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Contemporary college and university presidents are often expected to be the fundraiser-in-chief for their institutions, a role for which they are typically under-prepared. In this case study, the fundraising experiences of college and university presidents in ten private institutions holding membership in a private-institution consortium in one Midwestern state are discussed.

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. Ten presidents were interviewed, using a series of questions related to their interest in becoming a president, their current level of involvement with the fundraising endeavor at their institution, their perspectives about the best and worst parts of the task of fundraising, their competence in this area, described in this study as their perception of their chief advancement officer’s perspective, the surprises for them in this work, their preparation for this work, any lessons they have learned related to fundraising, and the opportunity costs associated with having to be so involved in fundraising.

Three major themes emerged from the study relating to the presidents’ experience as fundraisers: Preparation for successful fundraising work comes from a wide variety of
experiences; Fundraising work is not generally perceived as a “necessary evil;” and
Fundraising work is intrinsically connected to questions of legacy.

The results of this study were inconsistent with the literature describing presidents’ involvement with fundraising activities for their institutions. The literature described the dearth of formal fundraising preparation programs as troublesome and contributing to generally overwhelming expectations and obligations. The findings from this study indicate that a multitude of life experiences contribute to a particular president’s effectiveness in this arena.

The literature described a collective lament on the part of presidents related to their need to raise funds for their institutions, an activity that got in the way of what initially drew them to academia. The findings did not indicate that sentiment. Instead, these presidents framed their responses to this phenomenon as opportunities to tell institutional stories, to connect donors to meaningful projects, or to impact the lives of students.
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Chapter One
Introduction, Statement of the Problem, and Outline

The list of historically great American college and university presidents – Dodds (1962) refers to them as “Presidential Giants of the Past” – is a relatively short one, despite nearly 400 years of higher education in the United States. Even those few are known far less for their ability to raise funds for their respective institutions than for their moral courage, public oratory, or social stature. Collectively, and subjectively, Dodds (1962) and others (Cohen, 1968; Cowley, 1933; Davidson, 1948; Greenberg, 1998; Hamilton, 2004; Hawkins, 1966; Humphrey, 1972; Ikenberry, 1998; Keohane, 1998; Leslie, 1996; Levine, 1998; McArthur, 1990; McKenna, 2006; McCarroll, 2005; Merrow, 2005; Muller, 1987; Nelson, 2002; Rudolph, 1962; Scanlon, 1971; Silber, 2006; Tucker, 1961; Ungar, 2006) identify the following list of exemplary college and university presidents.

- Henry Dunster at Harvard (1640-1654);
- Thomas Clap at Yale (1740-1766);
- Eleazar Wheelock at Dartmouth (1769-1779);
- Eliphalet Nott at Union College (1804-1866);
- Francis Wayland at Brown University (1827-1855);
- Henry Tappan at the University of Michigan (1852-1863);
- Andrew D. White at Cornell (1867-1855);
- Charles W. Eliot at Harvard (1869-1909);
- James B. Angell at the University of Michigan (1871-1909);
- Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins (1875-1901);
• Booker T. Washington at the Tuskegee Institute (1881-1916);
• William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago (1891-1906);
• Benjamin Ida Wheeler at the University of California (1899-1919);
• Mary Wooley at Mount Holyoke (1901-1937);
• Nicholas Murray Butler at Columbia (1901-1945);
• Woodrow Wilson at Princeton (1902-1910);
• Mary McLeod Bethune at Bethune-Cookman (1904-1942 and 1946-47);
• Abbott Lawrence Lowell at Harvard (1909-1933);
• Robert Maynard Hutchins at the University of Chicago (1929-1945);
• James Bryant Conant at Harvard (1933-1953);
• Benjamin Mays of Morehouse (1940-1967);
• Reverend Theodore Hesburgh at the University of Notre Dame (1952-1987);
• William Friday at the University of North Carolina (1957-1972);
• Clark Kerr at the University of California (1958-1967);
• Kingman Brewster at Yale (1963-1977);
• John Silber at Boston University (1971-1996);
• Jill Ker Conway at Smith (1975-1985);

Gordon (1953) said “A consensus would typify the old-time presidents as men of great intellectual stature, educational and cultural leaders who represented the most rigorous type of educational statesmanship, shaped the structure of higher education as it stands today,” and this list of giants of American higher education, notably
comprised of both men and women, constitutes a collection of those who left an indelible mark on American higher education.

**Context of the Problem**

In what has been described metaphorically as “standing at the edge of the diving board at the high dive for the first time” (Siegel, 2001), contemporary college and university presidents face, daily, a morass of issues and institutional needs. The role of the college president has changed dramatically, and particularly so at any of the hundreds of private, church-affiliated American colleges or universities. Sontz (1991) stated that historically, “The president of a small colonial college was generally a theologian, a practicing minister, and an integral member of the faculty as well” (p. xxv). That has changed, and perhaps not for the better. As what may be one telling indicator, Martin, Samuels, and Associates (2004) said that “. . . not since the 1960’s have presidential tenure averages been at such low levels among the major American universities” (p. 7).

Bornstein (2002) said that college presidents have evolved from what Veblen (1957) called “captain[s] of erudition” in the past to “institution builders.” Presidents are required to be at once historian and entrepreneur, ivory-tower academician and carnival barker, in an environment where “the public is cynical and there are limited resources” (Smith, 2001). McLaughlin (2004) delineated the responsibilities of the contemporary college president in the following manner:

**Leadership:** [C]onnect[ing] individuals to the mission of the enterprise, to raise sights, and to encourage hopefulness in the future.

**Management:** [A]lign[ing] institutional resources – money, technology, and personnel to solve problems or forge new institutional directions.
Governance: Making things happen [by] building coalitions, forming alliances, compromising in order to get further, and working with other people whose purposes converge with yours in order to reach some common goal. (p. 10)

Kerr and Gade (1987) stated that as many as ten thousand men and women had served as college and university presidents at the time of their publication, and that “[t]hese ten thousand people will have been evaluated, and criticized, and praised to varying degrees by trustees (50,000 in total at any one time) and by faculty members (750,000 in total at any one time) and by students, alumni, and community members in the millions.” (p. 29)

Cook (1997) discussed the evolution of the presidency from builders of campus infrastructure in the 1950s and early 1960s to managers of student behavior in the 1960s and 1970s. By the 1980s, presidents’ roles had evolved again into a fiduciary, financial care-taking role. He called this period the “era of uncertainty.”

Kerr and Gade (1987) identified as “dominant themes for presidents” in the 1980s, in order, “good management of funds, effective recruitment of new students, and astute public relations” (p. 39). Kerr (1963) said college and university presidents were: . . . expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, as astute bargainer with the foundations and federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter
of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of football and opera equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies. No one can be all these things. Some succeed at being none. (pp. 29-30)

The editor of an on-line higher education journal (National Public Radio (NPR), 2005) suggested:

Now people like to imagine the golden era of college presidents thinking great thoughts, and I think a lot of college presidents wished they could spend their time thinking great thoughts. But the odds are you’ll find them on the road going to where the money is wherever their wealthy alumni are. (p. 2)

It is not true that fiscally-oriented college presidents no longer dream of greatness for their institution, or for higher education, generally. Brand (2002), a former president, wrote:

American university presidents are expected to be model citizens, public advocates for our democratic freedoms, and champions of worthy social causes. Some may argue that presidents of the past viewed this obligation more seriously and were more active in the fight for social justice than we are today. I disagree.

Rhodes (1998) also described the position of college president:
The task of the college president, reduced to its essentials, is to define and articulate the mission of the institution; develop meaningful goals; and then recruit the talent, build the consensus, create the climate, and provide the resources to achieve them. All else is peripheral. (p. 2)

He elaborated, providing a “recipe for failure,” by identifying five areas where college presidents are neglected by the institutions they serve, or where they neglect themselves, often leading to perceived presidential failure:

1. Personal exhaustion
2. Muddled priorities or no priorities
3. Neglect of their families and those closest to them
4. Personal isolation
5. Intellectual starvation

Martin, Samuels, and Associates (2004) presented their own list of “Pressures on Presidents:”

- To raise extraordinary amounts of money
- To do more with less
- To decide about distance education
- To compete with and outperform for-profit competitors
- To overcome deprofessionalization [sic]

The characteristics described by Kerr (1963), Rhodes (1998), and Martin and Samuels, et. al. (2004) are in many ways the antithesis of the classic, American college president of the past. Fisher and Koch (1996) suggested a common understanding that
“the college presidency, once the situs [sic] of many such powerful, effective, and important leaders, has decayed and all too frequently now is a refuge for ambivalent, risk-averting individuals who seek to offend no one, and as a consequence motivate no one.” (p. viii)

The focus on fundraising is a relatively recent phenomenon, led initially at small private institutions and more recently even at large public institutions. Cook (1997) described a paucity of intentional, sophisticated fundraising programs at private colleges prior to the 1980s. Bornstein (2003a) said that “[w]hat changed in the 1990’s was not so much the importance of fund-raising, but the respect and legitimacy accorded to this activity that increasingly holds a comfortable place at the academic table.” (p. 9) She also connected presidential legacy to success as a fundraiser.

Responding to an athletic scandal and a separate, highly public dispute around issues of academic freedom, former University of Colorado president Elizabeth Hoffman suggested:

The role of a university president as someone who has fireside chats with students and afternoon tea with faculty may have existed at some point in the past . . . but today . . . I am the CEO of a nearly $2 billion enterprise with 24,000 employees that operates in a highly charged political environment (Kantrowitz & Springen, 2005, p. 52).

Hoffman’s institution was in most ways the polar opposite of the small, private colleges and universities that are the subject of this study. Her situation, however, illustrated the tenuous, shifting role of the contemporary college and university president. Hoffman and her peers are accountable to various and often competing publics. They are
charged with the task of maintaining the academic reputation and historical moral voice of American higher education, while also continually seeking sufficient new revenue streams to keep the institution solvent. “University presidents should think of themselves as chief executives who continually think about the advancement of their organizations and how their actions further that goal,” stated an article summarizing a meeting of more than 250 college and university presidents and other senior-level officials in June, 2008 (At Chronicle Forum, 2008).

The market plays an ever-larger role in higher education fundraising operations. Effective management of stock portfolios and endowment funds is required. But it is also true that other market forces come to bear on presidents’ fundraising obligations. As an example, Cook (1997) quoted Rick Nahm, president of Knox College, who said “More boards of directors are saying [to the president], ‘It’s not what we can raise, but what we have to raise to beat so and so.’”

Finally, Cook (1997) suggested that college presidents’ fundraising – a “specialized form of begging,” according to Foster (1913) – is, to some degree, a vanity affair. A president’s fundraising becomes her or his singular task, the one criterion upon which they will be judged. Anderson (1984) said “Nowadays, a president is often hired to ask for money” (p. 17). McCarroll (2005) said “Fundraising has become a crucial component of the job [of President], with money ‘such a priority that the president becomes more like a corporate businessman [sic] crafting partnerships and less like a public intellectual who might be a bestower of wisdom for the entire society,’ (quoting Stanley Fish, English professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago and dean emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences).
An annual survey conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* since 1991 revealed information about college presidents’ salaries that was being noted in the American press as early as 1999 (CNN.com). That year it was reported that one path to being a millionaire was via a college presidency. By 2005, results from the same annual survey showed that 53% of college presidents who responded to the survey said they spent time fundraising at least daily (Bornstein, 2005; Drozdowski, 2005; Merrow, 2005; Pope, 2005; Selingo, 2005; Strout, 2005; Ungar, 2006).

**Statement of the Problem**

Successful contemporary American college or university presidents are defined in part in terms of their fundraising acumen, a proficiency many new presidents have neither been prepared for during their pre-presidency careers, nor trained for while in the position. In a survey of college and university presidents conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the modal response to a question asking what they were most unprepared for prior to assuming their presidency was “fund raising,” followed by “budgetary issues” (Selingo, 2005). The need to attend to fundraising will not go away; the president who fails to do so will.

Wessel (1991) identified two standard career patterns for presidents of private, four-year colleges and universities: an “Academic Career Pattern” and an “Administrative Career Pattern,” neither of which seem to be explicitly geared toward meaningful fundraising experience. The reality described above indicates that college and university presidents are required to be significantly involved in fundraising activities for their institutions. Should it not also follow that (a) anyone aspiring to the position of college president understands, expects, and embraces this reality and (b) once hired,
college presidents are innately skilled in this area? In both instances, the answer is often “No.”

Schoenherr (1984) described “four fears” many college presidents carry with them to their fundraising roles:

1. The fear that others will see you as a beggar, a person with a tin cup looking for a handout;
2. The fear of being an intruder into the personal life of another, of invading their privacy;
3. The fear of rejection;
4. The fear of offending people by asking them for a contribution.

Scott Jaschik, editor of the Inside Higher Education on-line journal, addressed some of these concerns during an interview with National Public Radio in 2005. He said, “. . . when you hear about presidents spending all their time raising money, you think, ‘Oh, they’re spending time with the rich people.’ But if you look at good things in higher education . . . wealthy institutions . . . have in the last few years announced huge expansions of financial aid programs for low-income students. Those are expensive policies. And they’re paid for with money from their endowments and gifts.”

There is also a sense among many that the very real need for substantive fundraising – extensive, on-going, and from a variety of sources – renders impotent the college president as moral avatar. The “bully pulpit” enjoyed by Harper, Dunster, Clap, and their contemporaries is elusive, as college presidents seeking donations large and small become more averse to offending anyone who might be at some point in the future
Interconnectedness and globalism make every public comment potentially known, immediately, around the globe. One of Harvard’s ex-presidents was held accountable for remarks he made at a meeting abroad regarding the genetic suitability for women scientists and mathematicians. His remarks were officially off the record, but recorded and rebroadcast literally around the world. He was held accountable for his remarks; it ultimately cost him his position.

The editor of the online journal Inside Higher Education, in a 2006 radio interview, discussed the explicit connection between public relations and presidential fundraising. He said:

And you don’t want to be writing anybody off because you’ve offended them on issue X or Y, especially when colleges are always at risk of having offended people for other reasons, like because the football team isn’t winning or somebody’s nephew didn’t get admitted. So if you’re trying to maximize the money you raise, you probably are careful about what you say. (NPR, p. 6)

The moral imperative to use the position of president for maximum public good remains strong for many higher education leaders, even in the face of daunting financial pressure. University of Hawaii president Evan S. Dobelle (2004) framed the tension between these two roles in the following manner:

The annual operational budgets of the 4,100 institutions of higher learning in America total more than $200 billion – greater than the gross domestic product of all but 20 countries in the world. Imagine, for a moment, if higher education were to take a leadership role . . . to provide the knowledge and enlightened power
needed to achieve a just and sustainable society. That is our responsibility – let us not allow the concerns of the next budget cycle to cause us to lose sight of this. Let us never doubt our universities also will be the beneficiaries of this ability to hope. (p. 3)

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. The intent was to identify practices, approaches, techniques, thoughts, or feelings related to active, intentional solicitation of funds for specific institutional projects or for the greater good of a given college or university (format adapted from Creswell, 2003, p. 90).

**Definitions**

Unless otherwise cited, definitions listed below reflect my working definitions for each of these concepts as I conducted my literature review and the research study. Drozdowski (2003) described the distinction between *fundraising* and *development*:

The first [distinction] is a matter of function. Most development offices employ professionals whose jobs do not directly involve raising money. Rather, they provide related services, including prospect research, database management, gift recording and processing, accounting, special-events planning and oversight, and donor relations.

Complex development operations will often feature positions dedicated solely to the internal coordination of fund raising across offices and schools; these
people may or may not have prospects assigned to them. In short, not everyone who works in "development" raises money.

But the more meaningful distinction pertains to purpose. For the sake of simplicity, let's put it this way: The time we spend cultivating or soliciting donors is fund raising; that spent aligning fundraising goals with institutional planning and maturation is development.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) described leadership in their “5 Practices of Exemplary Leadership” as Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Challenging the Process, Enabling Others to Act, and Encouraging the Heart. Roberts’ (2007) notion of leadership was defined as “conviction in action.”

Creswell (2003) described skills as particular practices, approaches, techniques, which for this study were related to active, intentional solicitation of funds for institutional projects or the greater institutional good.

Success was defined as (a) funds raised and (b) accomplishment of institutional strategic objectives via funds raised.

Delimitations and Limitations

This study was limited to one cohort of ten presidents, in one Midwestern state, at a particular point in time, 2008. Findings cannot be generalized beyond these parameters, since the case study research method, by design, is not meant to generate scientific data more suited to a quantitative method. The case study method is designed to explore in depth what Creswell (2003) described as “an event, activity, a process, or one or more individuals . . . using a variety of data collection procedures over a sustained period of
time” (p. 15). The sample size for this study was small, but in line with Creswell’s description of the method.

The presidents in this study presided over private institutions, and relatively small institutions. No president served an institution serving more than 8,500 undergraduate students, with the majority of the institutions serving populations far less than that.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

Section One: Evolution of the Position of College or University President

Lilly (1987) described a number of historical periods in American higher education during which the role of the president evolved in meaningful ways: Colonial times through the era of the academy (1819-1862), the emerging university (1862-1915), the golden age (1915-1975), and the age of uncertainty (1975 to the present). The descriptions of the role of president that follow parallel these distinctions.

Rudolph (1966) charted a history of higher education in the United States marked by “increasingly massive” support and involvement by state and federal governments. Along those same lines, a legacy of philanthropy from the colonial period through the 19th century, spurred by what he described as a “band of mighty millionaires,” funded new ideas and purposes, like technology, and higher education for new clienteles, including women and African-Americans. That legacy evolved into substantial philanthropic support from “foundations, alumni, and business corporations.” (p. 1424)

The Colonial Period

The role of the college president evolved significantly during nearly 400 years of American higher education. Originally a position grounded in, and responsible to, the church, the U.S. college president later became primarily corporate in his or her orientation.

In the Colonial colleges -- Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania [University of Philadelphia], Columbia [King’s College], Brown, Rutgers
[College of New Jersey], Dartmouth (as they are known in 2009) (Tucker, 1988) – the clergyman president served as “moral leader, teacher, administrator, and fundraiser” (Kerr, 1991). There were limits to the morality of the leader, however.

For example, Morison (1958) described the original funds establishing Harvard as the first colonial college as having been “embezzled” by Nathaniel Eaton from his friend, John Harvard. He also wrote of Eaton’s disciplining students in such a way that “the Cambridge cowyards [sic] [were] made . . . hideous with the yells of students being beaten” (p. 436), qualifying the morality of the leadership provided.

In response, students formed what were called “combinations,” which served as organized, collective resistance to strident discipline imposed by college presidents of the time (Hessinger, 1999). The role of the colonial college president was heavily connected to the management of student conduct, an outgrowth of their religious background.

“With few exceptions,” according to Vine (1976), colonial-era college presidents began their careers as clergymen, and saw their roles as “ministers-of-education” (see also Dannelly, 1931; Good, 1930; Howe, 2002; Naylor, 1977; Perrin, 1936). Despite the uniformity of pre-position experience at that time, the title of “president” was not universally used during this period. “Provost,” “Rector,” and even “Non-Resident Chancellor” were used to denote the chief executive of fledgling American colleges, though only the College of William and Mary used the “Non-Resident Chancellor” title (Durnin, 1961).

The colonial college president – or provost, rector, or chancellor, accordingly – was universally regarded as the chief executive educator, often without support or assistance. The expectation at this time was, generally, that the president was to teach at
the exclusion of other administrative tasks (Durnin, 1961). When assistance was available, it was almost always in the form of tutors, who were young and short-term staff members (Good, 1930). As president, he – and in this period it was “he” – was:

. . . responsible for the economic and educational survival of the college or university. He, as titular head, personified the institution and represented it at most social and ceremonial events. As an executive he was supposed to coordinate the work of the administrative subordinates who served at his pleasure just as he served at the pleasure of the board of trustees. As the one person privileged to view the institution in its totality he had to do the long-range program, financial, and physical plant planning.

