41). The least frequently reported activities that institutions engaged in included creation of an advisory board (N=2); inclusion of housing/residence life staff (N=4), health services staff (N=4), and student activities staff (N=7); involving former employees (N=7); and creation of a database of donors (N=8). Two of the least frequently reported practiced activities were the most frequently reported intended activities, with 36 respondents reporting future plans to create an advisory board and 35 reporting future plans to involve former employees in fundraising initiatives.

Table 14

Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Activities

	Yes		No, but plan to	
	N	%	N	%
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff	47	83.9	9	16.1
Applied for government grants for priorities	46	80.7	11	19.3
Sought private donations for priorities	43	79.6	11	20.4
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities	41	73.2	15	26.8
Involved in capital campaign	39	76.5	12	23.5
Attended institutional advancement meetings	36	72.0	14	28.0
Involved current students	30	66.7	15	33.3
Educated current students about philanthropy	30	58.8	21	41.2
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives	29	60.4	19	39.6
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors	25	54.3	21	45.7
Made an "ask"	25	54.3	21	45.7
Articulated division fundraising priorities	24	43.6	31	56.4
Created documents about fundraising priorities	21	40.4	31	59.6
Attended training and professional development	18	38.3	29	61.7
Included career services staff	17	43.6	22	56.4
Researched prospective donors	15	36.6	26	63.4
Coordinated stewardship events	15	35.7	27	64.3
Coordinated staff development activities	11	24.4	34	75.6
Created a database of donors	8	21.1	30	78.9
Included student activities staff	7	20	28	80
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives	7	16.7	35	83.3
Included health services staff	4	11.8	30	88.2
Included housing/residence life staff	4	11.1	32	88.9
Created an advisory board	2	5.3	36	94.7

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Medium and large institutions did not significantly differ in their practiced or intended fundraising activities. Significant differences emerged when examining the activities by institutional mission. Specific activities that differed by institutional mission included involving alumni in fundraising initiatives [$\chi^2(1, N = 48) = 5.548, p = .019$]; asking a donor for funding support [$\chi^2(1, N = 46) = 7.789, p = .005$]; articulating division fundraising priorities [$\chi^2(1, N = 55) = 4.534, p = .033$]; creating a database of donors [$\chi^2(1, N = 55) = 8.447, p = .004$]; and

involving a health services staff member in development and fundraising efforts [$\chi^2(1, N = 34) = 10.261, p = .001$].

Table 15

Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Activities by Institutional Size

	Medium	Large		
	%	%	df	X^2
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff (N=56)	83	88.9	1	0.196
Applied for government grants for priorities (N=57)	81.3	77.8	1	0.059
Sought private donations for priorities (N=54)	79.5	80	1	0.001
Involved in capital campaign (N=51)	81.4	50	1	3.695
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities (N=54)	73.9	70	1	0.064
Attended institutional advancement meetings (N=50)	72.5	70	1	0.025
Involved current students (N=45)	67.6	62.5	1	0.076
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives (N=48)	56.4	77.8	1	1.396
Educated current students about philanthropy (N=51)	61	50	1	0.400
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors (N=46)	54.1	55.6	1	0.007
Made an “ask” (N=46)	48.6	77.8	1	2.476
Included career services staff (N=39)	41.9	50	1	0.168
Articulated division fundraising priorities (N=55)	37.8	70	1	3.454
Created documents about fundraising priorities (N=52)	34.9	66.7	1	3.123
Attended training and professional development (N=47)	31.6	66.7	1	3.791
Researched prospective donors (N=41)	33.3	50	1	0.771
Coordinated stewardship events (N=42)	33.3	44.4	1	0.380
Coordinated staff development activities (N=45)	16.7	55.6	1	5.896
Created a database of donors (N=38)	13.3	50	1	5.109
Included student activities staff (N=35)	17.2	33.3	1	0.805
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives (N=42)	17.6	12.5	1	0.124
Included health services staff (N=34)	7.1	33.3	1	3.265
Included housing/residence life staff (N=36)	6.9	28.6	1	2.682
Created an advisory board (N=38)	3.2	14.3	1	1.401

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Table 16

Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Activities by Institutional Mission

	Major Research	Other		
	%	%	df	X^2
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff (N=56)	90.9	82.2	1	0.495
Applied for government grants for priorities (N=57)	91.7	77.8	1	1.173
Sought private donations for priorities (N=54)	92.3	75.6	1	1.697
Involved in capital campaign (N=51)	66.7	78.6	1	0.584
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities (N=54)	84.6	69.8	1	1.122
Attended institutional advancement meetings (N=50)	83.3	68.4	1	1.006
Involved current students (N=45)	70	65.7	1	0.064
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives (N=48)	90.9	51.4	1	5.548*
Educated current students about philanthropy (N=51)	54.5	60	1	0.106
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors (N=46)	63.6	51.4	1	0.503
Made an "ask" (N=46)	90.9	42.9	1	7.789**
Included career services staff (N=39)	55.6	40	1	0.681
Articulated division fundraising priorities (N=55)	69.2	35.7	1	4.534*
Created documents about fundraising priorities (N=52)	63.6	34.1	1	3.133
Attended training and professional development (N=47)	54.5	33.3	1	1.604
Researched prospective donors (N=41)	55.6	31.3	1	1.789
Coordinated stewardship events (N=42)	50	31.3	1	1.167
Coordinated staff development activities (N=45)	45.4	17.6	1	3.480
Created a database of donors (N=38)	55.6	33.3	1	8.447**
Included student activities staff (N=35)	16.7	20.7	1	0.050
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives (N=42)	22.2	15.2	1	0.255
Included health services staff (N=34)	50	10.7	1	10.261**
Included housing/residence life staff (N=36)	28.6	6.9	1	2.682
Created an advisory board (N=38)	0	6.5	1	0.477

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Table 17 presents development and fundraising activities by organizational model. As noted previously, organizational model was examined based on four areas of responsibility: selection, hiring, funding, and reporting. Reporting considers the locus of control for day-to-day activities and responsibilities. Since development and fundraising activities occur in day-to-day work, reporting was used to examine this relationship. No significant differences in current or intended development and fundraising activities emerged based on organizational model.

Table 17

Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Activities by Organizational Model

	SA	IA	Joint	df	X^2
	%	%	%		
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff (N=27)	87.5	93.3	100	2	0.635
Applied for government grants for priorities (N=29)	87.5	70.6	100	2	2.159
Sought private donations for priorities (N=28)	87.5	75	100	2	1.583
Involved in capital campaign (N=26)	100	64.3	75	2	3.668
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities (N=28)	62.5	75	100	2	2.000
Attended institutional advancement meetings (N=26)	75	71.4	75	2	0.042
Involved current students (N=25)	87.5	53.8	75	2	2.685
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives (N=24)	57.1	53.8	100	2	2.901
Educated current students about philanthropy (N=25)	57.1	64.3	75	2	0.353
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors (N=24)	50	58.3	75	2	0.686
Made an “ask” (N=24)	62.5	58.3	75	2	0.356
Included career services staff (N=21)	50	27.3	75	2	2.903
Articulated division fundraising priorities (N=27)	50	40	100	2	4.569
Created documents about fundraising priorities (N=25)	37.5	38.5	100	2	5.161
Attended training and professional development (N=24)	57.1	38.5	75	2	1.835
Researched prospective donors (N=25)	37.5	46.2	75	2	1.539
Coordinated stewardship events (N=24)	42.9	23.1	75	2	3.64
Coordinated staff development activities (N=25)	28.6	14.3	75	2	5.69
Created a database of donors (N=22)	28.6	27.3	75	2	3.157
Included student activities staff (N=20)	14.3	30	33.3	2	0.673
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives (N=24)	14.3	23.1	25	2	0.264
Included health services staff (N=20)	0	20	33.3	2	2.222
Included housing/residence life staff (N=21)	14.3	18.2	0	2	0.636
Created an advisory board (N=22)	0	16.7	0	2	1.833

* p < .05. ** p <.01. *** p <.001.

Most respondents reported that development and fundraising for student affairs falls within the purview of institutional advancement, defined as a centralized model. Regardless of the organizational model, a majority reported that previous experience or knowledge of development and fundraising is a requirement for the primary fundraiser and that the individual responsible for student affairs fundraising engaged in training and preparation activities. When asked about the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement, respondents tended to perceive a positive relationship and generally agreed that development and fundraising for student affairs should be a shared responsibility. The most frequently reported student affairs development and fundraising activities included collaboration with institutional advancement staff, solicitation of government grants, solicitation of private donations, and solicitation of private grants. In terms of intended development and fundraising practices, respondents most frequently reported future plans to create an advisory board and to involve former employees.

Hiring responsibility emerged as the only significant difference related to organizational model. In terms of approach, the data revealed no significant differences in relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement by institutional size or mission. However, the perceived strength in relationship significantly differed between medium and large institutions. Significant differences in practices emerged as function of institutional mission, but none appeared in terms of institutional size or organizational model.

Research Question Three

What models, approaches, and practices are most successful for those Student Affairs units at private institutions that engage in fundraising and development activities, as estimated by average dollars raised?

To align with Crowe's original study of public institutions (2011), fundraising success was defined by dollars raised and divided into three categories of success: less than $500,000; $500,000 to $2.5 million; and more than $2.5 million. Table 18 provides data examining the relationship between specific fundraising activities and success in terms of dollars raised. A chi-square test indicated that involvement in a capital campaign was the only activity significantly associated with amount raised [$\chi^2(2, N = 44) = 9.065, p = .011$].