He was also supposed to set standards of and control student behavior. And of course he was expected to be a scholar and an educational statesman able to set the intellectual tone of the academic community. As to the traits expected, they were truly Olympian. Physical stamina, intellectual power, political astuteness, high moral character, fluency of speech and writing, impeccable social graces, idealism, financial sense, the ability to raise money, the ability to relate to students, and supreme optimism – these were but a few of the traits considered to be essential (Mayhew, 1971, pp. 354-355).

At least some of the “giants” of the period earned that reputation by means of radically altering the course of study, changing the very nature of the educational experience (Hawkes, 1930; MacLean, 1877). Other presidents earned their reputation by means of managing student behavior. Given that the student body at the time was exclusively male, and relatively young, presidents of the era also spoke freely and
frequently about their role as moral shapers of young minds . . . a task they felt best not left to the students’ parents (Durnin, 1961; Lee, 2002; Vine, 1976).

Higher education in colonial America spread quickly and widely. In 1745 there were just three colleges in all of North America, but by 1776, every province and every major religious order had established institutions of higher education (McAnear, 1952, 1955). Dexter (1901) described this as the “virus” of college enthusiasm. By 1775, “the combined enrollment of all these [colonial] institutions was less than thirteen hundred students and their alumni totaled less than one percent of the entire population” (Cohen, 1968, p. 375). Brubacher and Rudy (1968) indicated a peak enrollment 413 students at Harvard and 338 at Yale in 1770.

As the institutions became more complex and more well-established, the need for the leaders to ensure the long-term success of the institutions grew, as well. McAnear (1952) described at least some of the colonial colleges as early as 1775 as needing to establish endowments in order to begin covering significant annual operating deficits.

During this period, Princeton and the Presbyterian Church in America for a time were essentially the fount from which the rest of American higher education flowed. A favorable geographic location and a denominational inclination toward education enabled Princeton’s influence to reach far and wide throughout the colonies. Come (1945) cited Nevin’s 1884 description of the Presbyterian Church’s interest in education as a collective sense that “Presbyterianism cannot take root in the shallow soil of ignorance.” Preceded by the “Pennsylvania log colleges” of the 18th century, a movement itself an outgrowth of the “Great Awakening” begun in 1733, Princeton eventually yielded a great number of colonial college chief executives (Come, 1945; Trinterud, 1948). Centuries
later, Fr. Theodore Hesburgh described his vision of the University of Notre Dame as a Catholic [modern-day] Princeton (Hesburgh, 1990).

In terms of fundraising, Spiller (1938) said that it was “even more difficult” for seventeenth-century colleges to remain financially viable [than it was in the early twentieth century]. Morison (1958) suggested that by the eighteenth century “. . . college founding was helped along the way by the years of prosperity after 1748, which made fund raising easier, and by the growth of civic and humanitarian spirit, which provided the stimulus” (pp. 24-25).

American higher education during the period from 1539-1789 (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997) was emerging in a country without what Good (1930) described as “funded wealth.” This limited the possibilities of funding initiatives like higher education, and without any tradition or body of scholarship (p. 540). Rudolph (1963) described the cost of four years’ attendance at Harvard in its earliest days as “equivalent to the full pay of a laborer for two years,” a cost that stayed relatively stable [in real cost] for the next three centuries. He suggested Harvard could not have survived were it not for significant government support, gifts, and bequests.

Two techniques for securing gifts of support during this period were subscription lists, which were promises of payment shared publicly at least in part to serve as some measure of a social register, and lotteries. Some lotteries were even offered, out of desperation, on a payment-plan option. Neither of these strategies were as successful as they were creative (McAnear, 1952).
Public vs. Private: The Dartmouth Decision

While the Dartmouth decision of 1819 (Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward, 1819) delineated the boundaries of authority and responsibility for a private institution of higher education, the distinction prior to that decision was in no way so clear. Lee (2002) said that private schools were much more likely to have significant involvement of the clergy in the makeup of their board . . . and the basis of the Dartmouth case rested in a dispute between the president of Dartmouth, John Wheeler, and the Dartmouth board. In this case the president was asking the court to side with him and the state legislature against the Dartmouth board. The court’s decision in favor of the board helped establish a public-private distinction.

Whitehead (1984) traced the earliest beginnings of the public-private distinction to the 1766 founding of Queen’s College, which became Rutgers. He suggested, as did Dannelly (1931), Howe (2002), and Rudolph (1966), that the public/government interest in sponsoring or supporting church-affiliated institutions continued for many years, even as the ability or will to do so began to ebb. Private institutions’ solicitation of non-governmental support, and the need to continue to solicit that support has grown exponentially since the Dartmouth case in 1819.

Ante-Bellum Era: The Emerging University

As in the preceding period, church sponsorship of higher education during the ante-bellum era resulted most often in seminaries that evolved over time into colleges and universities (Naylor, 1977). Dannelly (1931) stated that just 17 of 246 colleges in 1860 were state-sponsored institutions, with the proportion of graduates from church-sponsored institutions at that time exceeding 90%.
Schmidt (1936) identified just 182 colleges in existence at the beginning of the Civil War. Tewksbury (1932) described this group of institutions as bifurcated in its mortality. Colleges in the northeastern states of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island had low mortality rates, while in sixteen other states, the mortality rate was 81% (p. 28). Schmidt (1953) noted that “the exact number [of colleges] is difficult to ascertain since ‘college’ was a term of hopeful ambition rather than of precise definition” (p. 19). Tewksbury (1932) described a process where towns bid against one another for the right to sponsor an institution, with towns often being unable to continue sponsorship of the institution beyond the winning bid (p. 26).

Tewksbury (1932) listed several other ways colleges in this time perished. “Natural catastrophes,” including fire, were common. Malaria, smallpox, choleras, and “fevers of various sorts” contributed to the demise of institutions. Friction between and among faculty, trustees, and students contributed to conflicts that sometimes led to the closure of institutions.

The role of the college president continued to evolve during this period and presidents of this era were expected to teach an upper-class course on moral philosophy (Come, 1945; Gummere, 1960; McKenna, 2006; Naylor, 1977) as part of their church and teaching obligations. More than 90% of college presidents and the majority of the faculty of Christian schools of the period were ordained ministers, and theological seminaries offered the majority of graduate education during this period (Naylor, 1977).

Luminaries of the time like Daniel Coit Gilman at Johns Hopkins embraced the German model of graduate education. This period marks the beginning of the university
movement, an evolutionary step in the growth of American higher education (Fincher, 1993; Schmidt, 1953), and the role of the college and university president.

The Frontier College President

As the country expanded westward, new institutions of higher education were established in order to enhance and promote the new republic and to civilize the frontier. Robson (1983) suggested dual motives: the challenge for clergy of bringing the church to the un-churched on the emerging edge of a growing country, and the desire of those living at the frontier’s edge to embrace a certain amount of culture. Miller (1961) described the need at the beginning of the 19th century in America to address life in the “terrifying west” (p. 352). He said “… the cry for saving the West swelled to a chorus of incitation infinitely more impassioned than had been the call for resistance to England” during the American Revolution (p. 352).

A third motivation was identified by Mayhew (1971), a desire to educate those on the frontier about their obligations as citizens of the new republic. He stated that the pioneering spirit of the frontier did foster changes in the role of the college president, due to the president’s relative autonomy, control of the budget, contentment among the faculty – “so long as it could do the things it wished” – and colleges’ fit with other emerging public institutions like schools, businesses, and the military.

The pioneering spirit of America’s westward expansion did not lead to radical, innovative change in the nature of higher education in the west, though. Schmidt (1936) described ideological connections for these colleges to institutions of the seventeenth century, and not to new, emerging models of the nineteenth. Urofsky (1965) described a
connection to historic Yale and Princeton, the “greatest mothers of [U.S.] colleges” (p. 63).

Gordon (1953) described the focus on presidential fundraising during this period as at least as complex and concerning as that for the 1950s-era college president. Gordon suggested that any report describing a turn-of-the-twentieth-century institution without concomitant pleading for funds would be “exceptional.”

This also was the period when the nation’s great research institutions began to take shape, as directed by those institutions’ presidents. This was a new model for a new time: “After the Civil War, the presidential entrepreneurs built the research universities . . .” (Kerr, 1991).

The Modern Era: The Golden Age to the Age of Uncertainty

In an era marked by dramatic increases in interest in and access to American higher education following World War II, paralyzing civil unrest on college and university campuses (Astin, Astin, Bayer, & Bisconti, 1997) shaped the role of institutions of higher education and of the men and women who led them. The role of colleges and universities evolved (Finkelstein & Pfnister, 1984), as did the role of their presidents, particularly with regard to the need to be actively engaged in fundraising and to provide meaningful leadership (Kerr & Gade, 1987). Jones, Stanford, and White (1964), in one of a series of fictional letters based on their real experiences as college executives, spoke to the issues of the day. In a letter addressed to “the presidents of relatively small colleges, chiefly independent or ‘church-related’ and chiefly emphasizing the liberal arts,” they suggested that a new college president had to be prepared to
personally assume responsibility for the “inauguration of a development program,” even in the face of being overworked. In response to campus unrest and unprecedented interest in higher education, the presidents were being urged by Jones, Stanford, and White (1964) to respond financially, to develop a systematic way of raising the funds necessary to manage the institution.

Trachtenberg (2001) said that during this period there was a redefinition of the position of college or university president, from loquacious figurehead to someone who “has to deal, on shorter and shorter notice, with all kinds of offices located in such parts of the extracurricular society as business, government, and the courts.” At the heart of much of this required attention was the need to secure and retain the funds necessary to manage the educational enterprise.

Hamlin (1990) wrote “The private college president’s evolution from scholar to salesman [sic] appears to be a trend that will continue to gain importance as financial pressures require even greater attention in the future.” In his 1990 study of 126 presidents of accredited, private, four-year liberal arts colleges with full-time equivalent enrollments of between 500 and 2000 students, with each institution in existence at least 75 years, he noted that fully 54.8% of these institutions had been in “financial danger” at some point in the decade between 1975 and 1985.

Fifty-one of the 126 institutions he studied were considered “financially endangered” at the time of the study, as defined by an institutional financial matrix he developed. The presidents of those 51 institutions were asked to identify which “tools” were most important in helping them overcome the financial adversity faced by their institution at that time.
Nine of the top ten identified tools related to revenue enhancement. Two of the top three tools related to fund raising, specifically, with “Fundraising efforts of president” at number 2, and “Obtaining gifts/grants from benefactors” at number three. The number one tool identified by the presidents, “Expanded Recruiting Effort,” revealed the tuition-dependent nature of most private colleges and universities.

Section Two: Pathways to the Presidency

The line historically connecting professional experience as a chief academic officer to the position of college or university president is not nearly as straight as it once was. A significantly larger number of newly hired presidents are coming out of the ranks of institutional advancement, student affairs, the private business sector, government, and elsewhere. Bornstein (2005) said that “There is no clear route to the presidency, and the job has been filled successfully, and unsuccessfully, by scholars, business leaders, fund raisers, lawyers, and priests.” Noyes’ 1994 research described the emergence of chief student affairs officers as a viable population for moving into college and university presidencies. Noyes also reported, from this research, that only 10% of applicants for presidential positions come from truly non-traditional career paths.

Wessel and Keim (1994) shared that at private institutions, just 61% of newly hired presidents come from the ranks of tenured faculty members. Pope (2005) said that institutions must be looking for candidates who are more than mere scholars.

The literature presented several career paths for college presidents. Siegel (2001) stated “Nothing prepares one for the presidency,” one of seven themes eminent during a president’s first year in the position.
The typical college president is described, statistically, as “a married, Caucasian male in his early fifties (Arman, 1986; Waring, 2003), and a married protestant (Wessel, 1991). These descriptions are similar to descriptions offered by Cohen and March (1974) and Barr (1981). The majority of American college presidents in Howard’s 1983 study “were males, married, and held doctorates. On the average, presidents were individuals who had been socialized in higher education for over 15 years.” Mathern’s 1998 research showed similar findings.

From 1986 to 1988, the percentage of female presidents doubled, from 9.5% to 19%, and the percentage of minority presidents in that same time period increased 5.5%, from 8% to 13.5% (Groppe, 2007). Just 1.4% of all college presidents are African-American women, and more than half of that population served at community or junior colleges (Waring, 2003). McLaughlin and Riesman (1993) said that “. . . vaulting directly from professorial life to a presidency . . . [is] rare.” (p. 191)

Wessel (1991) described two super-ordinate pathways to the presidency, an academic track, followed by 70% of those surveyed, with 14 variations, and an administrative track, with seven variations. Rare is the president selected from within her or his institution (Arman, 1986; Bornstein, 2005). Birnbaum (1992b) documented a typical phenomenon of new presidents being hired to “act as a corrective for the perceived weaknesses of the former president” (p. 9). This is one version of a set of typical responses enunciated by Finkelstein, Farrar, and Pfnister (1984) which described institutional self-correcting in an attempt to create what they described as “revolutionary [institutional] change.”
Birnbaum (1988b) said that, at best, “... there is no consensus on the basic question of whether changes of leadership reduce organizational performance, improve organizational performance, or have no effect upon organizational performance at all” (p. 489). The path to the position, and the impact of the position upon the institution, are not universal.

Little (2005) suggested that a 15-year tenure as president is exceptional. Groppe (2007) reported an average tenure of 8.5 years, while Little (2005) described a tenure closer to five years as the norm. The five-year tenure is not sufficient to create meaningful institutional change, he said, but is a short enough period of time for presidents to exit “before something goes seriously wrong in their presidency.”

McLaughlin and Riesman (1993) wrote “We suspect we may be seeing some presidents with foreshortened terms of office because, once they have executed the budgetary decisions, they cannot survive the anger directed at them.” (p. 197)

Groppe (2007) cited a 2006 survey of 3,396 college presidents that predicted a “wave of retirements,” as nearly half the presidents (49.3%) responding to the survey were aged 61 or older at the time of the survey. Twenty years earlier, in 1986, a similar survey indicated that just 13.9% of the presidents were in that age group.

With all the variations on the pathway to the college or university presidency, the rule still remains that most candidates enter the arena with little experience in fundraising or advancement work (Little, 2005). This occurs despite the fact that institutions look for candidates with this sort of experience (Pope, 2005).

Hodgkinson (1970) predicted that the incongruence between institutional need and typical career pathways for college and university presidents would result in dual
chief executive positions: a faculty-student position to provide leadership for the educational and social side of the institution, and an administrative position to manage the financial and maintenance needs. The multiple-position approach has not come to pass. Instead of dual chief executives, the president continues to have significant fundraising expectations, often assisted by a senior-level vice president and team in charge of overall institutional fundraising.

Section Three: Need to Do Fundraising

There is an increasing emphasis on fundraising in all of American higher education, and especially so for private higher education. The chief executive officer, the president, must be involved in the fundraising enterprise, in a manner that capitalizes on her or his strengths, interests, and desires (Basinger, 2004b).

In an interview in February of 2005 on National Public Radio (NPR), the editor of the online publication Inside Higher Education, in response to a question about the typical duties of contemporary college presidents, replied, “Well, it varies a lot by institution, but their number one task tends to be to raise money.” He went on to add that they also “spend a lot of time worrying about what’s going to create a PR [public relations] disaster for themselves.”

Mathis (1998) reported that “approximately 50% of the time of the president [is given] toward fundraising activity.” Bornstein (2003a) reported that philanthropic gifts doubled between 1990 and 2000, and that during that same time period, campaigns were initiated that yielded 27 gifts of $100 million. Lively (2000) wrote:

[The 1990s were] a decade of megagifts – colleges reported 27 gifts of $100-million or more – and of increasingly ambitious capital campaigns. Twenty-
two institutions announced or completed campaigns of $1-billion or more during the 1990's. (p. A41)

“The centrality of fund-raising in both lean and flush economic times transformed this tattered sister of academe [fundraising] into a heavily courted princess,” Bornstein (2003a) wrote. (p. 9) The emerging need for more and bigger dollars was the catalyst for a restructuring of institutional mores.

Clayton (2001) described as exemplary the fundraising work of a retiring Harvard University president, whose final campaign raised $1.3 million a day – for a total of $2.6 billion – pushing Harvard’s endowment beyond $10 billion. In 2007, Harvard’s endowment’s increase of $6 billion was larger than the total endowment of all but 14 of 475 colleges and universities responding to a survey co-sponsored by the National Association of College and University Business Officers and TIAA-CREF. Seventy-six institutions surveyed claimed endowments of more than $1 billion, 14 more than the year previously (Marklein, 2008).

While this is a component of higher education long understood by private college and university presidents, it is also incumbent upon public institution leaders to actively, deliberately, and systematically raise funds to support the activities and budgetary needs of their institutions. Private college presidents still are required to do notably more of this than their public school counterparts, but both types of presidents suggest fundraising consumes a significant portion of their time. In a 1998 study, the American Council on Education found that fundraising was the “primary use of time by presidents at all doctoral and baccalaureate institutions, as well as presidents of private master’s schools.”
McLaughlin and Riesman (1993) stated “It was once the case that a certain tacit treaty existed between the public and independent [private] sectors, in which the former would maintain low tuitions and keep out of the market for philanthropy. Now, however . . . public institutions are going after the same philanthropy that is being courted by the independent sector.” (pp. 194-195)

Dr. Allen Lee Sessoms, president of Queens College of the public City University of New York system, garnered headlines when he began actively soliciting donations from alumni and corporations, the impetus for what was the College’s first capital campaign ever (Strosnider, 1997, p. A31). The decision to do so came in the face of a reduction in state-provided aid of nearly 23%, a loss of $17 million. Fogg (2004) shared that the also-public University of California – Los Angeles in 2004 embarked on a $250 million fundraising effort, with funds earmarked specifically for the recruitment and retention of faculty and graduate students.

Where historically the college or university president was the chief academic officer, presidents of the twenty-first century are required to function as “entrepreneurs, managers, fundraisers, economic development partners, lobbyists, and public figures” (Bornstein, 2003a). Boards charged with recruiting and selecting new presidents are looking for presidents with the ability to “improve the institution’s reputation, raise money, maintain the campus and facilities, balance the budget, and prevent crises” (Bornstein, 2003a). Hilton’s 1989 research showed that a more important factor in the presidential selection process, statistically, was previous presidential experience.

Williams (2005) said a contemporary college president must be more like a “corporate businessman crafting partnerships” than anything else. Bornstein (2000)
suggested that a college president is most likely to leave her or his stamp on the institution on the basis of funds raised, and not on the basis of curricular changes or student life, historical markers of presidential impact. Often, regardless of presidential aspirations or intentions, their legacy is ultimately defined in terms of buildings built and dollars procured (Bornstein, 2005). Myles Brand, former president of the University of Indiana, said (1995) that stewardship alone was insufficient; the obligations of a president included “nurturing . . . future achievement.”

Section Four: Skill Sets Required for a Fundraising President

“College administration, one has to be honest, isn’t rocket science,” said Queens College president Allen Lee Sessoms in a 1997 Chronicle of Higher Education interview (Strosnider, 1997). “It’s politics, politics, politics, with a little good judgment thrown in.” What are the skill sets that make for an effective leader in that environment, particularly with regard to the contemporary need to infuse active fundraising into the existing political, judgment-oriented arena?

The shift in presidential role and responsibility from chief academic officer to chief executive officer and corporate fundraiser requires a commensurate shift in the preparation of future institutional leaders, leaders who will be expected and required to participate in the institution’s fundraising efforts, and to lead the framing of the institution’s long-term needs, financially and otherwise. This will be expected and required despite many or most candidates for president positions having never been involved in advancement efforts, and potentially lacking an understanding of the history, tradition, meaning, ethics, and organization of the fundraising enterprise.
The relationship between the president and the chief advancement officer is critical to the success of the fundraising initiatives in place, as well as to the long-term viability of the institution (Bornstein, 2000, 1998; Strout, 2005). Rhodes (1998) reinforced the need for the president to be an effective fund- and friend-raiser for the institution, but cautioned that it not happen at the cost of fundraising activities becoming all-consuming.

Mayhew (1971) spoke to the practical reality of the time involved in the cultivation and pursuit of significant advancement gifts, much of it spent away from campus. He cautioned the college or university president against such prolonged absences that faculty and/or student unrest resulted.

Fr. Theodore Hesburgh, former president of the University of Notre Dame, shared an apocryphal tale allegedly told about himself by students on his campus:

“What’s the difference between God and Hesburgh?”

“God is everywhere; Hesburgh is everywhere, except Notre Dame.”

(Hesburgh, 1990, 73)

At the beginning of the twenty-first century came calls for increased scrutiny over gifts raised by colleges and universities, the gifts’ valuation, and sometimes their propriety, especially as the size of the largest gifts increased (Roush & Peterson, 2004).

Dennison (2000) described a concern that contemporary college presidents are known to stand, in moral terms, for nothing, except perhaps the next available dollar in the fundraising enterprise. Kaufman (2004) said that if true, that is not sufficient:

“Today’s college or university president must be a champion fundraiser and a strong
internal leader.” Kaufman (2004) elaborated and identified a list of requisite traits for successful presidents who were also successful fundraisers:

- An authentic belief in the role of the president as fundraiser
- A deep understanding of the need to invest in external relationships
- Strategic goal setting
- A future vision
- A passion for the institution coupled with storyteller ability
- Solid credibility (pp. 50-51)

Kaufman (2004) cited Patrick Kelly, chairman of the board of St. Norbert College (WI), who believed that “A president who is expected to raise funds needs both charisma and credibility,” and that “Alumni and others who are expected to donate their hard-earned money have to like the individual and believe that he or she will make the investment count” (p. 52).

June and Ashburn (2007) described attributes most likely to make a presidential candidate/fundraiser especially attractive as a candidate:

- The ability to set strategic goals and to enlist the support of other campus populations in pursuit of those goals
- The ability to create passion and excitement that lead to raising funds . . . and a proven track record of having done so
- The ability to manage crises
- The cache’ of national name recognition (p. B6)

The effective college or university president uses ambitious, strategically-defined, institutionally-embraced fundraising initiatives to establish what Kaufman (2004)
described as a “margin of excellence” for the institution. Christian (2003) suggested that the most effective presidents were those that worked long hours, began serving at a relatively young age, and served for a long period of time. Time spent at work was also one focus of Mathis (1998), who showed that effective fundraising college presidents devoted approximately 50% of their time to fundraising, and 10% of their institutional budgets.


What are the skill sets required of presidents hired to keep an institution out of financial trouble, or worse yet, to rescue institutions on the verge of financial ruin? Jones (1991) and Meadows (1999) stated that small, church-related colleges and universities, especially those with relatively limited endowments, were especially at risk.

Hamlin (1990) stated that “unquestionably, the ability to promote their institutions effectively” (p. 11) was the key skill effective fundraising presidents had to possess. A more precise list of requisite skills came from Fisher and Koch (1996) who stated that to establish a successful fundraising program, an effective president had to:

1. Establish a personal fundraising library
2. Keep or replace [the] incumbent Vice President
3. Appoint a fund-raising consultant
4. Conduct a feasibility study
5. Develop a case statement

6. Appoint an extraordinary Vice President, one with a strong track record of success and a personal chemistry with the President

7. Give the Vice President an attractive office near yours

8. Make the Vice President a member of your top advisory council

9. Approve a budgetary allocation that generously reflects the great potential of the activities of the area

10. Be lean in organizing and administering your advancement area (pp. 214-225)

Eldredge (1990) found that transformational leadership characteristics and skills were especially valuable for college presidents in their advancement/fundraising work, though he found that institutional context was also a critical factor. Epps (1999) found that the most effective college presidents practiced a mix of transformational and charismatic leadership styles. Fisher and Koch (1996) contrasted transactional and transformational leadership practices of college presidents, and found that transactional leaders would struggle to be effective, while transformational leaders “can and should make a difference” (x). Zhang (1993) showed that risk-taking behavior and vision-building were both important factors for effective college leaders.

Fisher and Koch (1996) said that effective college presidents were:

- Less collegial and more distant
- More inclined to rely upon respect than affiliation
- More inclined to take risks
- More committed to an ideal or vision than an institution
- More inclined to support merit pay
• More thoughtful, shrewd, and calculating than spontaneous
• More likely to work long hours
• More supportive of organizational flexibility
• More experienced
• More frequently published (p. 57)

Kaufman (2004), quoting Fr. Theodore Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame, said that “The leader needs a clear and challenging vision, magic with words, the ability to motivate others, the courage to stay on course, and the persistence not to lose hope” (p. 51). Hesburgh’s speeches, interpreted and summarized by Ncube (2002), described the requisite skills for the effective fundraising college or university president:

(1) [Hesburgh] connects and establishes identification with the alumni not because the University is their alma mater, but because they are to serve the world on behalf of the University.

(2) He focuses outward on universals not inward on institutional needs. As the alumni disseminate established principles and values learned at the University of Notre Dame, they are actually engaging in responding to the needs of the University.

(3) His appeal is for the alumni to work hard for the University and makes giving money an easy way to accomplish the work.

(4) He focuses on alumni, not current students. Alumni do not give to the University to help poor students have the same experience the alumni had,
but he reminds them of their experiences while at the University and how those experiences have gotten them to where they are in life.

(5) He focuses on what the University has, not on what it does not have – these are the principles and values the University imparts to students and they are those to which the University can hold students accountable. (p. 6)

**Hiring a Fundraising President**

More presidents are being hired who have a significant background in advancement or fundraising. Bornstein (2003a) and McMillen (1991) noted a 1991 Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) survey showing more than 60 presidents serving in 1991 having had some formal fundraising experience. In 1982 that figure had been 25.

Kaufman (2004) delineated both the skill sets search committees should be looking to find in candidates and the skills critical for successful fundraising. She described this as “a certain orientation.”

Die (1999) offered several cautions to search committees who would seek a new president. She urged committees to be wary of interview artifice that replaced candidates’ exercise of leadership with their rhetoric about leadership. She also cautioned committees to be especially sensitive to issues of “fit” or institutional match with candidate skill and style, an admonition that actions spoke louder than words. Springer’s (2003) assertion that “aspiring presidents [have] to endure five to ten searches before securing a position” reflected this, as well.
Search committees must seek and hire candidates who have strong academic credentials, but also have previous fundraising experience, a willingness to learn how to raise funds, and a fit with the institution (Kaufman, 2004). Presidents, once hired, must be inclined toward:

- An authentic belief in the role of president as fundraiser
- A deep understanding of the need to invest in external relationships
- Strategic goal setting
- A future vision
- A passion for the institution coupled with storyteller ability
- Solid credibility (pp. 50-51)

Luck’s PowerPoint presentation (n.d.) suggested three principles, and corollary maxims, successful fundraising presidents had to be aware of before beginning this task. All sought to re-frame the fundraising aspect of contemporary college president work as relational rather than transactional, as philanthropy rather than “sales.”

Principle No. 1: Wealthy People Don’t Always Appear to be Wealthy

Maxim: Let donors reveal to you their capacity for making a gift

Principle No. 2: Personal Relationships are Key

Maxim: Ultimately, it is the relationship that matters

Principle No. 3: Taking Care of People Will Bring Rewards

Maxim: Meeting people’s needs – no matter how insignificant will reap benefits

Fisher and Koch (1996) suggested that fundraising should not be dreaded or feared, and that it could be, in and of itself, a rewarding activity. In comments directed to the reader-as-college-president, they suggested:
... institutional advancement [fundraising] ... if handled thoughtfully and seriously, can not only be extraordinarily successful, but also one of the most rewarding and most intellectually stimulating of your presidential responsibilities. The key is to approach fundraising head on, with both eyes open, using all the mental faculties at your command at the beginning of your term. (p. 213)

Birnbaum’s (1992b) study of 32 college presidents described what often become unalterable trajectories for new college presidents once they have been hired. These trajectories most often begin as a series of corrections to what he called the “deficiencies of their predecessors.” (p. 16)

Systematic Integration of Fundraising Activity

Senge (1990) stated that all organizations can choose to become “learning organizations,” organizations that develop systematic means of learning from mistakes and that successfully create a culture of innovation and success. The linchpin in the notion of “learning organizations” is a systematic, comprehensive approach. Jones (1991) proposed a model for institutional advancement that “focus[ed] on the entire [institutional] program, rather than just the fundraising function.”

Luck (n.d.) proposed that this systematic orientation also served fundraising presidents exceptionally well. He said:

Failures in higher education could be laid at the feet of poor ideas. However, it is not a lack of ideas that we suffer from – we typically have too many ideas. Instead, it is a lack of focus, commitment, follow-through, and execution. It is not the thinking, it is the doing.
Higdon (2003) suggested that after first hiring personnel best equipped to maximize fundraising activity, the second-most important fundamental for fundraising involved doing the necessary work to make fundraising an integrated, central concern for the institution, involving “faculty, friends, alumni, past supporters, and students.” Tingey (1997) stated that presidential leadership of colleges and universities was “contextual and situational,” that certain types of institutions tended to have a president with a specific style of leadership, and that, consequently, “it is the stage, not the actor, that is of prime importance.” (p. 10)

Brink (1996) stated that one of the primary functions of a contemporary college or university president was to be the chief interpreter of their institution’s strategic vision and goals. These items are inextricably connected to the institution’s ability to raise and manage funds.

Meadows (1999) found fundraising enterprise deficiencies at Bible colleges in the following areas:

- Institutional commitment to fundraising
- Structure and authority for advancement officers
- Qualified and experienced advancement staff
- Sufficient advancement activities
- Planning and program evaluation

Smith (2001) stated that the most effective presidents were those especially well-suited to meet the needs of a particular campus at a particular time. In other words, an effective president at one institution might not be as effective at another.
Section Five: Rising Compensation, Rising Expectations

Another aspect of contemporary American college and university presidencies is the increased competition for the services and leadership of those who are perceived to be especially effective, determined in part by their ability to raise funds. Presidents are expected to be able to help their institutions achieve what their mission calls them to do and be. One consequence of this heightened competition is increased pay for effective chief executive officers, and the increased scrutiny that accompanies the higher salaries.

Bowen and Buck (2004) asked, “Is there a college president in the nation who merits such lucrative compensation? How much is too much to pay? What is the job worth? And what effects do high presidential salaries have on the academy?” (p. B24) Frahm (2004) shared that “At private colleges and universities, 42 presidents received more than $500,000, and seven topped the $800,000 mark in 2002-2003, the latest year for which compensation figures were available” (p. A1). At public institutions, the numbers were smaller. Just 17 public-school presidents made more than $500,000 in this same time period.

The increased expectation put on college and university presidents to bring big donors and big dollars to the institutional table is often used to justify such high salaries. This is the case for both public and private institutions:

University presidents who can attract big contributions from corporations, foundations, and wealthy alumni can help bridge the gap and hold down tuition increases. It’s a factor that shouldn’t be overlooked in deciding whether a president is ‘worth’ the salary paid.” (Pantagraph, 2004, p. C2)
Compensation structures in higher education begin to look more like those in the world of commerce. “As in the private sector, deferred compensation provides a lavish retirement benefit for top academics and a powerful incentive to stay on the job” (Walzer, 2004, p. A1). Basinger (2004a, 2004b) described other commercially-oriented factors in the determination of rising presidential salaries, from simple competition for the ablest candidates to a sitting president’s ability to leverage her or his own position, sometimes by foregoing the pursuit of a position at a different institution.

One strategy suggested to counter what some perceive as swelling compensation is to index the salaries of the presidents to those of the professoriate (Padilla, Ghosh, Fisher, Wilson, & Thornton, 2000). As a counter-point, Basinger (2004a) suggested this idea was not realistic, and that faculty putting forward the idea should “just get over it,” and accept the market realities at play in contemporary higher education. Chance (2004) asked “Why should the AAUP get to decide what it means to be paid well?” Rising institutional expectations of the president beget rising compensation, which beget rising expectations.

Corporate accounting scandals of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries resulted in passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act by Congress in 2002, legislation clarifying and codifying the relationship between boards and chief executives related to the financial interests of publicly held companies, and by extension, colleges and universities. In addition, the act established parameters connected to compensation of chief executive officers, which extends to college and university presidents. The act is an attempt to require greater financial transparency, a set of requirements that may increase
both the stress or pressure of the college president’s position and the scrutiny surrounding the appropriateness of their compensation (Roush & Peterson, 2004).

Section Six: Institutional Fundraising as a Team Endeavor

Bornstein (2000) paid particular attention to the critical nature of the relationship between the effective college president and her or his chief fundraising officer, in the areas of expertise, loyalty, and reciprocity. She stated that fundraising is a skill for which there are effective and ineffective practices, skills, and abilities. “Fortunate is the new president,” she said, “who can rely on a vice president already familiar with the institution’s key constituents, the history of their relationships to the institution, their philanthropic interests, and their giving potential” (p. 25). Ideally, the president will come to learn the necessary skills to be an effective fundraiser, but the presence of an expert chief fundraising officer is invaluable.

Second, she discussed loyalty. Specifically, she identified loyalty to the institution, to and among the leadership team, and to the trustees of the institution.

Finally, she discussed the notion of reciprocity, the idea that the advancement/fundraising staff must work in such a way as to maximize the president’s opportunity to be successful. The staff has to prepare the president to represent the institution well to potential donors, to friends of the institution, and to others, while also acknowledging the president’s need to occasionally, publicly support the advancement team. One small piece of this notion relates to who gets credit for what.
Multiple authors (Associated Press, 2006a; Bensimon, 1991; Birnbaum, 1992a, 1992b; Bornstein, 2003; Jaschik, 2006; Kerr, 1970; Kerr & Gade, 1987; Mayhew, 1971; Finkelstein, & Pfinner, 1984; Reppert, 2005; Shaw, 2005; Sullivan, 1956) described the role of the faculty in terms of what might be called “quality of professional life” measures for institutional presidents, as well as the success or failure of the institution’s fundraising efforts. Kerr (1991) described a gradual diminishing of the authority of the president coincident with the ascension of a newly organized American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

A growing divide between competing bottom lines exists. There is a financial bottom line connected to on-going institutional solvency, and there is a human resource bottom line, where faculty members have needs for “improvements in student selectivity, compensation, workload, and rankings,” and the protection of their interests, academically and otherwise (Vance, 1961).

The impact of the faculty on a president’s success or failure, or the perception of each, cannot be overstated. Whether via votes of no confidence, conflicting expectations surrounding the question of “who is in charge,” or the evolution over time from high collaboration to less-frequent collaboration, the faculty have a direct impact on the president’s performance. “Faculty access to information, participation in decision making, and feelings of empowerment” (Birnbaum, 1992b) were factors, too.

Faculty morale, according to Bornstein (2003), affects the president’s ability to be successful, in fundraising terms and in other ways. Rice and Austin’s (1988) study of 4,000 faculty members at 140 different small Liberal Arts institutions in the 1980s
showed “even higher than expected” levels of satisfaction and morale. They identified four primary sources of high faculty morale at ten institutions with particularly high morale, including:

- distinctive organizational cultures that are carefully nurtured and built upon;
- strong, participatory leadership;
- a firm sense of organizational momentum – that institutions are on the move;
- an unusually compelling identification with the institution that incorporates and extends the other three characteristics. (pp. 51-52)

Rudolph (1981), in his review of the work by Cowley (1980), described one factor in the on-going tension between president and faculty as “nonsense.” He ridiculed the belief in what he called a “golden age,” when faculty governed institutions virtually unimpeded by administrators of any sort, let alone an administrator with the title of “president.” Birnbaum (1992b) summarized the connection between a president and her or his faculty when he said that presidents will continue to be considered successful:

- . . . as long as presidents maintain the enthusiasm, openness, commitment to interaction, and desire to learn that they had when they came to the job . . . .
- But if they become bored, jaded, self-centered, distant, sure of their judgment, and less subject to influence, love will erode . . . .

Another old song reminds us that old soldiers never die, they just fade away. In a comparable vein, it may be said as well that old presidents never die; they just lose their faculties. (p. 22)

The position of college or university president evolved dramatically over the course of nearly 400 years of American higher education, and continues to evolve. The
position was initially understood to be theologian-in-chief, then academician-in-chief, then, in part, fundraiser-in-chief.

Presidents have typically risen to their position via academic careers, but that is no longer a given. A variety of work- and life-experiences prepares presidents for the work they will do as fundraisers for their institutions. These experiences augment and often take the place of formal training or preparation for the necessary work of fundraising.

Among the variety of other tasks and expectations, college and university presidents must devote significant time and attention to institutional fundraising. There are particular skills, interpersonal and otherwise, required of successful college president fundraisers.

The opportunity, historically, to speak from their “bully pulpit” is impacted by their need to raise funds, and the need to raise funds is often preeminent. The ability to raise funds consistently is one significant measure of success for college and university presidents, and their high salaries and compensation packages produce much public pressure to be successful.

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. The interviews conducted with the presidents helped determine which of the factors identified in the literature, if any, were relevant for them in their daily work.
Chapter Three
Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. The case study method allowed me to systematically explore those experiences with the presidents I interviewed.

Creswell (1998) defined a case study as “the study of a ‘bounded system’ with the focus being either the case or an issue that is illustrated by the case (or cases),” and suggested that the boundaries for a given system could be expressed in terms of time, place, and the makeup of the interrelated parts comprising the whole (p. 249). Stake (1995) said:

Custom has it that not everything is a case. A child may be a case. A teacher may be a case. But her teaching lacks the specificity, the boundedness [sic], to be called a case . . . . The case is a specific, a complex, functioning thing. (p. 2)

In this case study, I explored the lived experience of being the president of an independent college or university who had some role in the fundraising process for the institution in one Midwestern state in 2008. During 2008 funds from external sources for the institutions were limited in part because of national and international economic concerns, while private higher education remained an important educational option for many students.
The study is important because the need to conduct extensive fundraising is often identified as a reason college and university presidents’ collective influence may be less noticeable in contemporary America. Historically, college and university presidents have served as an important collective moral voice in American society.

In one Midwestern state, a consortium of the state’s 20 private colleges and universities exists to promote the interests of private higher education. The presidents of the institutions were asked to participate in the study, an approach similar to methods used by Goldsmith (2005), Mangum (1998), Plowman (1991), and Reichard (1990).

Marshall and Rossman (1989) described a population like the one for the study as “elite,” and proposed a notion of “elite interviewing,” data-gathering based on interviews with the “influential, the prominent, and the well-informed people in an organization” (p. 94). In the study, I interviewed the most prominent member of each institution’s leadership, the president.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. In order to describe that experience, a number of factors were explored.

The grand tour research question was: What were the behaviors employed in the fundraising process described by the president, generally, as understood by himself or herself? In addition, how did the presidents describe their behaviors, as they believed those with whom they worked most closely in the area of fundraising would describe them?
Secondary questions included what preparation, if any did the president have prior to assuming this particular responsibility in their executive position? I wanted to understand if they had received any formal training, but also if they utilized other experiences as informal training for their fundraising work.

In addition, I wanted to know the perceived opportunity costs, if any, when raising funds versus engaging in some other activity. Were there other choices presidents would have made, or wished they could make, instead of the fundraising work they did (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993)?

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. Research questions were:

First, what behaviors and practices were described by the presidents regarding their ability to successfully raise funds for their institution?

Second, how did presidents describe their preparation for the position of president, particularly with regard to the need to do fundraising?