Table 18

Development and Fundraising Activities and Fundraising Success (dollars raised)

Identified Practice	1 %	2 %	3 %	df	X^2
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff (N=49)	66.7	87.5	95	2	5.704
Applied for government grants for priorities (N=48)	80	100	80	2	1.920
Sought private donations for priorities (N=45)	76.5	100	60	2	2.182
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities (N=48)	63.2	77.8	75	2	.920
Involved in capital campaign (N=44)	63.2	57.1	100	2	9.065*
Attended institutional advancement meetings (N=43)	75	100	58.8	2	4.514
Involved current students (N=38)	66.7	75	73.3	2	.239
Educated current students about philanthropy (N=43)	47.4	50	75	2	2.992
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives (N=41)	56.3	42.9	66.7	2	1.234
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors (N=39)	43.8	57.1	68.8	2	2.035
Made an "ask" (N=39)	50	37.5	73.3	2	3.178
Articulated division fundraising priorities (N=46)	36.8	57.1	5	2	1.575
Created documents about fundraising priorities (N=45)	36.8	28.6	42.1	2	.411
Attended training and professional development (N=40)	41.2	14.3	43.8	2	1.974
Included career services staff (N=32)	23.1	33.3	61.5	2	4.149
Researched prospective donors (N=34)	37.5	0	58.3	2	5.770
Coordinated stewardship events (N=36)	25	33.3	50	2	2.047
Coordinated staff development activities (N=38)	31.25	0	25	2	2.834
Created a database of donors (N=32)	25	0	30	2	2.158
Included student activities staff (N=29)	8.3	16.7	27.3	2	1.445
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives (N=35)	25	0	23.1	2	1.827
Included health services staff (N=28)	8.3	0	18.2	2	1.312
Included housing/residence life staff (N=30)	21.4	20	0	2	2.679
Created an advisory board (N=32)	7.1	0	0	2	1.327

Note: 1=<$500K; 2=$500K-$2.5M; 3=>$2.5M

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p <.001.

With the exception of involvement in an institutional capital campaign, specific fundraising activities did not significantly affect overall fundraising success.

Research Question Four

Does the relationship between institutional advancement and student affairs differ at private and public institutions?

In order to explore whether relationships between student affairs and institutional advancement differ at private and public institutions, data from this study was compared with data collected in Crowe's study (2011). Two null hypotheses guided this analysis: $H_0$1: There will be no differences in the locus of organizational control of development and fundraising; and $H_0$2: There will be no differences in relationship with institutional advancement staff.

Table 19 presents chi-square statistics for organizational model utilized. Earlier in this study, organizational model was examined in terms of selection, hiring, funding and reporting responsibilities. Since Crowe's study (2011) did not ask participants to respond to a question related to reporting, it is not included in the comparison.

Analysis required acceptance of the null hypothesis that there would be no difference in organizational model utilized at private and public institutions in terms of hiring responsibility. However, significant differences emerged in terms of selection [$\chi^2(2, N = 102) = 12.460, p = .002$] and funding [$\chi^2(2, N = 97) = 12.768, p = .002$], resulting in a rejection of the null for these two responsibilities.

Table 19

Differences in Organizational Model for Student Affairs Development and Fundraising between Private and Public Institutions

	Private	Public		
	%	%	df	X^2
Selection (N=102)			2	12.460**
By Student Affairs	26.5	32.3		
By Institutional Advancement	50	17.6		
Joint	23.5	50		
Hiring (N=100)			5	10.408
Full-time Student Affairs	28.1	38.2		
Part-time Student Affairs	0	0		
Full-time Institutional Advancement	62.5	32.4		
Part-time Institutional Advancement	0	2.9		
Full-time joint	6.3	14.7		
Part-time joint	3.1	2.9		
Funding (N=97)			2	12.768**
By Student Affairs	23.3	34.3		
By Institutional Advancement	76.7	41.8		
Joint	0	23.9		

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Table 20 presents mean scores of responses to a variety of relationship indicators at both private and public institutions. T-test results comparing the means between private and public institutions are also included. Mean scores and t-test results for perceptions of the strength of student affairs/institutional advancement relationship are found in Table 21. Prior to performing the t-tests, an examination of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances at an alpha level of .05 indicated that homogeneity of variances was assumed for all relationship indicators except the last prompt which measured the extent to which respondents agreed that student affairs should have sole responsibility for student affairs development and fundraising. Homogeneity of variances was also assumed when examining t-test results intended to measure differences in perceived strength of relationship.

Analysis of the data required rejection of the null hypothesis that there would be no differences in relationship with institutional advancement staff for five of the relationship indicators: institutional advancement staff encourages student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising [$t(167) = 2.749$, $p = .007$]; the institutional president is supportive of student affairs development and fundraising [$t(163) = 2.797$, $p = .006$]; prospect data is shared between student affairs and institutional advancement [$t(169) = 3.459$, $p = .001$]; solicitations are shared between student affairs and institutional advancement [$t(168) = 2.650$, $p = .009$]; and communication between student affairs and institutional advancement occurs informally [$t(166) = 2.948$, $p = .004$]. The null hypothesis stating there would be no difference in the student affairs/institutional advancement relationship between private and public institutions was upheld for all other relationship indicators and for perceived strength of the relationship.

Table 20

Differences in Student Affairs/Institutional Advancement Relationship between Private and Public Institutions

	Private			Public			T-Test Results		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
IA staff assists SA staff in development and fundraising efforts for SA priorities	64	3.03	1.380	107	2.64	1.334	1.810	169	.072
SA staff assists IA staff in raising funds for SA	64	2.81	1.390	106	2.53	1.347	1.317	168	.190
Trust exists between the IA and SA divisions	64	2.34	1.116	106	2.25	1.012	.591	168	.555
The IA staff encourages SA staff involvement in development and fundraising	64	3.28	1.578	105	2.65	1.373	2.749	167	.007*
Tension exists between the offices	63	4.71	1.250	104	4.79	1.103	-.400	165	.689
President is supportive of development and fundraising efforts by staff in the SA division	61	2.82	1.478	104	2.22	1.230	2.797	163	.006*
IA staff members share current development and fundraising information with SA staff	64	3.06	1.457	104	2.83	1.376	1.054	166	.293
Prospect data (e.g. donor databases) are shared	64	3.91	1.498	107	3.07	1.562	3.459	169	.001**
Solicitations are shared between SA and IA	64	3.80	1.503	106	3.17	1.489	2.650	168	.009*
IA staff members understand the roles of SA staff and how they contribute to fundraising	63	3.38	1.325	105	2.89	1.146	2.555	166	.012*
SA staff members understand the roles of IA staff in university development and fundraising	64	2.86	1.283	105	2.60	1.034	1.442	167	.151
Communication occurs formally	64	3.41	1.433	104	2.76	1.347	2.948	166	.004*
Communication occurs informally	64	2.47	1.126	106	2.45	1.303	.081	168	.935
Communication between does not occur at all	64	5	1.084	105	5.28	1.014	-1.673	167	.096
The IA office should have sole responsibility for SA development and fundraising priorities	64	4.53	1.154	105	4.73	1.546	-.903	167	.368
Fundraising and development responsibilities for SA should be shared between the offices	64	2.28	1.105	106	2.11	1.304	.861	168	.391
SA should have sole responsibility for SA development and fundraising priorities	64	5.09	.938	106	4.76	1.418	1.822	166.544	.100

Note: SA: Student Affairs; IA: Institutional Advancement.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 21

Differences in Perceived Strength of Student Affairs/Institutional Advancement Relationship between Private and Public Institutions

	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Private	65	2.06	.747	.245	163	.807
Public	100	2.03				

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Organizational models utilized at private and public institutions differed significantly in terms of selection and funding. Additionally, responses to relationship indicators from participants at private and public institutions significantly differed in terms of institutional advancement encouragement of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising, presidential support of student affairs development and fundraising, shared prospect data, shared solicitations, and informal communication between student affairs and institutional advancement. Respondents from public institutions generally agreed more strongly with the presence of each of these relationship indicators on their campuses.

Research Question Five

Do models, approaches, and practices differ between student affairs units at private and public institutions?

Chi-square and t-test analyses revealed whether models, approaches, and practices significantly differed between private and public institutions.

Involvement

Chi-square analysis examined whether significant differences emerged for student affairs' involvement in fundraising and development at private and public institutions. Table 22 presents the chi-square statistics for four aspects of involvement. No significant differences emerged in terms of inclusion in the last institutional campaign and plans to employ a student

affairs fundraiser within the next five years. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no differences in the level of involvement was retained for these aspects of involvement. The null hypothesis was rejected for the other two aspects of involvement: current employment of a student affairs fundraiser [$\chi^2(1, N = 176) = 25.933, p < .001$] and assignment of a student affairs development officer from institutional advancement [$\chi^2(1, N = 177) = 4.321, p = .038$].

Table 22

Differences in Student Affairs' Involvement in Development and Fundraising between Private and Public Institutions

	Private	Public		
	%	%	df	X^2
Student Affairs priorities included in last institutional capital campaign (N=119)	68.2	66.7	1	.029
Student Affairs employs a fundraiser (N=176)	6.1	41.8	1	25.933***
Student Affairs plans to employ a fundraiser within the next five years (N=129)	15.4	28.1	1	3.080
Institutional Advancement assigns a development officer to Student Affairs (N=177)	42.4	58.6	1	4.321*

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Student affairs units at private and public institutions significantly differed in their involvement in development and fundraising, specifically in terms of a current fundraiser employed by student affairs and the assignment of an institutional advancement development officer to student affairs. In both cases, respondents from public institutions reported higher frequencies than those from private institutions.