Third, did the presidents describe their fundraising work in the frame of opportunity cost, and if so, how did they describe those costs?

Pilot Interview

Prior to conducting my study, I conducted a series of pilot interviews, in part to sharpen and refine my question set and in part to determine if my intention of roughly hour-long interviews was realistic. I also had the opportunity to test the recording device
I intended to use. I interviewed the outgoing president of the institution where I am presently employed, a chief advancement officer suggested by my advisor, and a colleague knowledgeable about interviews and qualitative research methods.

None of the findings were used in the dissertation, but the test interviews confirmed that the question set I intended to use did capture the breadth of fundraising work by college presidents, were open-ended enough to generate wide-ranging discussion, and were likely to fill approximately one hour’s time. The recording equipment functioned sufficiently, though I was never able to utilize the voice transcription software for the pilot or study interviews.

Method

1. Each president was sent a request via e-mail to participate in the study. The request stated a brief description of my current position at the institution where I am employed, and a one-sentence description of the study. A sample of that communication is in Figure 1.

2. Institutional Review Board documents related to the project were available electronically, upon request from the subject. The Informed Consent Form is in Appendix B. Institutional Review Board documents are in Appendix C.

3. Subsequent electronic communication via e-mail to confirm arrangements related to the interview again described the purpose of the study, the requirements to participate, and promises of confidentiality.

4. My communication included an explicit request to record and transcribe the interview. Most of this communication was with a secretary or other staff member who managed the president’s calendar.
5. Presidents were given a copy of the IRB form to sign before the interview began.

6. Presidents were interviewed for approximately 60 minutes, in person.

7. Interviews were transcribed and analyzed.
Dear President _____________,

I am currently the [position] at [institution], and I am also a student working on my dissertation at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln on the topic of presidential fundraising. I am hoping to interview each of the presidents of a [organization] institution, beginning ________________.

Ideally, I would need about an hour. Any time at your convenience, morning, noon, or night, would be fine. I will give your secretary a call next week.

If you have any questions about the project or about me, please give me a call at [number], or contact me via e-mail at [address].

Sincerely,

[Name]

Figure 1.
Sample Communication

Creswell (1998) defined a “gatekeeper” as a person who provides access to other research subjects in ethnographic and case studies. I was prepared for the presidents to require me to secure permission from board presidents, board members, or others prior to speaking with them about a subject matter as potentially sensitive as fund raising. I was not required to do so by any president.

The Case Study Method

McMillan and Schumacher (1993) stated that, “Case studies can provide a detailed description and analysis of processes or themes voiced by participants in a particular situation” (p. 377). Marshall and Rossman (1989) stated that case study
research served to “chronicle events; to render, depict, or characterize; to instruct; and to try out, prove, or test.” (p. 44)

Stake (1994) said that a case “is one among others” (p. 236), and “both the process of learning about the case and the product of our learning” (p. 237). He stated that an individual case study manifests its uniqueness and distinctiveness in the following ways:

1. the nature of the case
2. its historical background
3. the physical setting
4. other contexts, including economic, political, legal, and aesthetic
5. other cases through which this case is recognized
6. those informants through whom the case can be known (p. 238)
### Table I

*Stake’s Schema Applied to This Project*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stake’s Schema</th>
<th>Presidential Fundraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The nature of the case</td>
<td>Purposeful sample was limited to one type of institution – independent college or university – in one Midwestern state at one period in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its historical background</td>
<td>Higher education in America began with the founding of Harvard College in 1636. Most of the institutions are more than a century old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The physical setting</td>
<td>Some of the institutions are urban, some are situated in “college towns” near population centers, and some are rural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other contexts (economic, political, legal, and aesthetic)</td>
<td>There remain cultural expectations of college and university presidents to serve as moral authority and educator-in-chief, and higher education remains the goal of many American families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cases through which this case is recognized</td>
<td>There have been other studies, noted in Chapter Two, of college presidents. This study explores the experiences of one group of presidents of one particular type of institution, private institutions, in one state in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants through whom the case can be known</td>
<td>I interviewed ten men and women currently serving in these roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Creswell (1998), Merriam (1988), and Stake (1995), a case study research method is most appropriately used under certain research conditions. When the following interests guided the inquiry, the case study is the appropriate research method:

- The researcher can explore a “‘bounded system’ or a case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information and rich in content.” (Creswell, 1998, p. 61)
- The system is bounded by time and place.
- A case, “a program, an event, an activity, or individuals,” is being studied. Merriam (1988) labeled this “particularistic,” . . . suggesting to the reader what to do or not to do in a particular situation, examining a specific instance but illuminating a general problem, and being influenced by the author’s bias, or not. (p. 30)
- Multiple sources of information are used.
- The context of the case can be established by the researcher/writer. Stake (1995) said that “The allocation of attention to contexts will be based partly on the distinction between intrinsic and instrumental purposes.” (p. 64)

Distinctions were made (Creswell, 2005, 1998; Stake, 1994, 1995) between three general types of case study approaches: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective.

- An intrinsic case study details a case that is, due to its very uniqueness, worthy of focused study
- An instrumental case study serves to illuminate a particular issue or issues
- A collective case study focuses on more than one case

This study is an instrumental case study, where
a particular case is examined to provide insight into an issue or refinement in theory. The choice of case is made because it is expected to advance our understanding of that other interest (Stake, 1994, p. 237).

Stouffer (1941) stated that those doing case studies are looking simultaneously for the common and the particular, hoping in the end to present the unique. In addition, for case studies and for a number of other qualitative research approaches, the concept of epoche’ is central. Schram (2003), defined epoche’ as:

. . . the ability to suspend, distance ourselves from, or “bracket” our judgments and preconceptions about the nature and essence of experiences and events in the everyday world. . . . [The ability to] suspend judgments about what is real until they are founded on a more certain description of how everyday life (or some aspect of it) is produced and experienced by its members. (p. 71)

Creswell (1998, pp. 63-64) presented a list of challenges inherent within the process of developing qualitative case study research designs. The challenges include both purpose and process variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creswell’s Challenge</th>
<th>Presidential Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The researcher must identify his or her case.</td>
<td>As presented in Chapter 2, fundraising on the part of college and university presidents has never been more important, yet many presidents arrive at the position unprepared for and/or feel uneasy about the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher must consider whether to study a single case or multiple cases.</td>
<td>I interviewed the presidents of ten of the 20 independent, four-year institutions in one Midwestern state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher must “establish a rationale for his or her purposeful sampling strategy for selecting the case and for gathering information about the case.” (p. 64)</td>
<td>In this case, I intended to interview all 20 independent institution presidents. McMillan and Schumacher (1993) described this as “comprehensive sampling.” I was able to secure interviews with ten presidents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to develop a data collection matrix.</td>
<td>I came to understand such phenomena as career/background or preparation for the fundraising component of the presidency; institutional expectations; institutional support; perceived successes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries must be defined.</td>
<td>This research report reflects the experiences of this particular group of presidents in one state, in 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creswell (1998) described the case study qualitative research method using the focuses of the discipline’s origin, data collection processes, data analysis practices, and the form of the research unit. He said the method’s focus was on developing in-depth analyses of a single case or multiple cases, and that it originated in the fields of political science, sociology, evaluation, urban studies, and other social sciences. He identified documents, archival records, interviews, observations, and physical artifacts as some of the sources of data for case study research. He said the narrative form for the method was the in-depth study of a case or cases. (p. 65)

For the purposes of the research, I conducted an instrumental case study of the lived experience of ten presidents of independent colleges and universities in one Midwestern state who actively participated in fundraising for their institution. I used purposive sampling, which Berg (1995) recommended when “researchers use their special knowledge or expertise about some group to select subjects who represent the population” (p. 179). Because of my nearly 20-year career working in student affairs in private higher education and my review of the literature, I felt the presidents of the private institutions in one Midwestern state were an appropriate purposive sample.

The interview questions were written to capture the essence of the presidents’ experiences, and to answer the research questions. The subjects of the research were college and university presidents of independent institutions in one Midwestern state in 2008.

Creswell (1998) said that methodologically, case study research should go through a number of steps. These included:

- The researcher must identify his or her case.
• The researcher must consider whether to study a single case or multiple cases.
• The researcher must establish a rationale for their purposeful sampling strategy for selecting the case and for gathering information about the case.
• The researcher must be able to generate enough data that they will be able to present an “in-depth” description of the case.
• The researcher must decide the boundaries of the case. (p. 63-64)

A list of specific recommendations regarding the preparation of an interview-based research project was shared by Creswell (1998), and included guidelines about interviewees, interview type, recording procedures, interview protocol development, interview sites, consent, and time management within the interview. Creswell suggested the following:

• Determine what type of interview is practical and will net the most useful information to answer research questions.
• . . . I recommend the use of adequate recording procedures, such as a . . . mike sensitive to the acoustics of the room.
• Design the interview protocol, a form about four or five pages in length, with approximately five open-ended questions and ample space between the questions to write responses to the interviewee’s comments.
• Determine the place for conducting the interview.
• . . . obtain consent from the interviewee to participate in the study.
• During the interview, stick to the questions, complete within the time frame specific (if possible), be respectful and courteous, and offer few suggestions and advice. (pp. 123-135).
A similar list presented by Creswell (2005) included all of the items above, plus recommendations to “have a plan, but be flexible,” and to “use probes to obtain additional information.” (p. 218)

Ethics and the Role of the Researcher

Fontana and Frey (1994) agreed “wholeheartedly” with Oakley’s (1981) statement “. . . most of traditional in-depth interviewing is unethical.” (p. 373) They referred to the concern that researchers would see the subjects of their research as “objects or numbers rather than individual human beings.” (p. 373)

Stake (1994) elucidated. He wrote,

. . . it is the researcher who decides what is the case’s own story, or at least what of the case’s own story he or she will report. More will be pursued than was volunteered. Less will be reported than what was learned. . . . It may be the case’s own story, but it is the researcher’s dressing of the case’s own story. (p. 240)

Creswell (1998) addressed other ethical considerations. He recommended that researchers assign numbers or aliases for individuals, in order to protect their anonymity. He also recommended that researchers not be deceptive regarding the purposes of their research (p. 132).

Schram (2003) explored the nuances of the researcher’s dual roles in interview-based research. He wrote “Even under the most collaborative of circumstances with study participants, you and they are walking together on separate paths.” (p. 101)
While I feel confident I did not broach any ethical standard during the course of my interviews, there was one interview that made me reflect on this aspect of the project. One president I interviewed described himself early in the interview as being a particular “type” of president, in this case a president who was more committed to his institution than to his career. He returned to this point a number of times during the interview, eventually using the president of my own institution as the counter-example, a president more committed to his career than the institution he served.

I was not certain during the interview what to make of either assertion, or how best to respond. On the one hand, the president was sharing his genuine perspective on the nature of his presidency, in the context of his role in and understanding of the fundraising process. That was a valuable addition to the study.

On the other hand, I could not determine whether he was sharing a legitimate alternative model of the presidency, in the form of the president of my institution at that time, or whether he was asking me to be complicit in a criticism of either that particular style of leadership, or of my institution’s president. I responded primarily with what Rubin and Rubin (2005) identified as “continuation probes,” saying “mmm hmmm” and encouraging the president to continue. (p. 164)

**Development of the Interview Guide**

Moustakas (1990) identified three basic approaches for interviewers to use when collecting qualitative data. The three identified were informal conversational interviews, general interview guides, and standardized open-ended interviews. Of the three, he said,
“the conversational interview or dialogue is most consistent with the rhythm and flow of
[qualitative] exploration and search for meaning.” (p. 47)

He described the conversational interview as “a spontaneous generation of
questions and conversations in which the co-researcher [the interviewee] participates in a
natural, unfolding dialogue” with the researcher (p. 47). He further stated that the
conversational interview was a cooperative process, where the researcher and the
research subject “open pathways to each other for explicating the phenomenon being
investigated.”

Patton (2002, p. 349) described four possible instrumentations for interviews. He
presented the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, and identified the
characteristics of each:
### Table III

*Variations in Interview Instrumentation (Adapted)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal Conversational Interview</td>
<td>Questions emerge from immediate context; asked in the natural course of things; no predetermination of question topics or wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Guide Approach</td>
<td>Topics and issues specified in advance, in outline form; sequencing and wording of questions decided during course of interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Open-Ended Interview</td>
<td>Exact wording and sequencing of questions determined in advance; all interviewees asked exactly the same question, in exactly the same order; all questions are open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed, Fixed-Response Interview</td>
<td>Questions and response categories are predetermined; respondent chooses from among fixed set of responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moustakas (1990) emphasized that data generated by this interview process was dependent upon skillful listening, openness, flexibility during the interview, and management of the climate in which the interview is being conducted (p. 48). He presented a list of the questions a primary researcher might ask about the population he or she intended to interview. These included

- What does this person know about the experience being studied?
- What qualities or dimensions of the experience stand out for the person?
- What examples are vivid and alive?
- What events, situations, and people are connected with the experience?
- What feelings and thoughts are generated by the experience? (p. 48)

Rubin and Rubin (2005) recommended a series of principles for qualitative researchers as they developed main questions for interviews. These included providing interviewees the “opportunity to answer as they see fit,” translating the research question into questions that interviewees could easily answer from their own experience, avoiding yes-no sorts of questions, avoiding use of the word “why” in main questions, and deferring questions seeking opinions until relatively late in the interview. (pp. 157-158)

They recommended “start[ing] out broadly to help [the researcher] learn more about the topic and then rework[ing] the questions as [the researcher] learn more about the topic to come up with narrower and more specific inquiries” (p. 159). They described major, generally-worded questions as “tour” questions. These types of questions allow the interviewee to lead the researcher “through [the subjects’] turf while pointing out what they think is important on the way.” (pp. 159-160)
Berg (1995) cautioned researchers about a number of common problems associated with the development of interview questions. He recommended avoiding affectively-worded questions, or questions that might be perceived as antagonistic. As one example, he said the question “Why?” often has a negative connotation and is to be avoided (p. 41).

“Double-barreled questions,” questions that ask two or more questions simultaneously, are also to be avoided. He suggested that interviewees will often be willing to answer a double-barreled question, but that the researcher will find it “virtually impossible” to analyze it (p. 42).

Complex questions, questions that are overly long or involved, likewise may be answered, but present difficulties in analysis of the response. For those reasons they are to be avoided.

The sequencing of questions is important. Berg (1995) recommended moving from “mild, non-threatening questions concerning demographic matters” to “more complex and sensitive questions.” (p. 42)

I used a series of semi-structured questions, which McMillan (2000) defined as questions that were “open-ended yet specific in intent, allowing individual responses.” (p. 166) McMillan and Schumacher (1993) defined these questions as having “no choices from which the respondent selects an answer. Rather, the question is phrased to allow for individual responses.” (p. 251)

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. I developed my Interview Guide (Appendix A) to address the purpose of the study, using

On two occasions my recording equipment did not function properly, and in the second case, I transcribed hand-written notes I had taken during the course of the interview. In the first case, I discovered well after the interview that it had not been recorded, and could not recall enough of the interview to use the data. On numerous occasions my recorder ran out of recording space, but I had a second recorder ready to use, and in each case was able to switch recording devices seamlessly.

Interviews took place in presidents’ offices. A number of interviews took place during the summer months of 2008, and two presidents had just returned from travel abroad, one having just returned the day before our interview. I am not sure what impact, if any, this had on the president’s time with me.

My initial interview strategy was to divide the institutions into categories of those in or contiguous to the most metropolitan area in the state and those outside of that area. My hope was to interview all the metro-area presidents in a single week, a week where I might stay in the metropolitan area. The reality of the presidents’ work lives and summer obligations ultimately resulted in my needing to schedule interviews whenever I was able to, and in whatever order they came. Interviews began in April 2008 and concluded in November 2008.

My initial intention was to digitally record all interviews, and to then use either voice-transcription software or a transcriptionist to transcribe each interview. While I did digitally record the interviews, with the exceptions noted above, the voice transcription
software never worked. I experienced tremendous difficulty in finding a transcriptionist who was able to efficiently transcribe from the digital format in which the interviews were stored. I eventually found one person who was able to transcribe accurately and efficiently. I required her to sign a confidentiality form prior to transcribing the first interview. The confidentiality form for the transcriptionist is in Appendix D.

Because of a recommendation by Bazely (2007), I transcribed some of the interviews myself, primarily those interviews where I had to supplement the first digital recorder, which was able to create save-able, share-able electronic files, with a lower-quality recorder, one that created recordings that were unable to be saved or shared electronically.

About the Presidents

Of the ten presidents I was able to interview, six were in their first presidency, four in their second. Nearly all [obfuscated for the purpose of confidentiality] came from the private sector. Eight had explicit fundraising experience prior to accepting their current position, and an additional two had been specifically groomed to be a fundraiser.

Two of the presidents were women, and eight were men. All but two came from the ranks of academe. Two had formal religious training. The range for time in the current position was from less than one year to more than 20. The average tenure of those presidents I interviewed was 7.3 years, with six presidents having served for fewer than five years.
My initial work with the collected data was to review each transcript a number of times, initially by interview question number. I explored responses to individual questions for themes.

Creswell (1998) suggested using a form for each interview to serve as an interview protocol. I adapted his figure (p. 127), and utilized his suggestions for use of the form:

- Use a header to record essential information about the project and as a reminder to go over the purpose of the study with the interviewee.
- Place space between the questions in the protocol form.
- Memorize the questions and their order to minimize losing eye contact.
- Write out the closing comments that thank the individual for the interview and request follow-up information, if needed, from them. (p. 126)

My first question was designed to establish a tone for a conversational interview or dialogue, and to seek general information. I asked each president, “Why did you originally want to be president?” For this question, I also planned probing questions to follow up the initial one. They were “What keeps you in the position now?” and “What advice would you give to someone considering pursuing a presidency?”

The literature indicated that the percentage of time devoted by college and university presidents to fundraising was larger than it had been in the past, and that it was growing. Hamlin (1990) noted that the increasing demands on presidents to be involved in fundraising for their institutions was the impetus for their move from scholar to salesman. Mathis (1998) indicated that as much as 50% of a president’s time was spent in the fundraising process.
Bornstein (2005), Drozdowski (2005), Merrow (2005), Pope (2005), Selingo (2005), Strout (2005), and Ungar (2006) all reacted to an annual survey of presidents conducted by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The survey showed that in 2005, more than half of all college and university presidents indicated they spent time “at least daily” fundraising.

My second question, “Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?” was designed to elicit an open-ended response, in terms of both the *content* of the answer that might be given and in terms of the *type* of answer that might be given. That is, I wanted to avoid asking a leading question that suggested the appropriate response should be limited to a number, or that the number had to be somewhere between 0% and 100%.

My third question was designed to begin an intentional move toward Berg’s (1995) “more complex and sensitive questions” (p. 42), and to elicit more personal stories. I asked “What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?”

My intention with this question was to present the possibility that there was a “down” side to fundraising. I was concerned that I might hear just success stories, or just the positive aspects of fundraising. This question allowed me to ask about any negative aspects, but to do so in a “safe” manner, by framing the question in a “best/worst” construct.

Much of the literature focused on the relationship between an institution’s full-time fundraising staff and the president. Bornstein (2000) described the notion of “reciprocity,” the mutual benefit that comes from president and fundraising team working
collaboratively, in a way that maximizes both their strengths. My intention with the fourth question was to explore that notion, though in an indirect manner.

I asked, “If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser?” I followed that with the questions “Would they describe any challenges you face?” and “If so, what are they?” My intention was to have the president describe their work from someone else’s perspective, someone with the professional expertise to provide an insightful analysis of the president’s work in this area.

My next two questions were designed to address issues of preparation for the task of fundraising. Bornstein (2003a) cited the increasing number of presidents coming into the position from a fundraising background, but most often the literature indicated that presidents had been unprepared for the task of fundraising. Asking “What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?” and “What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?” allowed me to gain insight into each president’s formal and informal preparation for their fundraising work.