Training and Preparation

Table 23 presents chi-square statistics for four components of training and preparation for student affairs development and fundraising at private and public institutions. The data reveals

no significant differences between private and public institutions for the four training and preparation measures resulting in acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Table 23

Differences in Training and Preparation for Student Affairs Fundraising between Private and Public Institutions

	Private	Public		
	%	%	df	X^2
Experience/knowledge required for responsible staff (N=105)	64.5	67.6	1	.092
Responsible staff received training/preparation (N=105)	80.6	87.8	1	.923
Training/preparation shared w/ SA department heads (N=104)	51.6	69.9	1	3.162
Future plans to implement training (N=69)	51.6	52.6	1	.007

Note: SA: Student Affairs
* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Practices

In terms of specific development and fundraising activities utilized by student affairs units at private and public institutions, the null hypothesis stated there would be no differences in development and fundraising practices at private and public institutions. An analysis of chi-square statistics presented in Table 24 led to a rejection of the null for some activities and an acceptance of the null for others.

Significant differences between private and public institutions led to a rejection of the null for 11 activities. These included making an ask [$\chi^2(1, N = 141) = 13.291, p < .001$]; articulating division fundraising priorities [$\chi^2(1, N = 155) = 9.511, p = .002$]; creating documents about fundraising priorities [$\chi^2(1, N = 151) = 7.467, p = .006$]; attending training and professional development activities [$\chi^2(1, N = 141) = 15.263, p < .001$]; researching prospective donors [$\chi^2(1, N = 132) = 9.923, p = .002$]; coordinating stewardship events [$\chi^2(1, N = 131) =$

7.802, $p = .005$]; coordinating staff professional development activities [$\chi^2(1, N = 138) = 4.982, p = .026$]; creating a database of donors [$\chi^2(1, N = 128) = 13.639, p < .001$]; including student activities staff [$\chi^2(1, N = 115) = 5.924, p = .015$]; involving former employees in fundraising initiatives [$\chi^2(1, N = 123) = 14{,}287, p < .001$]; and creating an advisory board [$\chi^2(1, N = 125) = 9.244, p = .002$]. The null hypothesis was retained for the remaining 13 development and fundraising activities.

Table 24

Differences in Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Activities between Private and Public Institutions

	Private	Public		
	%	%	df	X^2
Collaborated with institutional advancement staff (N=157)	83.9	87.1	1	.306
Applied for government grants for priorities (N=157)	80.7	86	1	.761
Sought private donations for priorities (N=150)	79.6	80.2	1	.007
Solicited grants from non-government sources for priorities (N=152)	73.2	82.3	1	1.753
Involved in capital campaign (N=143)	76.5	69.6	1	.777
Attended institutional advancement meetings (N=144)	72	83	1	2.385
Involved current students (N=136)	66.7	56	1	1.411
Educated current students about philanthropy (N=140)	58.8	61.8	1	.120
Involved alumni in fundraising initiatives (N=140)	60.4	65.2	1	.314
Communicated fundraising priorities with donors (N=139)	54.3	66.7	1	1.995
Made an "ask" (N=141)	54.3	83.2	1	13.291***
Articulated division fundraising priorities (N=155)	43.6	69	1	9.511**
Created documents about fundraising priorities (N=151)	40.4	63.6	1	7.467**
Attended training and professional development (N=141)	38.3	72.3	1	15.263***
Included career services staff (N=123)	43.6	47.6	1	.174
Researched prospective donors (N=132)	36.6	65.9	1	9.923**
Coordinated stewardship events (N=131)	35.7	61.8	1	7.802**
Coordinated staff professional development activities (N=138)	24.4	44.1	1	4.982*
Created a database of donors (N=128)	21.1	56.7	1	13.639***
Included student activities staff (N=115)	20	43.8	1	5.924*
Involved former employees in fundraising initiatives (N=123)	16.7	51.9	1	14.287***
Included health services staff (N=111)	11.8	23.4	1	2.001
Included housing/residence life staff (N=115)	11.1	21.5	1	1.795
Created an advisory board (N=125)	5.3	29.9	1	9.244**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Private and public institutions differed significantly in terms of their utilization of almost half of the development and fundraising activities included in the questionnaire. For all

significantly different activities, respondents from public institutions more frequently reported engaging in the activity.

Open-Ended Responses/Comments

The last section of the questionnaire provided respondents with an opportunity to articulate their thoughts via three open-ended questions. A review of the responses generated themes in three general areas. This section describes those themes, with each supported by quoted remarks from participants.

Significant/Immediate Challenges for Participating Institutions

The first open-ended question asked participants to describe any significant or immediate challenges their division currently faced in relation to development and fundraising. Three themes emerged from the responses provided by 54 participants: (a) institutional structure and power, (b) insufficient resources, and (c) performing development and fundraising activities.

Institutional structure and power. Several respondents indicated that a central advancement office prevented their division from engaging in development and fundraising. As one participant described, "we feel we could do fundraising in student affairs and help [institutional advancement], but they do not agree." A handful of respondents indicated that the lack of support extended beyond the organizational structure, and in some cases student affairs' involvement was perceived as a threat to other units on campus or to institutional priorities. One participant stated, "Academic units are concerned that we have become too successful at fundraising," while another described the biggest challenge as "possible conflict over donors." In relation to institutional priorities, one respondent observed a "concern from the president that others may interfere with his efforts to raise funds…according to his vision."

Insufficient resources. Multiple participants cited resources as significant challenges for engaging in development and fundraising. Reported insufficient resources included time, staffing, and knowledge/expertise. One respondent described the most significant challenge as a lack of "time with all the other pressures," while another responded with, "lack of dedicated staff to this effort." A similar response from a different participant described the challenge as "lack of experience, training, and strategy."

Performing development and fundraising activities. While related to the first two themes in this area, challenges in performing development and fundraising activities more specifically referred to the incapacity to devise a strategic plan and effectively articulate needs. One participant identified "lack of…vision to develop a [student affairs] fundraising effort" as the most significant challenge. Another participant expressed an incapacity to effectively articulate need by responding that the most significant challenge was in "having student affairs needs considered," while yet another identified "develop[ment of] a compelling message."

Greatest Need for Student Affairs Success in Development and Fundraising

In the second question, participants responded to a prompt regarding the greatest needs for student affairs as a whole to be successful in development and fundraising. Responses from 52 participants produced three themes, including (a) knowledge and expertise, (b) establishing a culture of giving, and (c) connecting student affairs to the broader institution.

Knowledge and expertise. Participants frequently expressed a need for training and education to increase knowledge about the daily work and the philosophies that guide development and fundraising. One respondent described this as "understanding the challenges of advancement/development…knowing their world." Respondents further indicated that training and education is important for all student affairs staff members, with one participant stating,

"fundraising in student affairs needs to become more of a norm, starting with RA involvement. It is only as the [SSAO] that I have been introduced to fundraising in the profession."

In addition to training and education for all staff in student affairs, participants cited a need for a staff member dedicated to student affairs development and fundraising. One respondent described this in greater detail than others by stating, "There needs to be a person designating 100% of their time, not dividing [time] between another role and fundraising."

The final component of the knowledge and expertise theme encompasses models for student affairs development and fundraising. Two participants articulated a need for models of development and fundraising by describing the most pressing need for success in student affairs development and fundraising as "understanding the means and methods used to cultivate donors" and desiring "a description of the different models available, and a summary of the costs and benefits of investing in student affairs fundraising."

Establishing a culture of giving. As one respondent indicated, a historical disregard for giving to student affairs presents a challenge to development and fundraising success: "Overall, institutional fundraising efforts are poor and therefore [it is] difficult for any division to do this." One participant suggested that "developing a culture of fundraising for student affairs as partners with advancement" is necessary for student affairs success in development and fundraising.

Connecting student affairs to the broader institution. As an extension of the former theme regarding a culture of giving, participants discussed the importance of understanding how student affairs supports the institutional mission and benefits students. One participant expressed this by stating that student affairs must "be perceived as adding value to the institutional missions on a level similar to academic programs." Participants extended the concept of connecting student affairs to the broader institution by expressing the importance of connecting

student affairs needs with institutional priorities: "it [is] necessary to have a clearly articulated vision for how fundraising specific to student affairs fits with overall institutional fundraising."

Expanding on the Student Affairs/Institutional Advancement Relationship

The final question asked participants to expand on their thoughts related to any topics covered in the questionnaire, particularly focusing on student affairs development and fundraising and the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement. Although 22 respondents provided comments on a variety of topics, the majority addressed either the organizational structure of development and fundraising or the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement. Two themes related to these topics emerged from the participants' responses: preferred organizational model, and coordination and communication.

Preferred organizational model. Participants asserted divergent opinions regarding where the locus of control for student affairs development and fundraising should reside. Some indicated a centralized model as most appropriate. One participant connected a personal belief in a centralized model to the importance of focusing attention on the work student affairs does for students: "It is very important to me that current student believe that student affairs staff have their full attention and are not distracted by the search for donors." Others believed a decentralized model is more desirable. One participant explained, "[institutional] advancement wants/needs to control what [donors] get asked to give for. However, [student affairs] contends that there are donors who will give to our needs who would not give to the college in general." For most participants, a collaborative model seemed to be preferred, with one stating, "we have a mutually respectful partnership where we share duties, communications, and the workload," and another saying "we need to develop a plan together."