Moustakas (1990) said that one of the questions a researcher might ask their subject is “What time and space factors affect the person’s awareness and meaning of the experience” (p. 48), and my seventh question was designed to explore that notion. My hope was that I would hear of lessons learned, and to hear about what sense a given president might make about something, good or bad, that had happened early in their career.
The last question I asked revealed a bias on my part, a bias borne of my own predispositions and of the literature that described the need to do fundraising versus other activities. Inherent in much of the literature describing the evolution from “academician-in-chief” to “fundraiser-in-chief” was some lament about “the good old days.” Kantrowitz and Springen (2005) described one university president who said:

The role of a university president as someone who has fireside chats with students and afternoon tea with faculty may have existed at some point in the past . . . but today . . . I am the CEO of a nearly $2 billion enterprise with 24,000 employees that operates in a highly charged political environment. (p. 52)

My question, “Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?” gave presidents the opportunity to speak about the opportunity cost of being in a position that required them to raise funds. It also gave them the opportunity to put their fundraising work in the larger context of their full roles.

The Interview Guide helped guide the president through the fundraising experience, as I had come to understand it from the literature. Creswell (1998) suggested an interview protocol of no more than five questions (p. 127), but I felt the questions I used allowed me to explore a fuller range of experiences.

Following each interview, the recording was transcribed. I asked the transcriptionist to adhere to recommendations made by Bazeley (2007) when making the transcription, and I did the same for the interviews I personally transcribed. Bazeley’s recommendations included:

• . . . include all ums, mmms, repetitions, and the like.
• . . . don’t correct incomplete sentences (which tend to represent the way people talk) or poor grammar: it is important to capture the form and style of the participant’s expression.

• Note events which create interruptions to the flow of the interview, for example . . . (telephone rings) . . . .

• Record nonverbal and emotional elements of the conversation, such as (pause), (long pause), (laughter), (very emotional at this point), . . . .

• If one of the speakers (or the interviewer) is providing, say, a non-intrusive affirmation of what another is saying . . . record that affirmation by placing it in parentheses or square brackets within the flow of the text . . . . (p. 45)

Transcriptions were shared with each president to be checked for accuracy. No president asked for changes to be made to the transcription. I told them immediately following the interview that I would share a copy of the transcription with them, and all presidents but one said that would not be necessary.

Transcriptions were uploaded into the XSight (QSR, 2006) program. I then used this program to help identify, explore, and condense themes to be used in the final analysis.

In an attempt to further ensure confidentiality for the research subjects, I assigned a pseudonym to each institution prior to beginning the study. I did this in a way that it would be impossible to decipher which institution had been given which pseudonym, and avoided matching pseudonyms with an alphabetized list of institutions. The list of pseudonyms was randomly assigned to a randomly distributed list of institutions, though they are presented here in alphabetic order.
As I was the only person to see the data in analysis, this was an unnecessary step.

The table of these pseudonyms is below.

Table IV

\textit{Pseudonyms}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisnine College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foma College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galapagos College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoenikker College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karabekian Coll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilgore College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewater College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudywaltz College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slazinger College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbuck College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swain College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trotsky College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Berg (1995) suggested starting the analysis for a case study by establishing a filing system. He said “Files may involve placing material into boxes, file cabinets, envelopes, or even on floppy disks for microcomputers.” (p. 60) Lofland and Lofland (1984) described three types of files: mundane files, analytic files, and fieldwork files.

Mundane files are intended to help the researcher “keep track of people, places, organizations, documents, and so forth,” (p. 132) and to allow for efficient retrieval of data related to the study. Analytic files are an “emergent coding scheme” allowing multiple and diverse analysis of “a given episode, situation, or whatever” (p. 133). Fieldwork files provide a means of accounting for how the research was conducted.
For the study, I filed all data electronically, using the XSight software package (QSR, 2006). Initial codes were developed using demographic information, and then later using elements of the Interview Guide.

With the XSight software package (QSR, 2006) I used for analysis, I was encouraged to begin organizing the data in “tree nodes” (Bazely, 2007). Bazely (2007) advocated using four steps to build tree nodes, creating “some conceptual order in a coding system.”

1. Start with a thinking-sorting process, to decide how the nodes might be arranged.
2. Create top level nodes as needed.
3. Move free nodes into trees, so their order reflects that arrangement.
4. . . . check that [the structure] serves the main ideas you set out to work with and the research questions you want to answer. p. 104-105

I built initial tree nodes around the interview questions, as presented in the Interview Guide. The Interview Guide is presented in Appendix A.

Table V

Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Ph.Ds</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years in Position</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VI

**Tree Nodes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Level Nodes</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why want</td>
<td>Why did you originally want to be president?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps in Position</td>
<td>What keeps you in the position now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice</td>
<td>What advice would you give to someone considering pursuing a presidency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best and Worst</td>
<td>What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser? Would they describe any challenges you face? If so, what are they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprises</td>
<td>What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different?</td>
<td>What would you do differently today than you might have done, say, in your first two years in the position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More of</td>
<td>Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Qualitative, heuristic research methods (Creswell, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994; Glaser & Strauss, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Moustakas, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1998, 1997) call for the researcher to “spend time with the data” as a first step toward sensing themes. This is meant to be an organic, evolutionary process, and I did this in formal and informal ways.

Once I began to see the data “[m]oving from stable data/texts toward portrayals,” I was able to begin to describe the data in a way that captured the essence of the experience (Piantanida & Garman, 1999, p. 170). I also began to identify the significance and implications of my findings, pay attention to their relevance and applicability, and discern the comfort with which I am able to make claims about the experience (Schram, 2003, p. 130).

Coding Data

Creswell (2005) graphically illustrated the coding process for qualitative research (p. 238). The figure he presented showed a progression from the initial reading of text data, to segmentation of the data, to labeling of the segments. The labels were then checked for redundancy and discreteness and collapsed into themes. Concurrent with that process, the data was evolving from “many pages of text” to a number of codes to a smaller number of themes. This is the process I followed in the study.

Interview transcriptions were reviewed, and then read and reread a number of times. After several readings, I began to develop a sense of what became meaningful segments of text. Using the XSight software program (QSR, 2006), I began to identify
parts of paragraphs and sentences from each transcription that might have meaning for
the study. These eventually merged into themes.
TABLE VII

Top Level (Tree) Nodes to Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Level (Tree) Nodes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why did you originally want to be president?</td>
<td>a. Caution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What keeps you in the position now?</td>
<td>a. Motivation for position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What advice would you give to someone considering pursuing a presidency?</td>
<td>a. Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?</td>
<td>a. Percent of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?</td>
<td>a. Hours worked weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Story Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Joy of Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. The “No”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser? Would they describe any challenges you face? If so, what are they?</td>
<td>a. Advancement Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Advancement Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The Deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Inherited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. The Ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?</td>
<td>a. Donor Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?</td>
<td>a. Metaphor/Analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Skill Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you do differently today than you might have done, say, in your first two years in the position?</td>
<td>a. Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?</td>
<td>a. Epiphany Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Retiring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis Software

Richards and Richards (1994) said “Before computers, many researchers did not code segments of text. Rather, they felt through, explored, read and reread . . . ,” a
process they defined as “code-and-retrieve” (pp. 446-447). Computer-assisted coding allows “ways of making ideas, and of constructing and testing theories” (Richards and Richards, 1994). They identified three ways this happened:

First, the generation of categories . . . whether arrived at prior to data reading or by discovery of recurrent topics (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975) or in vivo categories in text (Strauss, 1987) . . . .

Second, decisions about what text sections are relevant to a category are never merely clerical decisions; they always involve some theoretical consideration . . . .

Third, the viewing of segments from many documents on one topic or selected topics always offers a new way of seeing data. (p. 447)

To assist with the analysis of transcript data, I used XSight software (QSR, 2006), a version of NUD•IST and other qualitative data analysis software packages recommended by Creswell (1998, p. 157). The software is specifically designed to facilitate the analysis of qualitative data, and is at one level an electronic version of research methods requiring the researcher to color-code snippets of interview transcriptions, cutting narrative text into component parts and arranging and re-arranging them as themes emerge. This “paper” process is described in detail by Dillon (1989):

I had previously made three copies of all field notes and interview transcripts to allow me to circle and code instances representing each category. At this point, I cut apart one copy of all field notes and interview transcripts, placing common incidents together on colored sheets of paper – a separate color for each category.
This process helped me display the data in order to count the number of incidents under each category . . . . (p. 235)

The XSight software package (QSR, 2006) provided the opportunity to do this same sort of analysis using electronic copy-and-paste techniques. Segments of text could be coded, un-coded, or recoded, as necessary.

As I analyzed the data, a number of codes began to be identified. The XSight program describes the labels for these codes as “tags.” The final set of tags or codes is represented in Table VIII.

There were a number of codes that I considered and then eventually rejected. These included codes related to gender or gender issues and the notion of “friend raising” versus fundraising. A screen shot of XSight is presented in Figure 2, showing one example of the data tags in use, and of one segment of text in analysis.
TABLE VIII

Data Tags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Square Background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Circle “No”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Triangle Story Telling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Best Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Diamond Metaphor/Analogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Square Technique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Circle Caution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Triangle Percent of Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross The Deal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Diamond Skill Set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Square Hours Worked Weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Circle The Ask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Triangle Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Cross Motivation for Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Diamond Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Square Legacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Circle Retiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Triangle Inherited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Cross Advancement Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Diamond Advancement Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Square Epiphany Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Circle Donor Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Triangle Consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Cross Alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Diamond Advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Berg (1995), Creswell (1998, 2003, 2005), Denzin and Lincoln (1994), Glaser and Strauss (2006), McMillan (2000), McMillan and Schumacher (1993), Rubin and Rubin (2005), and Strauss and Corbin (1997, 1998) discussed the process of coding data for qualitative research. Although these authors wrote about a variety of qualitative research methods, the process of converting raw data into meaningful information was similar for each.

Figure 2.

Screen Shot of Xsight
Berg (1995) offered four guidelines to use when conducting open coding of data. These included:

1. Ask the data a specific and consistent set of questions,
2. Analyze the data minutely,
3. Frequently interrupt the coding to write a theoretical note, and
4. Never assume the analytic relevance of any traditional variable such as age, sex, social class, and so on until the data show it to be relevant. (pp. 186-188)

Stake (1995) listed four forms of data analysis commonly employed in case study research. These included categorical aggregation, where the researcher helps issue-relevant meanings emerge from the data; direct interpretation, where a single instance is explored; patterns emerging from among two or more categories; and naturalistic generalizations, where lessons learned from a given case can be applied to other cases. (pp. 71-87) Creswell (1998) added a fifth step, the description or “facts” of the case. (p. 154)

McMillan (2000) said that, “The most common approach to organizing data is to read through the data; look for words, phrases, or events that seem to stand out; and then create codes for these topics or patterns.” (p. 264) Glaser and Strauss (2006) recommended using the “constant comparative” method, a four-step process. The steps they identified were: “(1) comparing incidents applicable to each category, (2) integrating categories and their properties; (3) delimiting the theory, and (4) writing the theory.” (p. 105)

McMillan and Schumacher (1993) discussed emic and etic categories as potential codes. Emic categories “represent insiders’ views such as terms, actions, and
explanations that are distinctive to the setting or people [being studied]” (p. 493). Pelto and Pelto (1978) described etic categories as more closely resembling the observations of outsiders looking in on a phenomenon. “Etic observation . . . usually requires the definition of ‘action settings,’ within which the observer notes the behavioral irregularities of the individuals who habitually inhabit these settings.” (p. 83)

Stake (1995) defined etic issues as those “brought in from the outside” by the researcher (p. 20). Etic issues emerge from emic issues, and “are the issues of the actors, the people who belong to the case. These are issues from the inside.” (p. 20)

Rubin and Rubin (2005) listed guiding characteristics for data analysis of interview-based research. These guidelines included admonitions that:

Analysis Occurs Throughout the Process

Qualitative Data is Not about Counting

Intuition and Memory Do Not Substitute for Systematic Evaluation

The Data Unit in Qualitative Work is an Exchange on a Single Subject

Data Units are Combined in Distinct Ways Depending on the Research Purpose (pp. 201-203)

Strauss and Corbin (1998) presented three variations of open coding processes. These included line-by-line analysis of text, analyzing whole sentences or paragraphs, and attempting to “peruse the entire document and ask ‘What is going on here?’ and ‘What makes this document the same as, or different from, the previous ones I coded?’” (pp. 119-120)

Initially I did as Strauss and Corbin (1998) had suggested and I reviewed each interview as a whole. Each interview transcription was structured to match the interview
protocol, and the first several times I read through the transcripts, it was challenging to see beyond that initial eight-question structure.

As I reviewed the transcripts and the tags or codes I had assigned to various segments of text, three themes began to be identified. These were:

(a) Preparation for successful fundraising work comes from a wide variety of experiences;
(b) Fundraising work is not generally perceived as a “necessary evil;” and
(c) Fundraising work is intrinsically connected to questions of legacy.

Data, Quality, and Verification: Member Checking

In order to enhance the quality of data generated by a qualitative investigation, Stake (1994) recommended a process of member checking. This process also helps ensure that the “meanings of situations [described in the research], observation, reporting, and reading” (p. 241) are interpreted by the reader as intended by the writer.

Member checking suggests that participants should be given the opportunity to review – and potentially, to revise – transcriptions prior to publication. I provided each president with the opportunity to review an electronic copy of the transcription of our interview.

One of the presidents, upon reviewing the transcript, asked to be removed from the study. The president did not suggest that the quality of the transcript was a concern. Rather, this president referred to institutional issues that made it problematic to remain in the study. The president would not allow to the interview to be recorded, so no recording existed. The transcript was destroyed.
Transcription Process

I used a digital voice recorder to record each interview. The digitized recording was then stored as an electronic file, and shared electronically with a transcriptionist. I did have a backup recorder that I used on more than one occasion, though one interview was somehow lost, apparently never having recorded on either device. Better practice would have been to simultaneously record each of the interviews with both recorders, in the event that one of them did not work properly, or ran out of recording space.

Because I had trouble consistently getting one of the recorders to work properly, I began to start each interview with both recorders sitting on or near myself or the president, as appropriate. On one occasion a fan blowing in the president’s office made the recording nearly indecipherable in many spots for the transcriptionist, and it took several hours for her to transcribe the one-hour interview. When I reviewed the transcription, I was able to correct some errors and omissions.

I purchased software that alleged to transcribe digital voice recording “up to 99% accuracy (Sony, 2007),” and intended to use that software program to transcribe each interview. I was never able to get the software to work properly, despite requests to the software company and conversations with Instructional Technology staff on my own campus.

Following each interview I reviewed the accuracy of the computer-transcription with my own review of the recorded interview. Creswell (1998) suggested reviewing each interview immediately following the actual, live interview, even making initial coding remarks in the margins of transcribed text, but I did not always do so. Better
practice would have been to do this every time, scheduling time immediately after each interview to do this.

*The Interviews*

I was able to interview 10 of the 20 presidents. One president did not want to be interviewed – no reason was given – two were in interim positions, one was ill and could not be interviewed until late October, and two were unable to schedule a time to meet, despite repeated attempts to make arrangements. Four could not be interviewed face-to-face.

One president permitted the interview, but then asked to be removed from the study. One of the interim presidents was explicitly in the position for just one transitional year, and the other had been recently promoted from the faculty to the interim role. My multiple initial attempts to contact the now-departed president at this second institution were never successful, and eventually I learned via their institutional website that the president had resigned suddenly after a relatively short time on the job. Two of the presidents I interviewed were in their first month or months on the job.
Chapter Four

Findings

Motivation for and Persistence in the Role

Four presidents responded to my first question asking why they originally wanted to be a college or university president with some version of “I did not.” I had assumed that for most of the subjects, their position as president was just the current stop along a well-mapped career trajectory, a stop informed by an inner calling to serve in the role, a stop perhaps preparing them for bigger and better things.

One said, “I never really wanted to do this;” another said, “I never did want to be a president . . . no, I never aspired to the presidency. Didn’t plan for it. Didn’t prepare for it.” A different president said, “[laughter] um…I don’t think at any point I really wanted to be president. It was really more a matter of being asked at various points in my life to ’ [apply for positions].”

One spoke of applying almost on a lark:

I came right out of the faculty, so I’m not suggesting I applied, uh, without some sense of the gravity of the position, but I can tell you that I applied without any, without any thought that I really actually might be chosen. So, I’m not sure that I really had the luxury of, of uh really thinking about all the implications and what this might entail.
One president replied “It wasn’t fundraising [that made the subject apply to be president].” Seven presidents spoke of filling the role in order to serve the institution or higher education, generally.

*Involvement in Fundraising*

In preparing the literature review, I reported studies and articles that cited the amount of time, by percentage, college and university presidents devoted to the task of fundraising. In the contemporary pieces, the context for the discussion was frequently a lamentation of the evolving role of the president from moral or cultural avatar to fiduciary shill, someone panhandling for the next seven-figure donation for their institution.

I anticipated that each president would easily and without provocation share a discreet, defensible figure, “55% of my time;” or “85% of my time,” spent in pursuit of funds for the institution. Second, I expected that they would share that figure with me with some regret, or perhaps some wistfulness. I believed the figure would be a large number and would represent all that the president was prevented from doing, all those things he or she would rather do instead of raising funds. I concluded my formal questions during each interview with a question designed to plumb exactly those “what-I-would-rather-be-doing” thoughts.

What I found, instead, was a general reluctance to identify a discreet percentage. Even when I probed directly what they might estimate the figure to be, if their response created any sort of an opening to ask the more pointed “what percentage or your time is devoted to fundraising” question, they had difficulty providing a number.
The equivocation seemed to come from two places: (1) a parsing of the high-
level task of fundraising into component parts and (2) an acknowledgement of the reality
of contemporary fundraising at private colleges and universities. The fundraising
operation is part of the fabric of the institution and often all parts of a president’s day or
week are connected in some meaningful way to raising funds or to the stewardship of
donors and donations.

One president said:

I could be talking about current undergraduate students, I could be talking about
faculty and staff on campus, so I think it . . . as a president, you are always
representing that institution, and there’s no place I could go in [former city] where
I wasn’t the [position] of [former institution], nor is there a place I can go on
campus here or even the surrounding area and not be president of [institution].
And therefore, um, almost 100% of your time, you are representing a campus, and
in this case, a campus that is dependent on um, um revenue from a variety of
different sources.

So, you know, the general answer is, you’re always in some phase of
resource acquisition. If you wanted me to answer the question, “What per cent of
my time is dedicated specifically to working with donors who have been brought
to the point of commitment . . . that’s a relatively small percentage of my time.
The vast majority of my time is spent getting people interested in the campus, to
the extent that you could go out and ask them for a contribution.
Others provided a general figure, with qualifications, similar to this president, who said

Now as far as the specific calling on donors or meeting with the advancement team or going to events or functions that have primarily an advancement focus uh I would say that I, I really have a hard time saying. I guess if you’re looking for a figure it would probably be a quarter of my time maybe but I that’s really loose. I mean sometimes it’s a lot more. You may be gone for four, five days where that’s all you’re doing to times when you know you just have your regular meeting with the dean . . . er . . . with the vice president and we’re talking about what’s ahead, so . . .

Actual figures shared, when given, ranged from 20% to 100%, and there was very little remorse expressed. Even when I asked them specifically about what they might rather do more of, or what their obligations as fundraiser prevented them from being able to do, they seemed reluctant to give any concrete answer.

The presidents described a variety of ways of working with their advancement or development teams, both in terms of organizational structure and in terms of their personal involvement in the day-to-day operations of those functional areas. One president, from an institution with a relatively small advancement team, described herself as, in many ways, the senior advancement person, in addition to serving as president:

It’s a high level [of involvement with fundraising]. Um, we’re a very small school, we’ve got a small development operation, so the president and relationships obviously that have been formed with the [inst] over the years are very, very important. Um so the president um is is almost operates at times like a
major gift officer. Um so lots of times I’m calling on folks who at larger schools probably would be seen by a major gifts officer. Uh and I’m helping cultivate gifts as well as closing gifts uh we I haven’t counted recently, but I would say that easily 40% of my time uh is spent in uh development-related work and travel.

Three presidents described having had to replace their senior advancement personnel shortly after their assumption of the role of president. This was predictable and is common, based on the literature,

Four presidents have specific understandings with their advancement staffs about a threshold amount for a donation that will result in the president being directly involved with “the Ask” [their term], the formal request for a donation.

Presidents spoke specifically about the “Ask” as the point where a fair amount of cultivation, sometimes over the course of several years, was realized. Solicitation had occurred over an extended period of time, institutional priorities and needs had been identified, and president and donor were meeting in a room together, face-to-face.

Five presidents described initial reluctance, ambivalence, and discomfort with the opportunity for this sort of interaction. One re-framed the whole enterprise:

In the beginning, well…this may sound simplistic, but I was surprised how difficult it was to ask for money until it dawned on me at the end of my very first lunch with a donor that I wasn’t asking for anything for myself, an impossible position for most….

A second president suggested:

But I was asking for something for others and that is a good thing. If you can um…encourage others to be charitable or to find ways where their charitable
inclinations and contributions can have the most benefit, that’s a very morally defensible job. So, I would say in the beginning that I was surprised, not surprised, but I discovered that I was morally conflicted about asking for money until I got past this point of understanding that asking for money for others in need was something that you could take…not pride in…but you know, have confidence in.

A third said:

There is really nothing quite as thrilling as asking somebody for money and having them say, “Yes” and it is not nearly the downer you would expect when somebody says, “No.” That sort of closes (claps) the (claps), you move (claps) onto (claps) something else (claps). That person said No. Did this ask [work]? It doesn’t mean that we will never ask them again. You have to ask yourself what did I learn from this? I mean…a little piece of engagement.

We hope that there is something that we learned about this person that might help me frame a different sort of project in which they would like to be…like to participate or…even if it causes me simply to strike them off the list, we have made progress in our fund raising efforts. The “No” isn’t the downer you would think . . . .

And another said:

I think I’ve discovered how much, how much the giver . . . gets, out of the giving. And uh so, so I’m really giving them the opportunity to express themselves in a way that’s that ultimately is going to make them really happy. Uh, and, and they get so much – they don’t always appreciate that on the front end but had the
opportunity, and so, you know I’m kind of helping them toward something that’s really good for them, that they will appreciate and enjoy.

After the first two interviews, I determined that the last question revealed a bias on my part about fundraising, a bias toward fundraising as something inherently unpleasant, something that was perceived as a necessary evil. I did eventually begin acknowledging that bias as part of asking the final formal question.

Another way the bias manifested itself was when I began to explore the nature of hearing “No” to a formal request for donations. After hearing how important “the Ask” was, and how meaningful successful fundraising was to these presidents, I anticipated that to be told “No” by a potential donor was excruciating or debilitating, a blow to the soul of the president.

To the contrary, only once did I hear the “No” described in anything close to those terms. “It hurts my feelings,” said one president, who said that was the case even though he knew intellectually that “two out of three” times he would hear “No.”

I heard the following:

You know, a “No” is a “Yes” waiting to happen. I mean, it depends. So, um, you have a fairly good idea going in whether or not you’re going to get anything, and then, you have some idea – you should have some idea of whether you’re asking for the right amount, or not. Sometimes you don’t get as much as you want, and occasionally you get outright rejected.

Another president said:

I know that it was a little more awkward for me at first and people somehow as they begin this work . . . it’s still some might say that that’s gotta be a bad part of
your job, asking people for money, and again, it’s not, if you know already that 
they love [institution], and that they want to be helpful. And of course I get to 
work with the, the higher end donors, people who’ve been connecting to us for a 
long time. So I don’t have those cold calls or those angry alumni calls that other 
persons have to do. So, it’s a lot easier for me.

A different president said, “I think at first I was real reluctant to [ask for money]. 
And partly because maybe I was still uncomfortable with the idea of asking people for 
money in the first place. But that doesn’t bother me anymore . . . .” Another said,

I had a tendency to not to want to overstep too much. Yeah, and I think I’m much 
more comfortable now asking more than I probably should expect to, to receive,
and not feeling bad about that. Because it’s . . . really challenging donors to step 
up.

The Best and the Worst

When asked to identify the best and worst parts of the task of raising funds for 
their institutions, responses to the “best” part connected to relationships with donors 
and/or to opportunities to tell stories about the institution and its faculty, staff, and 
students. All the presidents discussed fundraising primarily in terms of relationship 
development and management. One used the euphemism “friend-raising” to describe the 
cultivation that goes into long-term relationship-building as part of the fundraising 
operation.

One president framed the entire position of private college president in these 
terms:
If you’re going to be in a private college, and you want to be a president, you’d better figure this out. And you’d better like [fundraising]. Or don’t . . . take . . . the job. Or get out. Don’t stay in the job, so . . . . It’s about people, it’s about relationships, it’s about heart speaks to heart.

Another president re-framed the fundraising enterprise. He said that it was not about money, but instead about relationships. He said:

You know, I don’t look at something, and say “You know, there’s somebody that’s going to give me some money.” There’s somebody that I want to make sure knows a lot about this very special place called [institution]. And it’s about building those kinds of successful relationships. That, at the end of the day, might result in what’s been asked for, a donation.

So I don’t view my job as focusing on fundraising. That happens to be something that becomes a by-product. The job is to make sure that I am, uh, a good ambassador for the campus, that I can build, that I can work to help build and create a culture on campus that is a positive one, and that my interactions with people away from campus leaves them, uh, knowing a little bit about [institution], and what a valuable asset it is, not only to students here but to alums and to the larger community.

At the end of the day, you know, those relationships lead to opportunities. But I don’t think about them as exclusively fundraising. I think that’s a mistake, in my opinion.

This president suggested,
[Pauses, sighs] Well, you, you continue to say “fundraising;” it’s not really from my point of view all about fundraising um it’s about relationship-building, and I think that the best preparation one can have going into a presidency is having experience at and an ability to build meaningful, honest relationships with individuals.

Another responded to a follow-up question I posed:

CG: So, it really wasn’t a, a set of . . . fundraising skills or techniques or strategies. It really was just learning to build relationships with a variety of people.

President: Oh, well, that’s what fundraising is about. It’s not about asking people for money.

Four presidents described the fundraising apparatus in place when they were hired in terms of their relationships with alumni. These presidents described how their fundraising work was affected by the student populations they had historically served, and/or by the academic programs for which their institutions had been known.

For these institutions, their legacy as institutions teaching those pursuing the helping professions, often teachers and nurses, presented a unique set of challenges, in terms of attempts to secure major gifts from alumni. The suggestion made was that alumni currently serving in the helping professions, especially in education and health care, rarely had the means to donate significant gifts.
Chief Advancement Officer Perspectives

I could have asked Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) questions similar in tone and style to the questions I asked the college and university presidents I interviewed. I chose to interview the presidents themselves. I asked each president to share their thoughts about what they perceived were their Chief Advancement or Development person’s perspectives about the president’s fundraising work. I asked about the president’s strengths and weaknesses with regard to their fundraising for the institution, as they understood their fundraising staff to perceive them.

As a general rule, the positive aspects the presidents cited related to personal characteristics: “high energy;” “a passionate advocate;” “a genuine and sincere passion for the school;” “I do get along pretty well [with the donors] and have known them for a long time;” “mission-driven;” “willingness to schedule myself [to meet with donors];” “always ready to go.”

Many discussed their connection to the advancement staff, and the Chief Advancement Officer, in positive, mutually-beneficial terms. The rule seemed to be that new advancement teams were installed at institutions within a short time after the presidents had assumed their current positions, though there were exceptions.

Some of the challenges the presidents said their CAO’s would identify were connected to personality characteristics. One president spoke at length about his nature as an introvert, and about how he believed his CAO would wish for a slightly more gregarious style.

The predominant theme in responses to this question was “time”: 
There’s certainly never enough time in a day to get to everybody you want to talk to . . . ;

There’s never enough time to do all you want to . . . ;

I can tell off the bat that I suspect that one of the challenges [the advancement officer] might say . . . might come up with and that I certainly feel is question of time. . . . That said, there are always all kinds of demands on your time and so finding time for any one particular event including fundraising is a constant challenge;

. . . [the advancement officer] probably would say well, I wish she would do more but every Vice President for Development in the nation probably feels that way (laughter) like they are . . . yeah . . . the President.

As predicted by the review of the literature, the presidents, to a person, described fitting extensive obligations to the fundraising process into an already extensive weekly work-load. They described typical work-weeks of 60-65 hours each. In addition, extensive travel obligations required additional time from them on a regular basis.

**Surprises for Presidents**

The great surprise for five of the presidents was how much they enjoyed the fundraising process. I anticipated the subjects responding to this fifth question with varying degrees of elation or even euphoria, but I did not hear variations on that particular theme. Instead, I routinely heard two different, distinct themes, separate from but often connected to one another.
Ease of the Task

Two of the presidents described their surprise at how easy fundraising was for them, and how successful they were:

That [enjoying the task of fundraising] happened, that happened almost immediately. I mean that’s the interesting thing. I liked it almost from day one. So I’m talking about before I became a president to when I actually was in the job doing it, that’s when the, for me, the shift took place, and, uh maybe, maybe part of that was a little bit easier for me than it was for some people, because my first presidency was back at my alma mater, where I had never worked, um, but they really needed somebody to come in and really turn things around, and so I had a lot of passion for that place, and, um that probably helped, but uh fundraising there was an absolute necessity, right [laughs] right on day one.

Another president shared both that he liked fundraising, and that his enjoyment of it allowed him to re-frame his original impression of the entire fundraising process. He said:

One of the things that surprised me is that I enjoy it more than I might have anticipated. Um, I thought begging for money could be, you know, sort of a demeaning, um, task, and I have not found that to be the case at all. So I guess I’m surprised by the fact that I like to do it.

One president said, “The fact that actually fund raising is fun.” Another shared, “How easy it is” to raise funds.
The Meaning of Relationship

The separate-but-often-connected theme relates to the special value many of the presidents came to place on the relationships their fundraising work allowed them to have with donors. Where I had presumed these relationships to be purely transactional – the relationship no more than the means to a donation in the end, or a reluctantly-given donation in exchange for direct access to the president – the presidents described their donor relationships much differently than I had predicted:

I think I’ve learned so much from generous people, uh, and, and I don’t know if that makes it a surprise. That wasn’t really an expectation so I guess that makes it a surprise.

Another spoke about the impact donations, large and small, had on him. He shared,

And how, how you really can learn from people who are committed and dedicated uh and they and it challenges me to think more and more philanthropically myself. I’ve always felt like I had a, you know, at least the beginning of a handle on that, but uh you really see people who are genuinely sacrificial.

Some are extraordinarily wealthy people and they give wonderful gifts. But there are others who are not of that same capacity, who also give extraordinary gifts, and, uh, and . . . and you know you just learn a lot from that about faith and trust and it’s . . . it’s humbling uh it’s humbling in much the same way as when you have parents who . . . who entrust their children to you and they . . . they barely are making it and sacrificing so much in order to send their kids to this place. It’s really humbling.
One president remarked that, “I don’t know any generous miserable people.”

Another described her favorite type of donors:

Okay…what else was surprising about it? Well, I would say the range of kinds of donor. There are rare donors who simply want to support their college and will give undesignated gifts, trusting the President to address the area of greatest need. Love that donor… (laughter)…very, very few and far in between.

One president described the power of matching project to donor. He saw this process as the manifestation of deep relationship between president and donor or institution and donor:

So, what is surprising and needs nuanced attention from the President is to understand what kind of donor you are dealing with. If you are dealing with a donor with a single-minded notion, you need to not try to negotiate with them. You need to take their idea and make it as close to the needs of the college as you can and if you can’t do that, you will have to turn the gift down generally.

If you are with a donor who wants to negotiate, well you can’t just come to them with one idea and say this is what I need you to do. They want to be in more of a brainstorming process with the President. So, I would say um…that it is surprising how different people are in their temperaments toward giving and that it is essential that Presidents perceive those temperaments . . . .

Preparation for the Role

Eight of the ten presidents either had explicit fundraising experience from a previous position or had been groomed by a mentor or supervisor to perform that task.
Perhaps the most apt metaphor to describe what I gleaned from the presidents, in regard to their preparation for the position, is that many roads lead to the same place.

Among the variety of experiences various presidents listed as being central to their preparation were:

- Background as an advocate for students and their needs, leading to experience identifying needs and crafting compelling arguments for them and stories about them;
- Background in ministry, leading to experience listening compassionately and “connecting” with others, sharing stories in compelling, interesting ways;
- Background as an actor, leading to experience being a public presence, and adapting presentations to the audience;
- Background serving on community service boards, leading to experience raising funds and working philanthropically;
- Background in sales – as a youngster – leading to experience connecting with customers, having conversations with people in various states of need;
- Background working as an undergraduate on the campus’ grounds crew, leading to experience understanding the infrastructure of a campus and some of the political realities of campus life outside the administrative realm.

One common denominator in these preparation experiences, and one skill identified by presidents as critical to their work, was “listening.” Listening provided an avenue for genuine connection, for discerning personal interests of potential donors, and for crafting proposals that might be most likely funded.
One president spoke about using listening in order to understand both what is being said or shared, and sometimes what is not said:

But, I really do believe that if you watch and listen and let people tell you what they think, and they will tell you what they think and how they feel, so if a person talks mostly about the school or about education, that tells you that as long as you don’t mess it up, you know…but if a person doesn’t talk very much or ask any questions about the school or doesn’t seem focused on education per se, or religion or combination of the two in the case of a church college, then if they would rather talk about baseball, bird watching, whatever else, then the individual president better be ready to talk about baseball or bird watching . . . .

He continued to place this skill, or this part of the task of fundraising, into a context that described the “sales” aspect of the experience in a non-pejorative manner:

Don’t think “selling” is a bad word. Communicate to people spontaneously about what, you know, reading them, understanding, responding to them, because what the truth is, it’s what’s inside, it’s just how you, how you, find the best, listen to what the other person is saying and thinking, what they’re responding to, what their interests are, and most people are more interested in themselves than other people.

Another spoke about listening as a foundational skill, the skill upon which the rest of the fundraising work should be built. He said:

You have to listen. I mean, that is the biggest job in fundraising is first that you listen, you listen a lot. Why do people want to give? Is it because they remember their college or are they memorializing someone they loved? Do they have
disposable income? Are they competitive with another school? I mean, it all…and then they will also tell you their interests. So through the process of listening, you see where that kind of conversation that person hopes to have with the President.

Finally, another spoke of using listening to blunt an initial perception some potential donors might have about even being approached. This president said, And I learned to talk on, you know, to think on your feet. And, um, to talk to people who might be naturally just suspicious of what you’re saying. Try to find ways to communicate, listen to other people.

What Would You Have Done Differently?

The range of experience for the presidents varied from more than 20 years to less than six months. Asking about what would be done differently at the beginning of their careers was difficult for the most recently hired presidents to answer.

Three of the presidents described the use of consultants, two affirmatively and one negatively. Two said that consultants had helped them chart a course for their fundraising shortly after taking their position. One of the two maintained an active, ongoing institutional relationship with the consultant they had hired when assuming the position of president.

Another president, one who co-developed a recruitment and training program for new college and university presidents, had not used a consultant in his fundraising work. He said,
I’ve never hired a consultant [laughs]. Now, a lot of presidents do and a lot of presidents swear by ‘em, and you know, for them, that’s fine, but I, I think that the primary thing they do is to try to make you set goals and hold your feet to the fire. They’re supposed to also help you figure out how much you should ask for or who, those kinds of things.

The responses about what they would do differently varied, sometimes coming from a macro-, very high-level perspective, and sometimes from a micro-, very practical perspective. The more philosophical responses tended to be variations on the theme of getting to know the institution, its history, its strengths and challenges, and its possibilities as quickly, and as deeply, as possible:

I think it took me a while to figure out two important things. They say politics is the art of the possible but presidencies are also the art of the possible and um…I think it took longer than it should have to figure out what was possible here.

Another spoke about the connection of the institution’s image, either its self-image or its image in the community, and about the need for the president to connect that image in very authentic ways to the institution’s mission and vision, particularly if the vision and mission were beyond the bounds of current perceptions about the institution:

And the other part is the “vision thing.” And that is coming up with a credible future for the college and it is right on the edge of what is possible and what people can imagine. It is consistent with the heart of the place. That is what makes it possible to get out on that frontier, if you are not…you are trying to recreate the institution and self image, the point of my undergraduate experience or something like that, you just aren’t going to get as far.
One of the presidents shared that he “would have taken on the identity issue or the inferiority issue [he had used this description of the institution he served previously in the interview] earlier than I did.” Another would have worked harder to understand what was and was not in place, administratively, before even agreeing to accept the position. He suggested that the less-than-effective administrative structure in place when he had been hired was the manifestation of institutional values as much as past practice.

Finally, one of the presidents described a distinction in his mind between “professional presidents” [his phrase] and presidents who had a deep connection to a particular institution. My sense was that part of the distinction related to whether institutions like his, and like many of the ones whose presidents I interviewed, were merely stepping stones along a career path, or, rather, a place to which the president could connect at a deep level.

The notion of “professional presidents” for him was connected to the size and scope of the institutions within the consortium of private institutions. Within the consortium, just one institution is considered a national institution. He had witnessed many of the consortium’s institutions installing new presidents, sometimes many times over, during his tenure in his current post.

His rumination on what he would have done differently was rooted in the context of someone like himself who had taken the position with some reluctance, and out of a sense of obligation to the institution. His thought related to finding the proper balance between what the president inherited, what the institution is, and what the president could help the institution to become: what the institution could be. He shared, “… but . . .
especially first time presidents I think have difficulty finding the altitude, maintaining it, and um . . . being connected to the beating heart of the place.”

The more practical perspective, when shared, described timeliness of actions and pursuit of particular education. When presidents shared this perspective, there was a sense that they might have made things happen differently, and faster, with donors or potential donors:

President: I had a tendency to not to want to overstep too much

CG: To ask for too much?

President: Yeah, and I think I’m much more comfortable now asking more than I probably should expect to, to receive, and not feeling bad about that. Because it’s . . . really challenging donors to step up.

Another spoke of learning to be comfortable asking for larger amounts of funding, saying,

So many things I’d do differently than I did then, but I, I guess the . . . well . . . it’s more, it’s almost a question of “what do I do differently?” or “What should I have avoided?” Then, um, one thing that that I think I’ve learned as I’ve gone along is that you shouldn’t be afraid to challenge people.

Another said, following a long pause, “Um…I now have a very clear idea of people’s capacities [to donate] before speaking with them.” A different president suggested,

If I had it to do all over, I would probably try to go to more workshops, try to do more reading specifically on fundraising, I might even hire, a, you know, a
consulting firm to do certain things. Fourteen years, I’ve never hired a consultant
[laughs].

Another spoke about skills development, and suggested, “I might have tried to
learn more, quicker, about fundraising. I had to learn everything at once, and fundraising
was only one part of it.”

Obligations

Based on my review of the literature I expected that the presidents, individually
and collectively, would have a list of activities and experiences that their fundraising
obligations made it impossible for them to pursue. I anticipated that I would hear laments
about not being able to do preferred activities like teaching or research to the degree they
would ideally want.

Presidents either had no meaningful response to this question, or they shared that
they would not have taken the position if they did not anticipate or even enjoy the need or
opportunity to raise funds on behalf of the institution.