Coordination and communication. Coordination and communication between student affairs and institutional advancement were frequently cited as necessary for any student affairs development and fundraising efforts. One response in particular summarizes this theme with the participant stating, "coordination, communication, institutional agreement, transparency, and teamwork are key."

Summary of Results

Of the 354 senior student affairs officers that received an invitation participate in this study, 66 responded. The respondents were representative of the study sample in terms of institutional size and mission, with the majority of respondents working at medium-sized institutions (80.3%) whose missions are focused outside of research (76.9%). Respondents represented institutions located in 24 different states spanning most geographic areas of the United States.

Results indicate that student affairs' involvement at the private institutions is limited. Although a majority of the respondents reported that their institutions had recently been involved in capital campaigns, student affairs priorities were only occasionally included. In addition, most represented institutions did not employ a fundraiser specifically for student affairs and instead operated under a centralized model with institutional advancement responsible for any student affairs development and fundraising efforts. Participants tended to perceive a positive relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement, and indicated a desire for shared responsibility among the parties for student affairs development and fundraising.

Where student affairs was involved in development and fundraising, the most frequently reported fundraising activities include collaboration with institutional advancement staff, solicitation of government grants, solicitation of private donations, and solicitation of private

grants. The most frequently cited intended activities include the creation of an advisory board and involving former employees in development and fundraising initiatives. The only fundraising activity included in the questionnaire that appeared to impact fundraising success in terms of dollars raised was involvement in an institutional capital campaign.

Institutional size and mission had little impact on several measures for the study. Perceived strength in relationship differed significantly between medium and large schools. Hiring responsibility for a student affairs fundraiser and five of the twenty-four identified activities utilized in fundraising and development differed significantly between major research institutions and those with missions focused outside of research.

A comparison of data collected in this study at private institutions and data collected in Crowe's study (2011) at public institutions showed significant differences in how student affairs units at the two institutional types engaged in development and fundraising. Public institutions more frequently employed a student affairs fundraiser and selection and funding of that individual significantly differed between private and public institutions. Additional significant differences included the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement and utilization of eleven of the twenty-four identified activities utilized in student affairs development and fundraising.

Significant challenges identified by respondents resulted in three themes: (a) institutional structure and power, (b) insufficient resources, and (c) performing development and fundraising activities. Three themes also emerged as regarding respondents' views on the most critical needs for student affairs to be successful in fundraising and development. These included (a) knowledge and expertise, (b) establishing a culture of giving, and (c) connecting student affairs to the broader institution.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter begins with a review of additional limitations discovered during the execution of the study. A discussion of key findings and implications for practice follows. The chapter concludes with recommendations for future areas of inquiry related to student affairs development and fundraising practices.

Additional Limitations

While implementing the study, additional limitations surfaced. Acknowledging these limitations prior to interpretation of the findings helps preserve the integrity of the discussion.

The first set of additional limitations relate to questionnaire design. Approval for the study required that participants have an opportunity to bypass any question, which resulted in varying response rates for each question. Additionally, several participants responded to questions not intended for their particular circumstances. The questionnaire should have utilized flow technology that restricts access to certain questions based on previous responses and requires responses for all questions that any given participant reviews.

The overall response rate places limitations on the findings of this study. Though the response sample was representative in terms of institutional characteristics, only 18.6% of the study sample responded to the questionnaire. The data collected from this small subset allowed for statistical analysis, but a higher return rate lends higher levels of reliability. Additional recruitment methods could have yielded a higher response rate.

Finally, the assumption around the definition of success limits the findings of this study. Total dollars raised served as the indicator for fundraising success. A variety of factors not accounted for in this study may influence the amount of revenue generated. The units or departments housed within student affairs may significantly affect the amount raised for the overall student affairs division. Some of the participating institutions may include athletics and other attractive programs for donors, resulting in greater interest and donations to the division. Fundraising goals also influence the dollar amount raised. A student affairs division seeking funds to construct a new facility will likely yield higher revenue than a division seeking donations to fund a program, scholarship, or isolated event. Finally, the impetus for the revenue generated is not accounted for in this definition of success. An unsolicited gift may significantly increase amount raised, but does that mean the division was successful in engaging in development and fundraising? The questionnaire should have included items that allowed for identification of these factors or a different measure of success should have been identified.

Finally, conceptualization of the terms models, approaches, and practices did not fully take shape until data analysis. This resulted in discrepancies in which survey questions were used to analyze models, approaches, and practices for various research questions. For instance, in research question three, relationship resides under the term approach. Relationship is addressed independently of approach in research questions four and five. While the findings ultimately remain the same, the change in terminology may result in confusion. The terms models, approaches, and practices should have been better conceptualized prior to collecting data in order to avoid confusion.

Discussion of Findings

Findings from this study provide a baseline understanding of the state of development and fundraising in divisions of student affairs at private, 4-year, not-for-profit institutions of higher education. Additionally, the findings suggests some similarities and differences in how student affairs divisions at private and public institutions engaged in development and fundraising.

Involvement in Development and Fundraising

Data from this study reveal that student affairs divisions at private institutions are moderately involved in development and fundraising. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents whose institutions had recently embarked on a capital campaign reported that their division's priorities were included in the campaign. The findings align with previous research done in this area indicating that level of involvement is relatively similar at private and public institutions (Crowe, 2011) and involvement has not increased over the past two decades (Hendirx-Kral, 1995). Despite what appears to be an increased level of interest in development and fundraising, student affairs divisions have yet to increase their involvement.

Organizational Model

Contradictory to recent research that reveals an increase in the number of individuals dedicated to student affairs development and fundraising (Crowe, 2011; Hillman, 2005), the results of this study indicate a tendency toward a centralized development and fundraising model in private institutions. The majority of the institutions in this study reported that the selection, hiring, funding, and managing a fundraiser for student affairs resided in institutional advancement. Although the data does not reveal an explanation for the discrepancy, it may be due to institutional type. In 1995, Grunig found that decentralized models tend to exist at large

institutions with expansive graduate programs—characteristics more prevalent in public institutions. Both Crowe (2011) and Hillman (2005) studied public institutions while this study focused on private institutions. Juxtaposing Grunig's results with the findings from Crowe (2011), Hillman (2005), and this study reveal that little has changed over the past two decades in terms of the relationship between organizational model and institutional type.

While the data indicate a continued tendency for private institutions to utilize centralized models for development and fundraising, it does not account for whether the centralized model is preferred. Responses to open-ended questions reveal differing perspectives on where development and fundraising responsibility should lie. Those tending toward a decentralized model believe control over development and fundraising would yield greater success because student affairs staff can better articulate the needs of the division. Those tending toward a centralized model believe student affairs staff should focus on the learning and development of students and leave the administrative functions of development and fundraising to institutional advancement staff. Ultimately, it appears that preference only minimally factors into the organizational model utilized with institutional leadership making decisions regarding locus of control for development and fundraising endeavors.

Training and Preparation

Institutional advancement professionals have long espoused the need for formalized training and preparation. Researchers studying student affairs development and fundraising have made similar appeals (Crowe, 2001; Kroll, 1991; Hendrix-Kral, 1995). Despite these calls to action, development officers and fundraisers have historically relied on experience and professional development opportunities to meet their training and preparation needs (Kelly, 1998; Levy, 2004; Worth, 2002). Results from this study reveal that a lack of formalized

training and preparation has carried over to student affairs, with professional workshops/institutions, on-the-job training, soliciting knowledge from institutional advancement staff, and consultation with colleagues being the most frequently reported training and preparation activities for student affairs development and fundraising. While engaging in such activities is important, formal training and preparation activities may better prepare staff members for success in development and fundraising.

Relationship between Student Affairs and Institutional Advancement

While some participants in this study relayed sentiments affirming a tenuous relationship, the majority of respondents indicated that the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement on their campuses is a positive one. The findings support earlier research by Crowe (2011) and Fyegtakis (1992) indicating that the perception of a tenuous relationship is largely a misconception and the two units enjoy a positive relationship.

Data comparing private and public institutions revealed that while both institutional types perceived a positive relationship between student affairs and institutional affairs, they differed along five relationship indicators. Further analysis reveals that the differences may relate to the organizational models utilized. Student affairs divisions at private institutions perceived lower levels of support for engaging in development and fundraising endeavors from both the president and the institutional advancement office. Additionally, student affairs and institutional advancement offices at private institutions were less likely to share work functions and communicate informally with one another. Lack of support, sharing of work functions, and daily interactions may be attributed to the tendency for private institutions to utilize centralized models, which place the responsibility for all development and fundraising endeavors in the institutional advancement office.

Development and Fundraising Activities and Success

Best practice in development and fundraising requires full attention to preparation in order to be successful (Seiler, 2003). Findings of this study suggest that student affairs units at private institutions engage more frequently in active solicitation of private gifts than in the planning or preparatory aspects of development and fundraising. Crowe's study (2011) of public institutions found similar tendencies toward active solicitation. Several factors may promote such predilection. First, active solicitation yields immediate results making it a tempting place to begin. Secondly, a centralized model may preclude engagement in preparatory activities, though it is important to note that the responsibility for identification and articulation of priorities fundamentally resides in the unit for which private gifts are solicited. Finally, the time needed for adequate preparation may seem daunting and better spent elsewhere when development and fundraising is only a portion of the focus of the unit. Regardless of the reason, it is clear that student affairs units tend to employ some best practice activities—primarily those associated with the active phase of development and fundraising—while overlooking others—those associated with relationship building and maintenance—that may be most important for significant and long-term success.