One said, “I thought that was an interesting question [is there anything your
obligations to raise funds prevent you from doing?], and the answer is really no.”
Another replied, “No,” stating that she was able to keep what was for her a good balance
of being with students, alums, faculty, and that she actually enjoyed fundraising.

Another felt well-prepared for the demands of this particular function, and for all
the obligations of the role. She said:

. . . I had had a decade of working in a large university president’s office and
seeing what happens day in and day out and so I thought coming into the job there
wasn’t going to be a lot generically that I hadn’t already seen. By and large, that was true.

Another spoke about continuing to find ways to connect meaningfully with individual students, despite fundraising obligations. He presented his perspective not as a lament, but instead as two equally important needs competing for his limited time. He was not answering the question by identifying a preference for one activity versus another. Instead, he suggested that both activities were important enough that he worked diligently to be able to do them both, simultaneously.

He shared,

You know, the thing that drew me to higher education in the first place was the desire to really have a transformational impact in the lives of students, especially traditional-aged students. I have managed to teach a class every year throughout my presidency, and that’s becoming more and more difficult to do as campaigns get bigger and bigger and responsibilities for external work becomes more and more significant so even though I’ve managed to continue I don’t feel like I’ve done as much with it as I would like to have done.

So, the one thing that’s, that’s somewhat compromised, even though I’m conscious of it, and I want to continue to do as much as I can, that, that very close interaction with students where they see me as someone that’s real accessible really for them and with them, and I think that our students feel that way but I feel like it’s not as much as I enjoy doing and would like to do and hope to do more of in the future, actually. And I think I can and will . . . .
Another president, when asked if there were things that his fundraising work prevented him from doing, responded, “Not at all . . . . Nah, that’s silly.” This president went on to say that, “[If you say] I’d rather be doing this instead of this, that’s because you’re not good at it [fundraising].”

Another president took issue with some of his colleagues. He said, “I have heard that before [that some presidents feel that their fundraising obligations keep them from being able to do other things] but I have not understood it.”

I have heard Presidents I respect talk about how their fundraising duties keep them from doing other things that they would rather do or that they think are more important and ah...you know I have already talked a little bit about what could be more important than the eight- or seven- or six-figure gift or whatever it is.

There are probably a few things that are more important than that but I don’t know that I would ever turn down that meeting so I could work with a faculty committee on a new curricular proposal or whatever.

One president shared that he developed and remains involved in a “president preparation” program, where he and a colleague work to help others consider and prepare for a career as a college or university president. He said,

I think it’s probably just the opposite, actually. I think most of us, by human nature, let’s see . . . would I rather be sittin’ in a cafeteria with a bunch of students, or would I rather be out pounding the streets, you know?
We have a level of comfort being on a campus, so I think it’s just the opposite. I think sometimes the fundraising is a thing that you back into, and you know I’ve said this to different vice presidents before, too. I could figure out how to work 50, 60 hours a week, never leave my office, never leave the campus. Go home on the weekends, saying [slaps hands together] “Man, I worked my ass off this week.”

But if I didn’t make any calls, didn’t write any letters, if I didn’t get out and see anybody, then I really didn’t do my job. So, I think it’s just the opposite of the way I understand this question.

One president re-framed this issue as one of locus of control regarding how much say a president has over how they decide to spend time, administratively. He connected this issue to the interaction of the president and her or his fundraising team, saying:

But the other is that I think one is missing the point. One of the things that presidents can do is they can decide how much time they are going to spend on things and so…anybody who is feeling like they are spending too much time raising money maybe better take a look at their advancement office and ask if they have the right people in there.

He continued by sharing,

I think it would be wrong for a president to be spending 40% of his time on his next book . . . or even an article. Um . . . but inside that . . . that world of you know . . . it runs like 65 hours a week, inside that 65 or 60 or 65 hours you really can decide. If I wanted to spend more time on A than I am spending and I wanted to spend less time on B, I can do that.
I might have to make some difficult internal adjustments but fundamentally it is a job that is relatively free. The constituencies have expectations of you and I think you have to know what those expectations are and one needs to hearken to them but one doesn’t need to be driven by them. If presidents did lament anything, it was related in some way to previous connection to the academic world of teaching or collegiality. One said:

I have given one course in four years and had four tutorial students. Those were very good experiences for me as well as the students to get to know the President and get to be in a seminar where being able to work with the President on important subject and needing to do work at a certain level . . . and I think it was very good for all of us. I would have liked to do somewhat more teaching um…but I have been restricted in that because when you travel this much you are not consistently around . . . .

Later, she spoke about her relationships with the faculty. She added,

… In the beginning I spent quite a lot of time with the faculty. I visited each one of them in the offices individually when I arrived at the college. Um…I spent time with their post-docs and I made sure that they came to the house for Sunday brunch and I knew every one of the post-docs.

Now there have been people hired to the faculty who I have not met individually, and post-docs whom I have not met individually, and I don’t feel good about that but I simply don’t have the time so, the Provost has become much more of the College’s face to the faculty. I attend faculty meetings but not every one of them.
There was not a question in my Interview Guide (Appendix A) asking the presidents to describe their work metaphorically or in any non-literal way. Five of the presidents used metaphor to illustrate the essence of all or part of the fundraising experience.

Some of the metaphors were used to construct an image of fundraising in a relatively positive light, typically as the means to some noble end. Some were used in the negative – fundraising is not like X – and often done to highlight the particular place in U.S. higher education served by schools like those in the consortium.

Some of the positive metaphors described to me were academically oriented, comparing fundraising to homework. Some spoke about fundraising as alchemy and chemistry. Others described the nature of their fundraising using team-oriented metaphors, and one president used a symphony to describe a specific type of team.

The negative/not-like-this metaphors included a discussion about how fundraising in private higher education is and is not like other types of sales positions, including the sale of used cars. Another analogy likened the flexibility of a particular institution, and by extension, other institutions of the type studied here, to marine craft.

One president used the example of pushing his own children to do their homework as similar to the process of cultivating gifts, and large gifts, especially. He connected his ability to see beyond what his children – or potential donors – could see, in terms of their ability. He also spoke of knowing a joy that cannot be fully known until
one had personal success, success with either the experience of mastering an academic subject or of philanthropy.

He said:

It’s like you know you push your kid in homework, doesn’t really want to do it, gets a good grade, “oh, oh that was really good, that was really positive.”

We have one donor who recently gave a gift uh who, you know, had a hard time giving gifts early on and has made a very substantial one and I think has the capacity to do even more, and, and just again, I’ve observed the joy and gratification that that has brought to that person. It’s uh, that’s uh I think a big part of it. And the other the other side is that, again, what we’re trying to accomplish here is very compelling.

Fundraising as Alchemy

One of the presidents suggested that successful fundraisers at the college or university president level were proficient at both the science and art of fundraising, the balancing of which I refer to here as “Alchemy,” though the president himself did not use that term. He suggested that successful presidents needed to “know the science but practice the art.”

A different president also spoke metaphorically in similar ways, though also without using the label “Alchemy” to describe the relationship between the president and her or his fundraising team. In this instance, I had responded to one of the president’s earlier remarks, and I had shared that my research indicated it was fairly common for new
presidents to install their own fundraising teams, even if it meant removing existing staff from their roles:

. . . I think it [the relationship with the chief advancement officer] does depend on chemistry…and it also depends quite frankly on the willingness of Development to accept the president’s priorities and the previous president might have had different priorities which were quite relevant and um…well suited to their time, um…but if priorities are changing and the Development director is adhering to prior goals that he or she still thinks are important, then that can produce some tension too.

So, I think you are right. I think new presidents often hire new Development directors to get the right chemistry and to also get somebody on board who is going to take their priorities and run with them.

Fundraising as Teamwork

One president, when describing his relationship with his Advancement team, said, “It’s not the Lone Ranger, it’s not, um the president rides in and saves the day. It doesn’t work that way.”

Another shared,

So, it’s a team effort, but the president is the top dog on fundraising. Can’t delegate it, can’t avoid it. If you don’t wanna do that, don’t be a president of a private college. It’s that simple.

One president used a specific type of team metaphor, that of a symphony conductor, to connect the nature of college and university leadership to the fundraising
enterprise. Speaking about the role he had as a fundraiser for his institution, in the context of his relationship with the Advancement team at that institution, he said,

... The institution is sort of like a symphony ... And it's kind of like the difference between being the lead violinist, and being the conductor. You know, but if you’re going to be the conductor, your sense of satisfaction has got to, you’ve got to be able to take a great deal of satisfaction from the fact that this collection of individuals is doing great, in large part because of your leadership.

**Fundraising as Different from “Sales”**

The primary metaphor-in-the-negative used by presidents related to fundraising as different from sales work. There was a fair amount of conversation regarding how this work of fundraising was like and dislike other sales positions. The phrase “Used Car Salesman” was one example used as a counter-example of the fundraising work done by colleges and university presidents.

Even presidents who described their experience in sales as a youth, for example, in very positive ways still differentiated “sales” from their fundraising efforts. Even when earlier sales work had been identified by them as foundational for their work and success as college or university presidents, they differentiated what they did in their current role from the task of “sales.”

One contrasted what he described as his strengths in the fundraising role with a pejorative sense of what it would mean to be what he called a “sales guy.” He said that he was a successful fundraiser for his institution, because potential donors knew:
. . . that I’m sincere and that I’m not I’m not a, a sales guy, really. I don’t think people feel uncomfortable with me, and that I, that I’m willing to, uh, to do whatever they want me to do.

Another president explained how the notion of “sales” was and was not germane to fundraising in private higher education. He said that sales and education were fundamentally different from one another:

It’s . . . it’s not like – and this is not meant to be pejorative about other sales ventures that people do as a part of legitimate vocations – but what we’re selling here is, is nothing that we need to be even the least bit shy about, apprehensive about. It’s worth investment, and, uh, people who, again who you work with, if you know you’re in a role like this are, are people who have some sense of what you’re trying to accomplish, and that’s really that’s a very good thing.

It doesn’t take very many encounters with cheerful givers to really to, to make that so much more an enjoyable part of what you do. I think that’s a part but I maybe there’s more to it but that and part you know it’s with almost every part of the job, really, the longer you’re at it, the less, . . . I was going to say sensiti- . . . the less insecure you become.

The more you recognize that this is just what I do. This is, people know it, they expect it, uh, I’m not really . . . you want to be careful about offending people . . .

A different president used “sales” to establish the proper context for the position.

She said,
Without that authentic understanding [of the purpose of the fundraising enterprise], you are just a salesperson and that is not an authentic role for a President. A President needs to be still a higher education leader and asking for funds needs to be driven by higher education needs and causes.

Fundraising as Marine Craft

One president shared what he described as a metaphor he employed with new staff at his institution. It is a metaphor useful for trying to “tell the story” of the institution, in a way that contrasted it with the large, generally well-regarded state system of higher education in his state:

I like looking over the lake here. In years past at different times I have used the metaphor talking with people who are candidates for positions [here]. I have done quite a bit of interviewing. As you know the [flagship, state] University . . . is like one of those big tankers out in the lake, tankers…it does a great deal of good work for the society. Very important. Gets lots of goods to market. All the best… It takes a whole lake to turn the thing around.

[We are] a little speed boat and you go zip . . . zip . . . zip . . . zip. We can twist and turn and we can also go flip . . . flip . . . flip . . . flip . . . if we don’t do it right. Umm . . . we’re fun. We hope that we are useful for more than just entertainment. We think we are. So, by all means . . . one sees the results pretty quickly and that’s fun.

A different president used a maritime example, in this case a sailing analogy, summarizing his own personal characteristics as geared more toward solitude or small groups rather than large, social activities. Asked to share his perception of his chief
advancement officer’s sense of the president’s fundraising skills and challenges, he
contrasted the relatively “public” work required of fundraisers with his natural inclination
toward the relative solitude of sailing:

And, I’m an avid sailor but…so one other person…maybe no other people
(laughter) [vs. entertaining large groups of potential donors and friends of the
institution] and…I think that drives him nuts because he is an extraordinarily
gregarious and charismatic and charming fellow and those things do not describe
me.

*The Legacy Question*

The presidents spoke of their legacy, imminent retirement, or of when it would be
time to leave the position. The legacy issue was a serendipitous finding of the study.

Six of the presidents described contemplation of how the institution they
anticipated leaving behind would be substantively different than the one they had
inherited. They had thought about one consequence of the cultivation of donors was that
they understood that in many ways, they were really “setting the table” for their
successor. They shared a sense that there was both wisdom and valor in leaving an
institution before being asked to do so. Different presidents described this phenomenon
in different ways:

Now, somebody else is going to get credit for that gift when it comes in. And um
well, my predecessor [sic] will have a bigger pool than I had, and you know, we’ll
go from there, so . . . .
It will be interesting to see whether the person that follows me gets to figure out a way to avoid that [the president had talked about inheriting an institution with what he described was an ‘inferiority complex’] or whether [the board of trustees] just think they will use that…oh it is a great time to promote [an internal candidate] … a great moment to promote the college, they promote the person and um … anyway.

Those sorts of characters [presidents committed to serving an institution over a long term] have different relationships with their institutions than people who are on their way somewhere else.

And some of the, some of the yield on that crop is gonna be after you’re long gone, you know. Uh, how long will I, how long will I go? This is my 14th year. Some of the relationships that we’re working on now are gonna come in later.

. . . what keeps me in the role [of president] is the ability to make changes in the institution that will be to its long term benefit.

. . .we have done a number of things over the last four-plus years that I think of as my legacy and I think it is building that legacy that is not one of personal achievement so much as institutional benefit that that feels very worthwhile . . . .
You get sort of trapped in your own plans. It is always the next thing. Do I really have four more years of tread on my tires? So, I think figuring the end game out is a tough part of a presidency. Not very hard, if you are a professional president [versus a president deeply committed to a particular institution]. What do you care about the institution that you are leaving? You just care about your resume and the next job but if you are really committed to the institution that you are in.

Presidents who stay in that 5- to 10-year window and then move on to find that project or that person or that concept or that idea that is going to connect with the donor and usually they do it the other way around and campaigns are based on that certain principle of we are going to figure out what we want to do and then we will run around and find people who will help and this is the pile that we have got [hand hits desk].

The findings showed that the presidents had a variety of rationales for seeking the presidency, from having actively sought it out to being invited into the selection process by supporters. All were deeply involved in the fundraising enterprise at their institution, and fundraising was a central part of their regular work. The need to devote more time to fundraising was one of the “worst parts” of the fundraising work they did and the ability to have deep relationships with donors was the main part of what was “the best.”

The presidents’ reflections on their Chief Advancement Officers’ perspectives was shared in the context of time and access most often, but also in terms of personality characteristics that made the task of fundraising easier or harder. Presidents were
surprised by how easy it was to ask for significant gifts, regardless of their beliefs prior to assuming the position, and by how important the relationships they got to have with donors had become to them.

A wide range of personal and professional experiences were cited by the presidents as preparation for their present fundraising work. The preparation was both directly related to fundraising work, in the form of formal training for fundraising, and indirectly related, in the form of various vocations and avocations.

The presidents were reluctant to identify tasks or opportunities their fundraising obligations kept them from, and spoke instead about their clear understanding of what was expected of them prior to assuming the position, and about the value they placed on their fundraising work.

The presidents used a number of metaphors to describe their fundraising work. The metaphors made comparisons of what their work was like, and what it was unlike.
Chapter Five

Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of college and university presidents in raising funds for their institutions in one Midwestern state. The research questions that guided the study were: to what extent do the presidents of private colleges and universities feel the need to effectively raise funds for their institutions, and, essentially, what sense do they make of that part of their work, given their preparation – or lack thereof – their professional aspirations, and their unique role in academe? The case study methodology was critical to a deep understanding of the lived experience for each of these men and women.

Three major themes emerged from the study relating to the presidents’ experience as fundraisers: Preparation for successful fundraising work comes from a wide variety of experiences; Fundraising work is not generally perceived as a “necessary evil;” and Fundraising work is intrinsically connected to questions of legacy.

As explained in Chapter Two, the position of college president in the United States has evolved from the founding of Harvard in 1636 to 2009. The results of this study indicated that these contemporary presidents did not connect their role or work to the earliest notions of college and university presidents using their bully pulpit to actively shape students’ morality, or to weigh in on vexing social issues. Perhaps the closest any of these presidents came to describing their work in terms of the greater social good was when a number of them referred to fundraising being one vehicle that allowed greater access to higher education, for a greater variety of students, socio-economically and otherwise.
In this study, the presidents came to the position from a variety of places, vocationally. This was supported by the literature reviewed in Chapter Two that described an evolution of the position from academician-in-chief to Chief Executive Officer of a major business enterprise.

The literature also described the evolution of the preparation for the position. Where college presidents once came exclusively from within the ranks of academe, contemporary college presidents come from a variety of backgrounds and experiences. Presidents in the study came from academe, but also from Student Affairs and the ministry, and eight of the presidents were hired from outside the institution they presently serve.

The results of the study supported the literature which indicated that the need to do fundraising was significant, and that fundraising took a large and growing portion of presidents’ time. Each of the presidents described their involvement in institutional fundraising as significant, and as occupying much of their time.

The literature described presidential fundraising in terms of discrete numbers and percentages of time. The presidents resisted identifying a percentage of time devoted to fundraising. They placed their fundraising work into a larger context. For most of these leaders, the context included the near-complete connection of fundraising to all activities of the president.

The literature indicated a gathering storm of collective social reaction to high salaries paid to contemporary institutional leaders. Not a single president interviewed for this study placed their work as fundraisers in the context of their salary. Instead, they
described their work in terms of furthering institutional goals and objectives, or matching generous donors to meaningful projects, or, ideally, both.

The presidents affirmed the literature describing effective, team-oriented institutional fundraising enterprises. Most often this was described in the affirmative, in terms of how their advancement teams helped them to be successful in these fundraising endeavors. References were made by three of the presidents to ineffective working relationships with their advancement team, and in those cases, the presidents described either changing the leadership in their advancement area, or growing and maturing the advancement operation.

The case study consisted of ten approximately one-hour interviews with the presidents of private colleges and universities in one Midwestern state. Interviews were recorded and transcribed for coding. The coding was used to elicit themes and to analyze the data.

One of the surprises of the study was how the presidents responded to the last formal question, a question about what, if anything, their obligations as a fundraiser prevented them from being able to do. The implication of the question reflected the literature, that many presidents raised funds for their institutions begrudgingly, or that they wished fundraising did not take as much of their time as it often does.

The research literature suggested that, for many college and university presidents (a) fundraising was often at best a necessary evil, (b) fundraising was inherently unpleasant, and (c) fundraising somehow detracted from the truest, noblest responsibilities of the position. The presidents did not report being prevented from doing what they wanted to do because of fundraising.
Summary

The case study method is designed to help the researcher grasp the “essence” of the phenomenon being researched, within a bounded system (Creswell, 1998). In this case, I was able to interview 10 of 20 men and women serving as president of one of the member institutions of a private-institution consortium in one state.

I interviewed two women and eight men. One subject withdrew following the interview. Subjects ranged from being in their first months on the job to having served more than 20 years. All were in their first or second presidency.

My question set was developed to capture data regarding motivation (what brought them to this point), persistence (what sustains them in their position), and the costs, personally and professionally, of doing the work of fundraising.

The literature described in Chapter Two led me to conclude prior to the study that fundraising would be described by the presidents as a necessary evil, a diversion from each institutional leader’s true calling, a burden carried in exchange for the cache’ and prestige associated with the role of president in U.S. higher education.

The literature revealed a growing dependence on president as chief fundraiser, and a growing percentage of their collective time devoted to that enterprise. It described in various ways the evolution of the position of college or university president from moral voice for a given generation to fundraiser-in-chief, an evolution most often described as at least in part lamentable.
Preparation for successful fundraising work comes from a wide variety of experiences

Just one president described a formal training program for presidents as fundraisers, and he was one of the co-developers of that program. Presidents did have experience in fundraising prior to assuming their positions, with two exceptions, but had not been formally trained as fundraisers.