Comparing the fundraising activities utilized by student affairs units at private and public institutions reveals that public institutions more frequently engage in activities related to all aspects of the development and fundraising process. Again, organizational model may contribute to the differences. Findings from this and Crowe's study (2011) indicate that private institutions tend toward centralized models and public institutions tend toward decentralized models. In all cases where significant differences appeared between fundraising activities at private and public institutions, public institutions were more likely to engage in the activity than

their private counterparts. This aligns with expectations for a decentralized model, in which student affairs would be responsible for all development and fundraising activities.

Results from previous studies suggest that engaging in certain fundraising activities yields higher levels of success (Crowe, 2011; Rovig, 2008; Sonn, 2010). Data from this study does not support those findings, indicating that the field has yet to link any single activities to success. This requires continued attention to all aspects of best practice fundraising processes and implores further study in this area.

Significant Challenges and Needs for Success

Senior student affairs officers participating in this study identified lack of resources and ineptitude to perform development and fundraising activities as some of the greatest challenges for successfully engaging in development and fundraising. These same challenges arose throughout the evolution of higher education fundraising. As noted in Chapter 2, institutions realized the need for intentional fundraising strategies, dedicated staff, and formal training and preparation as the expectation for securing private gifts increased over time (Curti & Nash, 1965; Elliot, 2006; Kelly, 1998; Sears, 1990; Worth, 2002). As expectations for securing private gifts continue to increase and individual units become increasingly involved in those efforts, it may be that development and fundraising in student affairs follows the same evolution that occurred in higher education as a whole. With that in mind, it is important that leaders in student affairs development and fundraising look to the evolution of development and fundraising in higher education to learn from missteps and capitalize on successes.

Training and preparation in development and fundraising was cited as one way to overcome challenges associated with a lack of knowledge and expertise. Participants noted the value of educating all members of the student affairs staff regardless of direct involvement in

development and fundraising. As noted in Chapter 2, individuals most familiar with a particular area should be involved in development and fundraising for that area (Grunig, 1995; Hall, 1992; Miller, 2010b). Equipping all members of the staff with a base knowledge serves as a proactive means of preparing student affairs administrators to successfully collaborate with fundraisers.

An additional challenge cited by senior student affairs officers resides in institutional structure and power. Centralized models and competing interests prevented some from engaging in development and fundraising endeavors. Participants suggested that student affairs leaders forge strong relationships with those responsible for institutional advancement and reinforce student affairs' contributions to the institutional mission in order to assuage concerns around competing interests. This strategy aligns with former endorsements to establish student affairs interests in development and fundraising in the context of institutional priorities (Claar & Scott, 2003; Nayman, Gianneschi, & Mandel, 1993). In doing so, student affairs demonstrates a respect for advancing the institution as a whole, which previous research indicates is critical for success (Kroll, 1991; Hillman, 2002).

The final need senior student affairs officers identified as critical for success is the establishment of a culture of giving. Little is currently known about how to establish a culture of giving (Crowe, 2011). Looking to literature that describes culture within student affairs reveals that leadership and professional development serve as guiding stones to culture change (Manning, Kinzie, & Schuh, 2006). Therefore, stimulating an environment prepared to embark on successful development and fundraising endeavors through staff training and identification of divisional needs via the lens of institutional priorities may serve as a starting point for establishing a culture of giving.

Implications for Practice

Findings of this study provide a baseline understanding of the current state of development and fundraising in student affairs at private colleges and universities. Additionally, the study suggests barriers to student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising, as well as strategies to overcome these challenges. Interpreting the findings for use in practical application offers student affairs professionals interested in beginning or strengthening their involvement in development and fundraising with direction for engaging in such efforts. Though not comprehensive, these individuals should consider (a) defining success based on identified needs, (b) championing for student affairs priorities to be included in capital campaigns, (c) maintaining strong relationships with institutional advancement, (d) increasing training and preparation, and (e) utilizing available best practice models.

Defining Success Based on Identified Needs

As noted in the limitations, defining success based solely on dollars raised is not an accurate depiction. When defining success, student affairs administrators must look to the need they are attempting to address through revenue generation. If the need is an increase in discretionary spending to offset various student fees required for participation in programs, then success may be defined as raising the funds need to establish a discretionary endowment for the division. If the need is to establish a new resource center, then success may be defined incrementally, beginning with the ability to fund a staff person dedicated to the center's efforts. When basing success on need rather than purely on dollars raised, it is important that student affairs administrators begin with clearly identified needs, establish revenue goals that will fulfill those needs, and modify revenue goals as necessary.

Championing for Inclusion in Capital Campaign

Inclusion in an institutional capital campaign remains a significant factor for success in student affairs development and fundraising. Therefore, it is important that student affairs administrators capitalize on any opportunities to involve themselves in comprehensive institutional campaigns. To ensure revenue generated meets the needs of the division or unit, student affairs administrators must first identify and articulate funding priorities. For those student affairs units responsible for their own development and fundraising activities, this is a fundamental first step in employing a successful sub-campaign built upon the institutional campaign. For those units operating in a centralized development and fundraising model, it is critical to convey unit priorities to institutional advancement officers in a way that clearly connects to institutional priorities and overall campaign goals. Failure to identify and articulate priorities connected to the overall campaign mitigates the benefit of becoming involved in a capital campaign.

Once involved, student affairs administrators must remain good stewards of the institutional campaign by adhering to institutional advancement's procedures and expectations for development and fundraising. Respecting institutional advancement conventions not only promotes success of the overall campaign, but also reinforces the value of student affairs' involvement thereby increasing the likelihood of involvement in future campaigns.

Maintaining Strong Relationships with Institutional Advancement

Positive relationships between student affairs and institutional advancement are critical for sustained involvement in development and fundraising. Whether an institution operates according to a centralized or decentralized model, institutional advancement ultimately influences the success of any fundraising and development efforts. In a centralized model, a

strong relationship ensures that student affairs priorities are included in the overall portfolio of opportunities presented to prospective donors. In a decentralized model, a strong relationship increases institutional advancement's awareness of student affairs priorities allowing them to convey those needs should a prospective donor not assigned to student affairs express interest or affinity toward the division. Opportunities for enhancing the relationship include increasing informal communication, continuing to discuss the realities of one another's work, and establishing greater levels of trust.

Increasing Training and Preparation

Lack of training and preparation continue to be a primary concern for student affairs administrators interested in development and fundraising work. While not all student affairs administrators will be intimately involved in development and fundraising on behalf of their units, all should possess a baseline understanding considering the increased call for student affairs to secure alternate sources of funding. Success in securing funding does not reside solely within the individual assigned to the work; instead, it requires all members of the staff to consider how their work contributes to development and fundraising efforts.

Increased awareness should begin with students enrolled in graduate preparation programs. Curriculum in these programs should include the foundational concepts of development and fundraising for all students, with opportunities for more in-depth discovery through elective courses. For current administrators and those who do not enroll in formal graduate preparation programs, divisions should make continued professional development opportunities available to their staff members. Common readings and subsequent discussions, workshops facilitated by institutional advancement staff, and webinars facilitated by professional

organizations all offer affordable opportunities to educate staff from across the division on topics related to development and fundraising.

Those directly responsible for development and fundraising on behalf of student affairs should engage in formal training and preparation. While few formal graduate preparation programs exist for institutional advancement, many institutions offer isolated courses or certificates in this area. Alternately, several professional organizations offer annual intensive training institutes. These experiences, combined with orientation, training, or shadowing with the institutional advancement office could provide a solid foundation from which to begin engaging in development and fundraising.

Utilizing Best Practice Models

Although the majority of best practice models currently available rely on practice rather than research to define them, they appear to be effective when employed intentionally and holistically. Student affairs administrators interested in engaging in development and fundraising should utilize models to promote success. While many senior student affairs administrators report engaging in certain activities contained within best practice models, they tend to engage more frequently in active solicitation than in preparing or stewardship. Student affairs units operating in a centralized model should work with institutional advancement staff to identify which activities and phases they can directly contribute to and ask to be kept abreast of progress toward activities and phases in which they are not involved. Student affairs units operating in a decentralized organizational structure should consult with institutional advancement staff to identify an appropriate best practice model and then ensure execution of each activity and phase contained within the model.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study intended to explore student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. The findings provide a baseline understanding, from which several additional questions arise. Future research would assist in further exploring this topic and addressing questions generated by this study.

First, a follow-up qualitative study would offer a greater understanding of the findings. The quantitative approach utilized in this study produced a description of student affairs development and fundraising, but did not provide explanations. For instance, the findings suggest that student affairs remains only minimally engaged in development and fundraising despite continued calls from the profession to engage further in these activities. Understanding why student affairs maintains limited involvement is not apparent through this study. The study also provided information regarding whether student affairs goals and priorities are included in institutional capital campaigns, but did not elicit factors that influence decisions to include student affairs priorities. Similarly, while it is now apparent that the represented institutions tend to operate under a centralized model, one must speculate as to the reason for the trend. Inviting respondents from this study to participate in a qualitative study would lend clarity to the current understanding of development and fundraising in student affairs.

One of the questions that arose from this study related to establishing a culture of giving. Respondents cited this as one of the greatest areas of need for success in development and fundraising. A study that explores the factors contributing to a culture of giving, and follow-up studies to validate those factors, could provide student affairs administrators with a model for establishing a culture of giving.

Several respondents indicated a desire for models to engage in development and fundraising. Many of the best practice models that exist to date rely on practice rather than research to define them. Further, they speak to best practices in the broad field of institutional advancement. Empirically testing these models in the context of student affairs development and fundraising could increase confidence for utilizing them or may reveal the need for new models specifically designed for student affairs.

In the event that current models prove ineffective for student affairs, expanding and refining this study along with the research conducted by Crowe (2011) and others could help define best practice models. A combination of case studies and questionnaires would provide a strong foundation for identifying best practices and developing an associated model. Systematic examination of student affairs divisions that successfully engage in development and fundraising would generate potential best practices. Follow-up interviews and questionnaires sampling both student affairs and institutional advancement experts would refine and validate practices to be included in a best practice model specific to student affairs.

To further research done to develop best practice models for student affairs, follow-up studies should explore best practices for predicting success based on articulated needs. The practices used to support a scholarship may differ greatly from those needed to establish a program or build a facility. Similarly, a campaign goal of $1,000 may require different practices than those used to secure $10 million. Identifying best practices for various goal types would prove useful in employing appropriate strategies and tactics, and may provide a framework for conducting a cost-benefit analysis of work needed to accomplish identified goals.

Finally, future research should continue advancing knowledge related to development and fundraising based on organizational model. Findings of this study suggest that differences in

approaches and practices may relate more to organizational model than to institutional type. Research to date reveals that organizational model is not necessarily a factor in determining success. Therefore, it may be better to understand what factors contribute to success within those models. Case studies may be an appropriate foundation for this line of inquiry. Systematic examination of institutions who successfully engage in development and fundraising within the parameters of centralized, decentralized, and collaborative models would provide a baseline understanding of successful practices based on organizational model.

Conclusion

This study attempted to extend knowledge on student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. Earlier research attempted to explore this topic based on one specific aspect of development and fundraising, yet one recent study extended the line of inquiry to include examination based on (a) the organization of fundraising at the institutional and student affairs level, (b) the relationship between student affairs and institutional fundraising offices, (c) student affairs preparation for engaging in fundraising activities, (d) student affairs priorities for being involved in fundraising, and (e) effectiveness of identified practices based on the amount of private support secured (Crowe, 2011). Conducted at public institutions, the results of that study provided a baseline holistic representation of development and fundraising at public institutions. This current study extended that knowledge by not only examining the same factors at private institutions, but also by comparing the results from both studies to determine whether institutional type impacts student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising.

Findings of this study reveal that differences do exist between private and public institutions, but organizational model utilized for development and fundraising may account for those differences. Further, the results indicate that little has changed over the past two decades

in terms of student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising. These results contradict increased calls for involvement and recent research illuminating student affairs' central role in cultivating long-term affinity and support for institutions of higher education. Perhaps student affairs' involvement in development and fundraising is following the same course as the progression of advancement in higher education, which took decades to evolve even after institutions realized the need for intentional efforts to secure private gifts. If this is the case, it is more critical than ever for student affairs administrators to properly position themselves for success in development and fundraising by educating themselves, fostering strong relationships with institutional advancement staff, and advocating for the inclusion of student affairs in institutional advancement efforts.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P.G. (2000). Comparative perspectives on private higher education. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.). *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st century.* (pp. 1-14). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

American College Personnel Association. (1996). The student learning imperative: Implications for students affairs. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(2), 118-122.

American Council on Education. (1937). *The student personnel point of view.* Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (1949). *The student personnel point of view.* Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A.W. (1999). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 587-598. Retrieved from http://www.myacapa.org

Baxter Magolda, M. (2001). *Making their own way: Narratives for transforming higher education to promote self-development*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bloland, P.A., Stamatakos, L.C., & Rogers, R.R. (1994). *Reform in student affairs: A critique of student development.* Greensboro, NC: ERIC Counseling and Student Services Clearinghouse.

Brittingham, B.E. & Pezzullo, T.R. (1990). *The campus green: Fund raising in higher education.* Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

Brubacher, J.S. & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1976*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.). Classification description: Size and setting classification. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/size_setting.php

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Claar, J.M. & Scott, H.J. (2003). Comparing financial issues in public and private institutions. In J.H. Schuh (Ed.). *Contemporary financial issues in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 103, pp. 17-29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A.M. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Council for Aid to Education. (2012, February 15). Colleges and universities raise 30.30 billion in 2011: 8.2 percent increase fueled by gifts for capital purposes [Press Release]. Retrieved from http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/VSE_2011_Press_Release.pdf

Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crowe, P.A. (2011). *Development and fundraising practices in divisions of student affairs at 4-year, public universities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 3451562)

Curti, M. & Nash, R. (1965). *Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Dungy, G. & Gordon, S. (2011). The development of student affairs. In J.H. Schuh, S.R. Jones, & S.R. Harper (Eds.) *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed.). (pp. 61-79). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eller, D.H. (2010). *College vice presidents' role in fundraising activities in the 2000s and beyond: A case in California.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 3406629)

Elliott, D. (2006). *The kindness of strangers: Philanthropy and higher education.* New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Evans, J.R. & Mathur, A. (2005). The value of online surveys. *Internet Research, 15*(2), 195-219.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E. (1996). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Freeman, R.A. (1965). *Crisis in college finance? Time for new solutions*. Washington, DC: Institute for Social Science Research.

Fygetakis, E.C. (1992). *A study of the relationship between student affairs offices and university development offices in fund-raising for student extracurricular activities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 9306056)

Fygetakis, E.C. & Dalton, J.C. (1993). The relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement offices in educational fundraising. In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.) *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 51-61). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Geiger, R.L. (2005). The ten generations of American higher education. In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, & P.J. Gumport (Eds.). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed.). (pp. 38-70). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Gold, J.A., Golden, D.C., & Quatroche, T.J. (1993). The challenge of chief student affairs officers: Planning for the future. . In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.) *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 95-107). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gordon, S.E., Strode, C.B., & Brady, R.M. (1993). Student affairs and educational fundraising: The first critical step. In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.) *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 5-15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Grunig, S.D. (1995). The impact of development office structure on fund-raising efficiency for research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(6), 686-699.

Hall, P.D. (1992). *Inventing the nonprofit sector and other essays on philanthropy, voluntarism, and nonprofit organizations.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Hendrix-Kral, B.A. (1995). *Capital campaigns: Implications for fund-raising for student affairs divisions in public universities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 9622395)

Hillman, J. (2002). *An investigation of the current status of fundraising activities and training within student affairs divisions in Texas colleges and universities.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 3118748)

Johnstone, D.B. (2005). Financing higher education: Who should pay? In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, & P.J. Gumport (Eds.). *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (2nd ed.). (pp. 38-70). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Kelly, K.S. (1998). *Effective fund-raising management.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kopita, R.R. & Royse, D.L. (2004). Fundraising and development in student affairs. *Leadership Exchange, 2*(2), 10-13.

Kroll, D.N. (1991). *Role expansion in student affairs: Student affairs officers and fund raising in selected Midwestern liberal arts colleges.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 9130503)

Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., & Whitt, E.J. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, J. & Clery, S. (2004). Key trends in higher education: A review of the data. *American Academic, 1*(1), 21-36.

Levy, J.D. (2004). The growth of fundraising: Framing the impact of research and literature on education and training. In L. Wagner and J.P. Ryan (Eds.) *Fundraising as a profession: Advancements and challenges in the field* (New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising No. 43, pp. 21-30). New York, NY: Wiley.

Lindahl, W.E. & Conley, A.T. (2002). Literature review: Philanthropic fundraising. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 13*(1), 91-112.

Mann, T. (2007). College fundraising using theoretical perspectives to understand donor motives. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*(1), 36-45.

Manning, K., Kinzie, J., & Schuh, J. (2006). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

McAlexander, J.H. & Koenig, H.F. (2001). University experiences, the student-college relationship, and alumni support. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 10*(3), 21-43.

McEwen, M.K. (2005). The nature and uses of theory. In M.E. Wilson & L.E. Wolf-Wendel (Eds.). *ASHE reader on college student development theory* (pp. 5-24). Boston: Pearson.

Miller, T.E. (2010a). The context for student development work in student affairs. In T.E. Miller (Ed.) *Advancement work in student affairs: The challenges and strategies* (New Directions for Student Services No. 130, pp. 3-8). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, T.E. (2010b). Summary and suggestions for the path ahead. In T.E. Miller (Ed.) *Advancement work in student affairs: The challenges and strategies* (New Directions for Student Services No. 130, pp. 71-74). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miser, K.M., & Mathis, T.D. (1993). Creating a student affairs institutional advancement program: Strategies for success. In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.) *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 29-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, M.F. & Policcello, S.M. (2010). Getting started in student affairs development. In T.E. Miller (Ed.) *Advancement work in student affairs: The challenges and* strategies (New Directions for Student Services No. 130, pp. 9-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2011). *Independent colleges and universities: A national profile.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www.naicu.edu/docLib/20110308_NAICU_profiles.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Digest of Education Statics: 2011.* Washington DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/2011menu_tables.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *Digest of Education Statics: 2010.* Washington DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=76

National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Glossary.* Washington DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/

Nayman, R.L., Gianneschi, H.R., & Mandel, J.M. (1993). Turning students into alumni donors. In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.). *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 85-94). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Oseguera, L. (2005). Four and six-year baccalaureate degree completion by institutional characteristics and racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of College Student Retention, 7*(1), 19-59.

Patterson, F.D. (1974). Endowment and survival. *AGB Reports, 16*(8), 28-31.

Perry, W.G. (1999). *Forms of ethical and intellectual development in the college years: A scheme*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pike, G.R., Smart, J.C., Kuh, G.D., & Hayek, J.C. (2006). Educational expenditures and student engagement: When does money matter? *Research in Higher Education, 47*(7), 847-872.

Pumerantz, R.K. (2005). Alumni-in-training: A public roadmap for success. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 5*(4), 289-300.

Raymond, S. (2008). *Enabling the progress of the mind: The future of philanthropy and higher education in America.* Washington, DC: Changing Our World, Inc.

Rissmeyer, P.A. (2010). Student affairs and alumni relations. In T.E. Miller (Ed.) *Advancement work in student affairs: The challenges and strategies* (New Directions for Student Services No. 130, pp. 19-30). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Romano, J.C., Gallagher, G., & Shugart, S.C. (2010). More than an open door: Deploying philanthropy to student access and success in American community colleges. In T.E. Miller (Ed.) *Advancement work in student affairs: The challenges and strategies* (New Directions for Student Services No. 130, pp. 55-70). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rovig, N.G. (2008). *An examination of the relationship between development support characteristics and the amount of funds raised for student affairs divisions.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 3351867)

Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university.* Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.

Sandeen, A. & Barr, M. J. (2006). *Critical issues for student affairs: Challenges and opportunities.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schoenecke, M. (2005). *A description of fundraising programs in student affairs divisions.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT 3174535)

Schuh, J. (2003a). Editor's notes. In J. Schuh (Ed.). *Contemporary financial issues in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 103, pp. 1-2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schuh, J.H. (2003b). The financial environment of student affairs. In J.H. Schuh (Ed.). *Contemporary financial issues in student affairs* (New Directions for Student Services No. 103, pp. 3-16). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schuh, J.H., Jones, S.R., & Harper, S.R. (Eds.) (2011). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sears, J.B. (1990). *Philanthropy in the history of American higher education.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Seiler, T.L. (2003). Plan to succeed. In E.R. Tempel (Ed.). *Hank Rosso's achieving xxcellence in fund raising* (2nd ed.). (pp. 23-29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shay, Jr., J.E. (1993). The president's perspective on student affairs and educational fundraising. In M.C. Terrell & J.A. Gold (Eds.) *New roles for educational fundraising and institutional advancement* (New Directions for Student Services No. 63, pp. 17-28). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

State Higher Education Executive Officers. (2011). *State higher education finances: FY 2010*. Boulder, CO: Author. Retrieved from http://www.sheeo.org/finance/shef_fy10.pdf

Sonn, A.C. (2010). *Institutions' needs and donors' dreams: A case study of successful student affairs fundraising collaboration at three private research universities*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. AAT3387315)

Strickland, S. (2007). Partners in writing and rewriting history: Philanthropy and higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*(2), 104-116.

Sun, X., Hoffman, S.C., & Grady, M.L. (2007). A multivariate causal model of alumni giving: Implications for alumni fundraisers. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7(*4), 307-332.

Thomas, J.A. & Smart, J. (2005, May). The relationship between personal and social growth and involvement in college and subsequent alumni giving. Presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research. San Diego, CA. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov

Thelin, J.R. (2004). *A history of American higher education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Tuckman, B.W. (1994). *Conducting educational research* (4th ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Westmeyer, P. (1997). *An analytical history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Whitney, K.M. (2006). The importance of being earnest: Creating successful fundraising environments. *Leadership Exchange, 4*(2), 15-17.

Winston, R.B., Creamer, D.G., Miller, T.K., & Associates (2001). *The professional student affairs administrator: Educator, leader, manager.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Woodard, D.B., Love, P.G., & Komives, S.R. (2000). *Leadership and management issues for a new century (*New Directions for Student Services No. 92). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Worth, M.E. (Ed.). (2002). *New strategies for educational fund raising.* Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger.

Zumeta, W. & LaSota, R. (2010). Recent patterns in the growth of private higher education in the United States. *ASHE Higher Education Report, 36*(3), 91-106.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL INVITATION EMAIL

Dear Senior Student Affairs Officer,

My name is Kara Fresk and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counseling and Student Personnel Services program conducting research for a dissertation under the direction of Dr. Richard Mullendore at the University of Georgia. Our research seeks to understand the development and fundraising practices of student affairs units at private institutions. As the senior student affairs officer for your institution, we invite you to participate in our survey so that as a field we may gain a better understanding of the current state of development and fundraising and work to identify effective practices.

Your name and contact information were obtained by cross-referencing the NCES database for qualifying institutions with your institution's official website. **If you are not the senior student affairs administrator for your institution, please forward this email to the appropriate individual.**

We would greatly appreciate your participation in this study. Responding to the questionnaire should take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. The study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Georgia.

If you are willing to participate, please visit ${l://SurveyLink}. It is very important that you, the senior student affairs officer for your institution, complete this survey from your perspective. Although consultation with others in your division who may assist with fundraising is encouraged, it is important that your perspectives are primary when responding.

Additional details and information about the study are available prior to entering the questionnaire. Upon completion of the questionnaire, participants will have an opportunity to request a copy of the research result. If you do not wish to participate or receive any further emails regarding this study, please respond to this email with "Unsubscribe" in the subject line.

The questionnaire will be available until Wednesday, August 15, 2012. After that date, the link will no longer be active.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me at kfresk@uga.edu or at (612) 532-2788. You may also contact Dr. Richard Mullendore, chair of the committee for this study, at richardm@uga.edu or at (706) 542-6478.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration,
Kara L. Fresk, doctoral candidate
Richard Mullendore, Ph.D., faculty
University of Georgia

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER

Thank you for considering participation in this study, titled *Student Affairs Development and Fundraising Practices at Private Institutions*. This dissertation research is being conducted by Kara L. Fresk under the advisement of Dr. Richard Mullendore in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

The purpose of this study is to determine development and fundraising practices at private, not-for-profit institutions of higher education with enrollments of 2,500 or more students. Your participation will involve responding to a questionnaire that is anticipated to take 15-20 minutes to complete. The questionnaire asks questions related to:

- institutional profile and organizational arrangements;
- preparation for development and fundraising;
- student affairs priorities and monies raised;
- student affairs development and fundraising practices;
- and the relationship between student affairs and institutional advancement.

Your involvement in this study is voluntary, and you may choose to not participate or stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your participation in the study will remain confidential. You will have an opportunity to provide contact information should you wish to be informed about the results of the study, but this information will be stored separately of any responses and will not be used to individually identify you as a participant in the study. No other individually identifiable information will be collected, stored, or reported on; only aggregate results will be reported. Please note that the nature of electronic communication reduces guarantees of anonymity.

The findings of this research may lead to the identification of effective development and fundraising practices in student affairs, which helps to support quality college experiences for students. There is minimal risk for participation in this study. Those participants who disclose organizational or financial information about their institution that is considered private may encounter employment implications should knowledge of such disclosure come to the attention of the participant's institution. To minimize risk, confidentiality will be maintained as noted above and you will have the option to bypass any question at any time.

It is important that you, the senior student affairs officer for your institution, complete this survey from your perspective. Although consultation with others in your division who may assist with fundraising is encouraged, it is important that your perspectives are primary when responding. If you are not the senior student affairs officer for your institution, please forward this link to the appropriate individual.

As you consider the questions contained in the questionnaire, please begin with an understanding of the researchers' interpretation of the following terms:

- *Development and fundraising* – the process of and organized attempts to cultivate relationships and secure private gifts to meet institutional needs
- *Institutional advancement* – an office outside of student affairs that centrally coordinates or conducts development and fundraising efforts on behalf of the institution
- *Student affairs development and fundraising* – fundraising and development activities occurring within your division with or without the involvement of institutional advancement

Please contact me at (612) 532-2788 or at kfresk@uga.edu if you have any questions or concerns related to this research. Additionally, you may contact Dr. Richard Mullendore at (706) 542-6478 or at richardm@uga.edu. Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

By completing this questionnaire, you are consenting to participate in the above described research project. Please print a copy of this informational overview for your records.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I: Institutional Profile & Organizational Arrangement

1. Are you the Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO) at your institution?

- Yes
- No

2. What is your title?

3. What is your institution's total enrollment?

- 2,500-4,999
- 5,000-7,999
- 8,000-10,999
- 11,000-14,999
- 15,000-19,999
- 20,000-29,999
- Over 30,000

4. Is your institution a major research university?

- Yes
- No

5. In your best estimate, what percentage of your institution's budget comes from tuition and fees?

- Less than 20%
- 21%-30%
- 31%-40%
- 41%-50%
- 51%-60%
- Over 60%

6. In what state is your institution located?

7. Did your institution embark on a capital campaign within the previous 5 years (2007-2012)?

- Yes
- No

8. Were student affairs divisional priorities included in the campaign goals?

- Yes
- No

9. What was the approximate goal of the institution's overall campaign?

- $1 billion or more
- $500 million - $999 million
- $200 million - $499 million
- $100 million - $199 million
- $75 million - $99 million
- $50 million - $74 million
- $25 million - $49 million
- Less than $25 million

The following questions are to identify the presence (or absence) of the person(s) responsible for development and fundraising efforts for the division of student affairs.

10. Does your division employ a fundraiser specifically for student affairs?

- Yes
- No

11. Does your division plan to employ a fundraiser specifically for student affairs within the next five years?

- Yes
- No

12. Does your institutional advancement office assign a development staff member to assist the student affairs division with development and fundraising activities?

- Yes
- No

13. Whom do you consider to be the primary fundraiser for your division?

- Senior Student Affairs Officer (SSAO)
- Associate or Assistant SSAO
- Dean of Students (if not SSAO)
- Department Head or Director
- Institutional Advancement Officer
- Student Affairs specific Development Officer/Fundraiser
- Other

The following questions are in reference to the staff member responsible for student affairs development and fundraising initiatives. Please complete this section if your division employs a fundraiser specifically for student affairs or if your institutional advancement office assigns a development staff member to assist the student affairs division with development and fundraising activities. <u>If neither of these is the case, please skip this page AND THE NEXT PAGE and proceed to Section III.</u>

14. This staff member was selected...

- by student affairs staff.
- by institutional advancement staff.
- by a joint selection between student affairs and institutional advancement.

15. This staff member was hired...

- full-time in student affairs.
- full-time in institutional advancement.
- part-time in student affairs.
- part-time in institutional advancement.
- joint full-time appointment between student affairs and institutional advancement.
- joint part-time appointment between student affairs and institutional advancement.

16. This staff member's position is funded by...

- student affairs.
- institutional advancement.
- both student affairs and institutional advancement.

17. This staff member reports primarily to...

- student affairs.
- institutional advancement.
- both student affairs and institutional advancement.

Section II: Preparation for Development & Fundraising

The following questions are in reference to the staff member responsible for student affairs development and fundraising initiatives. Please complete this section if your division employs a fundraiser specifically for student affairs or if your institutional advancement office assigns a development staff member to assist the student affairs division with development and fundraising activities. <u>If neither of these is the case, please skip this page and proceed to Section III on the next page.</u>

18. Regarding this person's job description, is having fundraising experience and/or knowledge a prerequisite for employment?

- Yes
- No

19. Has this person received training/preparation specific to development and fundraising functions?

- Yes
- No

20. What type of training/preparation activities have been employed? Please check all that apply.

- Credit-bearing fundraising/development courses
- Professional workshops/institutes about development and fundraising
- Books, articles, published research
- Consultation with other practitioners doing this work
- Professional student affairs conference presentations
- On-the-job training
- From institutional advancement staff on campus
- Other

21. Does your division plan to implement training/preparation opportunities specific to development and fundraising in your division within the next five years?

- Yes
- No

22. Is training/preparation information shared with department heads within the student affairs division?

- Yes
- No

Section III: Student Affairs Priorities & Monies Raised

23. Please indicate if any of the following programs/activities have been identified as a featured priority for fundraising activity within your division during the previous five years (2007-2012). *Please check all that apply.*

- Alcohol/substance education
- Athletic (intercollegiate) programs
- Building construction/renovation of a student union
- Building construction/renovation of a student recreation center
- Building construction/renovation of residence halls
- Building construction/renovation of a health center
- Campus safety/rape education
- Career planning and placement
- Childcare for faculty, staff, or students
- Community service/volunteerism

- [ ] Disabled student programs/services
- [ ] Diversity programs
- [ ] Emergency student loan funds
- [ ] Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender student services
- [ ] Graduate assistantships
- [ ] Healthcare/wellness/personal counseling
- [ ] Homecoming events
- [ ] International student programs
- [ ] Intramural/Recreation programs/equipment
- [ ] Leadership programs
- [ ] Programs/services for students of color
- [ ] Orientation
- [ ] Parents/Family weekend events
- [ ] Residential life programs
- [ ] Scholarships
- [ ] Student activities
- [ ] Student government

24. Considering collectively, the divisional priorities you selected above, estimate the total amount of external funding that was generated for them within the previous five years (2007-2012). Please include whole numbers only with no commas and no dollar sign.

25. Please rate your division's overall success in raising external funds for priorities in your division within the previous five academic years (2007-2012).

- ○ Excellent
- ○ Good
- ○ Fair
- ○ Poor
- ○ No money has been raised for our division

Section IV: Development & Fundraising Practices

26. Considering each of the following development and fundraising practices, identify whether each reflects, to date, involvement of your division (or, where applicable, the student affairs development and fundraising staff member) in such practices ("*Yes*") or your future plans to be involved in such practices ("*No, but plan to in the future*"). The following statements are asked to solicit one of two responses - current practices or future plans to be involved in such practices. *If neither response applies, please leave blank.*

	Yes	No, but plan to in the future
Our division has identified and articulated division fundraising priorities.		
Our division has created documents detailing the need for support of divisional fundraising priorities.		
Our division has attended training and professional development activities to learn about development and fundraising practices.		
Our division has coordinated staff development activities about fundraising for staff within the division.		
Our division has attended institutional advancement meetings.		
Our division has collaborated with institutional advancement staff in fundraising efforts for student affairs.		
	Yes	No, but plan to in the future
Our division has created an advisory board for the division to assist in fundraising efforts.		
Our division has been involved in an institutional capital campaign.		
Our division has conducted research to identify prospective donors.		
Our division has created a database of prospective donors.		
Our division has sought external funding sources for student affairs priorities via: external grants-federal, state or local government.		
Our division has sought external funding sources for student affairs priorities via: donations (private individuals, alumni/alumnae).		
	Yes	No, but plan to in the future
Our division has sought external funding sources for student affairs priorities via: grants from sources other than		

federal, state or local government.		
Our division has involved current students in development and fundraising efforts for student affairs (e.g. stewardship events, fundraising efforts, donor visits).		
Our division has educated current students about philanthropy and the importance of giving back to their institution after graduation.		
Our division has involved alumni in development and fundraising efforts for student affairs.		
Our division has involved former employees in fundraising efforts for student affairs.		
Our division has communicated funding priorities with prospective donors.		
	Yes	No, but plan to in the future
Our division has asked a donor for funding support (made an "ask").		
Our division has coordinated stewardship events for donors.		
Our division has designated a staff member from housing/residence life to be involved in development and fundraising efforts for their department.		
Our division has designated a staff member from career services to be involved in development and fundraising efforts for their department.		
Our division has designated a staff member from student activities/engagement to be involved in development and fundraising efforts for their department.		
Our division has designated a staff member from health services to be involved in development and fundraising efforts for their department.		

Section V: Relationship with Institutional Advancement Staff

27. Please indicate your level of agreement (*using a Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree scale*) with each of the following statements regarding your division's relationship with the institutional advancement staff at your institution.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Institutional advancement staff assists student affairs staff in development and fundraising efforts for student affairs priorities.						
Student affairs staff assists institutional advancement staff in raising funds for student affairs priorities.						
Trust exists between the institutional advancement and student affairs divisions.						
The institutional advancement staff encourages student affairs staff involvement in development and fundraising.						
Tension exists between the institutional advancement office and student affairs division.						
The president of my institution is supportive of development and fundraising efforts by staff in the student affairs division.						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Institutional advancement staff members share current development and fundraising information with student affairs staff members.						
Prospect data (e.g., donor databases) are shared between student affairs and institutional advancement.						
Solicitations are shared between student affairs and institutional advancement.						
Institutional advancement staff members understand the roles of student affairs staff and how they might assist in development and fundraising efforts.						
Student affairs staff members understand the roles of institutional advancement staff in university development and fundraising efforts.						
Communication between student affairs and institutional advancement occurs formally (e.g. meetings).						

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Communication between student affairs and institutional advancement occurs informally (e.g. phone, email, internal communication).						
Communication between student affairs and institutional advancement does not occur at all.						
The institutional advancement division should have sole responsibility for student affairs development and fundraising priorities.						
Fundraising and development responsibilities for student affairs should be shared between the institutional advancement office and the student affairs division.						
The student affairs division should have sole responsibility for student affairs development and fundraising priorities.						

28. Please rate your division's overall relationship with the institutional advancement division at your institution.

- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor
- Non-existent

Section VI: Open-Ended Comments/Responses

29. What are the most significant/immediate challenges in development and fundraising efforts within your division at your institution?

30. What is the greatest need in order for student affairs in general (not necessarily at your institution) to be successful in the fundraising arena?

31. Please add any comments you have regarding student affairs development and fundraising, training, relationship with institutional advancement staff, or to clarify or expound on any responses made to previous items.

32. Would you like to...

- submit responses for inclusion in the study, or
- discard all responses?

Thank you for your participation!

Your responses will assist us in identifying development and fundraising practices of student affairs units at private institutions. As our field becomes evermore reliant on non-traditional funding sources, this information will prove valuable in identifying best practices for securing private gifts to support our programs and services.

If you would like to receive a copy of the results, please email kfresk@uga.edu with "RESULTS" in the subject line.

If you have any further questions about this research project, please feel free to contact me at kfresk@uga.edu or at (612) 532-2788. You may also contact Dr. Richard Mullendore, chair of the committee for this study, at richardm@uga.edu or at (706) 542-6478.

Our sincerest thanks,
Kara L. Fresk, doctoral candidate
Richard Mullendore, Ph.D., faculty
University of Georgia