Presidents described a variety of experiences that prepared them to raise funds for their institutions. These included other positions they had held, where they had the opportunity to solicit donations. They also included work on the stage, in the ministry, and in sales.

Fundraising is not generally perceived as a necessary evil.

The presidents interviewed indicated a general comfort with the notion of fundraising. Each of the presidents knew prior to accepting their respective positions that fundraising was a necessary and important expectation of them.

Two presidents were able to identify, only at my prompting, facets of their professional lives that were less prevalent than they might have liked . . . but never in a way that suggested if, given the choice, they would give up their current responsibilities in exchange for the others. With one exception, a president who felt called to remain connected to students in the classroom, I did not hear “If only I did not have to do fundraising, I could be doing . . . .” Even in the case of that one exception, the president indicated that he was continuing to find ways to teach one class each year, even when he admitted that his advancement team would likely prefer he did not.
Presidents described special relationships with certain donors. They described their ability to utilize the fundraising function to craft realities that would outlast them.

Nine presidents spoke of the unique, meaningful role they had the opportunity to play in connecting interested donors with the right projects or activities. These projects or activities often perfectly married the donors’ passions with the institution’s greatest needs. In two instances, presidents suggested that they had been helpful in serving the needs of the world with their fundraising, having created opportunities for students to participate in higher education who otherwise would not have been able to do so.

No president described the process as “Here is what you, the donor, can do to help me, the president.” Instead, the presidents described it as being about “Here is something I have learned that you are passionate about, and I want to give you the opportunity to use that passion to enhance the lives of students, faculty, or staff.”

Fundraising is intrinsically connected to questions of legacy.

With one exception, no president spoke about structures that had been built on their campus as a result of their fundraising work. The one exception followed a probe during the interview, when I probed a response she had given, and indicated that I was aware of a new student union being built on that campus. I initiated the question about the building, and even then, the president’s response was more about the generosity of the donors and the ability to serve students in better and different ways with the new facility.

Six presidents shared that there was a clear connection for them between fundraising work and their legacy as president. They made that connection to the past, and discussed the situation they inherited upon taking their current position and the
legacy that inheritance created for their predecessors. They made the connection to the future, either in terms of “setting the table” for their successor, positioning themselves for a timely departure, or leaving the institution in a better position, financially or otherwise, than it had been when they arrived.

No president spoke about the role as serving the wider community’s greater good. Their positions provided these men and women with an intellectual *nobles oblige* to use their status, power, and historical moral authority to serve the world, yet these presidents never referred to opportunities they had taken to do so.

One president indicated that he had led a highly efficient strategic planning process for his institution, and had, as a result been asked to serve a similar function for his local community government. One president indicated that their fundraising work allowed them to provide access to higher education for students whose socioeconomic status might have precluded it, absent the funds raised. Three described their fundraising work in terms of enhancing the long-term viability or sustainability of the institution they served.

For the study, I conducted approximately one-hour interviews with ten different college and university presidents. Alternative research methods would provide much more time with each president.

Garnering an hour from each of ten presidents often proved to be difficult. In two cases, interviews were never scheduled, despite repeated attempts. On three occasions, the president had just returned the day prior to the interview from travel abroad, and that may have affected the interview, positively or negatively.
The normal rhythms of a typical academic year suggest that examination of a given president’s fundraising work at a different point in their academic calendar, or of the same president at a different institution, might yield alternative results.

**Implications**

Eight presidents had had experience with fundraising, but only one had specifically been trained to do so, prior to assuming the position. At a time when the need for successful fundraising has never been greater, the need for formal training is paramount.

Research subjects mirrored concerns expressed in the literature about the intense, unyielding time demands placed on the position. This was especially the case during capital campaigns or other targeted advancement initiatives.

**Recommendations**

*Presidential Preparation for Fundraising*

More and better formal preparation programs need to be designed to teach what one president described as both the “science” and the “art” of fundraising. Particularly as the pool from which potential presidential candidates are recruited grows to include individuals with business, advancement, student affairs, philanthropy backgrounds, the need to position the presidents for success in the fundraising arena becomes paramount.
One of the presidents interviewed shared that he has developed a preparation program, now entering its fourth year, for those considering a presidency. Fundraising is a significant component of this program.
For Further Study

Another line of inquiry might be whether there are different needs or expectations of institutions identified as either colleges or universities. Future research might explore the impact a given type or size of institution has on the fundraising process.

Four presidents described their fundraising apparatus in the context of their institution’s legacy teaching those pursuing the helping professions, notably, teachers and nurses. Further study about fundraising for these types of institutions is warranted.

Alternative, non-traditional administrative models that allow college or university presidents to focus almost exclusively on fundraising should be explored. Studies exploring the viability or effectiveness of a variety of administrative models should be pursued.

Two of the presidents used the word “introvert” to describe themselves, in the context of what surprised them about the work they do [Question Five] and what their CAO wished of them. A study exploring personality type as it relates to successful fundraising work may yield insight into type-specific strategies for success.

Studies designed to explore particular fundraising techniques, strategies, and approaches would be necessary to continue the development of a comprehensive understanding of effective practices. Beyond that, the development of a matrix analyzing particular practices with personality traits or other personal characteristics, compared with institutional attributes, would yield a potentially rich understanding of fundraising.

This study should be replicated at public institutions. The literature suggested that public institutions need to develop sophisticated fundraising enterprises, akin to those
of private institutions. The needs and opportunities of public institutions may be different than private institutions.

**Propositions**

Based on the findings of this study, the following propositions merit further examination:

- The primary motivator for private college and university presidents in their fundraising efforts has an impact on their effectiveness as fundraisers, and should be explored further.

- If the president’s institution is grounded in a tradition emphasizing service to the world, the president’s and the institution’s fundraising should serve that end, as well. The degree to which this happens, and the challenges and opportunities inherent in doing so, should be explored further.

- Of the small number of presidential preparation programs, there might be one “best” method of preparation for college and university presidents, particularly regarding fundraising. This should be explored further.

- Demands on presidents’ time and resources continue to grow, perhaps beyond what is feasible. A simple cost-benefit analysis is insufficient, and further exploration of this topic should be pursued.
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Appendixes
Appendix A: Interview Guide

Project: Goddard Dissertation re: Fundraising Presidents

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer: Corday Goddard
Interviewee ID No.:
Position of Interviewee: President

(Briefly describe the project)

Questions:

1. Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?

2. What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?

3. If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser? Would they describe any challenges you face? If so, what are they?

4. What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?

5. What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?

6. It has been suggested that presidents fail or succeed in large part based on what happens in the first 500 days of their tenure. What do you recall from your first 500 days, specifically related to fundraising for your institution?

7. Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?

(Thank individual for participating in this interview. Assure her or him of confidentiality of responses and potential future interviews.)
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form
Informed Consent Form
Corday Thomas Goddard, University of Nebraska-Lincoln Department of Educational Administration

Project Description
Title: Presidential Fundraising at Independent Colleges in the Midwest: A Case study

This project is being done for research as partial completion of requirements for a Ph.D. in Educational Administration from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. It is scheduled to occur during the spring 2008 through spring 2009, and individual participants should expect less than one hours’ worth of involvement (with some exceptions).

You have been selected to participate in this study because of your position as president of an independent college or university in the state of [state]. Participation requires a tape- or digitally-recorded interview of approximately 60 minutes. You will have the opportunity to review transcriptions of the interview. Interviews will take place at a time and place convenient to the participant, in person if at all possible.

Risks, Benefits, and Alternatives
There are no known risks to participants. Benefits of the research include an increased understanding of the unique challenges inherent in contemporary fundraising for presidents of independent colleges and universities.

Confidentiality
Every attempt will be made to ensure confidentiality, and no remarks that can be directly traced to their source will be included in the dissertation without participants’ approval. Individual institutions and interview subjects will be given pseudonyms.

Compensation
No compensation is available for participation in this project. Participation is purely voluntary.

Right to Withdraw
Participation is completely voluntary, and you are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with the investigator or the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or anyone else associated with this project. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Sometimes study participants have questions or concerns about their rights. In that case, you should call the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board at (402) 472-6965.

Consent, Right to Receive a Copy:
You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to participate in this research study. Your signature certifies that you have decided to participate having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Signature of Participant: ___________________________ ___________________________ I agree to be audio taped during the interview.
Signature of Research Participant Date

Contact Information:
Corday Goddard, (920) 403-1351, corday.goddard@snc.edu
141 Teachers College Hall / P.O. Box 880360 / Lincoln, NE 68588-0360 /
(402) 472-3726 / FAX (42) 472-4300
Appendix C: IRB Approval Request Form and Continuing Review Form

IRB New Protocol Submission

Project Title: Presidential Fundraising at Independent Colleges in the Midwest: A Case Study

Investigator Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator:</th>
<th>Corday Goddard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Department of Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone:</td>
<td>(402) 472-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Address:</td>
<td>231 N 6th St De Pere, WI 54115-2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corday.goddard@uni.edu">corday.goddard@uni.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Investigator:</th>
<th>Marilyn Grady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Department of Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone:</td>
<td>(402) 472-2270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Address:</td>
<td>125 SFAC, UNL, 88588-0360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgrady@unlserve.unl.edu">mgrady@unlserve.unl.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Student theses or dissertations must be submitted with a faculty member listed as Secondary Investigator or Project Supervisor.

Principal Investigator is: Graduate Student
Type of Project: Other

Does the research involve an outside institution/agency other than UNL? Yes

If yes, please list the institutions/agencies:

Where will participation take place? (e.g., UNL, at home, in a community building, etc)
Ideally, in the office of each of the presidents of the above institutions. There may be opportunities during meetings of [ ] presidents to interview one or more of them at the...
meeting site.

* Note: Research can only begin at each institution after the IRB receives the institutional approval letter.

**Project Information:**
Present/Proposed Funding Source: Personal Funds
Project Start Date: 01/01/2008
Project End Date: 03/31/2009

1. Does the research involve prisoners?
   Yes

2. Will the research only be conducted in schools or educational settings?
   Yes

Does the research study involve only normal education practices (such as research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or research on effectiveness or of the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods)?

N/A (or no answer)

3. Does the research involve only the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior? (The use of pre-existing data does not fall into this category.)
   Yes

Does the research involve children (under 19 years of age)?

No

Does the research only involve the observation of public behavior where the investigator does not intervene or interact in the activities being observed?

N/A (or no answer)

Is the information recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects?

No

Could any disclosure of the human subjects’ responses outside the research reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation?

No

Are the subjects elected or appointed public officials (e.g. senior officials, such as mayor or school
superintendent, rather than a police officer or teacher)

N/A (or no answer)

Does any Federal statute require without exception that the confidentiality of personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter?

N/A (or no answer)

4. Does the research involve only the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens?

No

Are these sources publicly available?

N/A (or no answer)

Will the information be recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects?

N/A (or no answer)

5. Does the research involve only studying, evaluating or examining public benefit or service programs?

No

Is the research or demonstration project conducted or approved by the Department or Agency Head?

N/A (or no answer)

Does the research or demonstration project involve only the study, evaluation, or examination of:

Public benefit or service programs:

N/A (or no answer)

Procedures for obtaining benefits or services under public benefit or service programs:

N/A (or no answer)

Possible changes in or alternatives to public benefit or service programs or to procedures for obtaining benefits or services under public benefit or service programs:

N/A (or no answer)

Possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those public benefit or service programs:
N/A (or no answer)

Does the research or demonstration project involve only the study, evaluation, or examination of the previous 4 categories?

N/A (or no answer)

6. Does the research involve only a taste and food quality evaluation or food consumer acceptance study?

No

Are wholesome foods without additives consumed?

N/A (or no answer)

Is food consumed that contains a food ingredient, agricultural chemical, or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture?

N/A (or no answer)

7. Does the research present more than minimal risk to human subjects?

N/A (or no answer)

For each category, please mark if it is a part of the project:

1) Clinical studies of drugs and/or medical devices?

N/A (or no answer)

2) Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture?

N/A (or no answer)

3) Prospective collection of biological specimen for research purposes by noninvasive means?

N/A (or no answer)

4) Collection of data through noninvasive procedures routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves?

N/A (or no answer)

5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis)?
6. Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes?

N/A (or no answer)

7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior)?

N/A (or no answer)

8. Research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies?

N/A (or no answer)

Does the research involve only procedures included in the previous 8 categories?

N/A (or no answer)

Could identification of subjects put them at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be socially or economically damaging?

N/A (or no answer)

8a. Does the research involve clinical studies of drugs and medical devices?

N/A (or no answer)

Is FDA required?

N/A (or no answer)

9. Does the research involve collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture?

N/A (or no answer)

from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds? (Amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week)

N/A (or no answer)

from other adults and children considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.
N/A (or no answer)

**Description of Subjects.**
Total number of participants (include ‘controls’): 20

Will participants of both sexes/genders be recruited? Yes
Will participation be limited to certain racial or ethnic groups? No
What are the participants’ characteristics?
Presidents of independent colleges and universities in Wisconsin

**Type of Participant:** (check all appropriate blanks for participant population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Adults, Non Students</th>
<th>Pregnant Women</th>
<th>Persons with Psychological Impairment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNL Students</td>
<td>Fetuses</td>
<td>Persons with Neurological Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minors (under age ’19)</td>
<td>Persons with Limited Civil Freedom</td>
<td>Persons with Mental Retardation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adults with Legal Representatives</td>
<td>Persons with HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (Explain):

**Unique Research Methodology or Data Sources**
Will your project involve audio taping? Yes

How long will tapes be kept? Where will they be stored? Who will have access to the tapes? If transcriptions are required, how will transcriptions be handled? Who is doing the transcriptions? Please attach a copy of the confidentiality agreement that transcriptionists will sign.

Transcripts will be made by use of voice transcription software, if possible, and/or by paid transcriptionist.

Recordings will be destroyed immediately upon transcription.

Project: Goddard Dissertation re: Fund-raising Presidents

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:

Interviewer: Corday Goddard
Interviewee ID No:
Position of Interviewee: President
(Briefly describe the project)

Questions:
1. Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?

2. What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?

3. If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser? Would they describe any challenges you face? If so, what are they?

4. What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?

5. What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?

6. It has been suggested that presidents fail or succeed in large part based on what happens in the first 500 days of their tenure. What do you recall from your first 500 days, specifically related to fundraising for your institution?

7. Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?

(Thank individual for participating in this interview. Assure her or him of confidentiality of responses and potential future interviews.)

Please submit copies of all survey instruments.

Is this project web-based research? No

Is this study utilizing Protected Health Information (PHI, e.g., information obtained from a hospital, clinic, or treatment facility)? No

Does this project involve genetic data/sampling/analysis, illegal drug use, or criminal activity that places the participant at risk for legal action? No

Does this project involve photography? No

Does this project involve videotaping? No

Does this project involve archival or secondary data analysis? No
Does this project involve biological samples? No

**Project Personnel List:**
Please list the names of all personnel working on this project, starting with the principal investigator and the secondary investigator/project advisor. Research assistants, students, data entry staff and other research project staff should also be included. For a complete explanation of training and project staff please go to http://www.unl.edu/research/orr/index.shtml.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>UNL Status</th>
<th>Is Involved In Design/Supervision</th>
<th>Is Involved In Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corday Goddard</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Grady</td>
<td>Supervisory PI</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**
1. Describe the research purpose of the project.
   What is the purpose of the study? (Please provide a brief 1-2 paragraph explanation in lay terms. Include a brief literature justification.)
   This case study will explore the experience of the fund-raising efforts of presidents of independent colleges and universities in Wisconsin. The intention is to understand the lived experience of women and men serving as president of a given institution, primarily the experience of having to cultivate and reap donor support for institutional objectives.

2. Description of the Methods and Procedures.
   Describe the data collection procedures and what participants will have to do.
   How long will this take participants to complete?
   Each president will be interviewed for 60 minutes.

   Where will participation take place?
   Interviews and interactions will take place on the home campus of each president. There may be opportunities to meet with some of the presidents at meetings sponsored by the Wisconsin Association of Independent Colleges and Universities.

   Will follow-ups or reminders be sent? If so, explain.
   Both will be used to make certain my travel to a given institution is at a time convenient to participants.

   Describe the data collection procedures and what participants will have to do.
   Participants will be asked a series of open-ended questions related to their preparation for, work in, and perceived effectiveness in the area of institutional fundraising. Interviews will be recorded and transcribed. The participants will have the opportunity to review transcribed materials for accuracy.

   How long will this take participants to complete?
   One hour each
Will follow-ups or reminders be sent?
Yes

If so, explain.
Interviewees will have the opportunity to review transcripts for accuracy.

3. Description of Recruiting Procedures
How will the names and contact information for participants be obtained?
Names of the presidents are readily available. I will seek their permission to be interviewed/participate in the study.

How will participants be approached about participating in the study?
I will share with them, via personal contact or e-mail, the purpose of my dissertation research, and ask them to participate.

[Email text, identical to text of cover letter]

Dear Dr. __________,

I am currently ______________________ and am also a student working on my dissertation at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln on the topic of presidential fundraising. I am hoping to interview each of the presidents of a ______________ beginning _____________. Ideally, I would need about an hour. Any time at your convenience, morning, noon, or night, would be fine. I will give your secretary a call next week.

If you have any questions about the project or about me, please give me a call at 920-403-1331.

Sincerely,

Corday Goddard

[Secretary/Admin Assistant Phone Contact Text]

“Hello, my name is Corday Goddard, and I recently contacted President ____________ about their participating in a research project for my doctoral dissertation. I would like to make arrangements to meet with them for one hour at their convenience. Might we find a time for me to do that?”

4. Description of Benefits and Risks
Explain the benefits to participants or to others.
Explain the benefits to subjects or to others.
The benefit for the president is that he or she will have an opportunity to reflect on and review her or his work in the arena of fundraising for their respective institutions.

Explain the risks to participants. What will be done to minimize the risks? If there are no known risks, this should be stated.
There are no discernible risks at this time.

5. Description of Compensation
Will compensation (including money, gift certificates, extra credit, etc.) be provided to participants?
No

6. Informed Consent Process
In certain cases for children over the age of 14, such as UNL students who are 17 or 18, waivers of informed consent can be granted.

Would you like to request a waiver of consent?
No

7. Description of How Confidentiality will be Maintained
How will confidentiality of records be maintained?
How will confidentiality of records be maintained?
I will be in possession of all materials. I will hire a transcriptionist, who will be asked to sign a letter of confidentiality.

Text of transcriptionist confidentiality agreement is here (and form is uploaded):
Confidentiality Form for Transcriptionist
Confidentiality Agreement

By signing below, you are agreeing that all information shared is to be considered confidential and private, and may not be shared with anyone other than Corday Goddard, University of Nebraska-Lincoln doctoral student.

__________________________
Signature of Transcriptionist  Date

Will individuals be identified?
Yes

Will the participants be identifiable during data collection? How long will individuals be identifiable? At what point will the identities be removed (if ever)?
Will individuals be identified?
Only for my personal records. For the dissertation itself, they will be identified by randomly assigned pseudonyms (so, for example, I will not assign pseudonyms alphabetically, or in any other way where a reader could easily discern the institution’s or president’s true identity).

If the data is coded, will there be a list linking names and codes? If so, how long will this list be kept and where?
Yes, in my personal records, and it will be destroyed once the dissertation is published.

How long will records be kept?
Two years and then destroyed

Where will records be stored?
In my home office.

Who has access to the records/data?
Only me. The transcriptionist will have the data only long enough to transcribe it.

How will data be reported?
In my dissertation

8. Copies of Questionnaires, Survey, or Testing Instruments
Please list all questionnaires, surveys, and/or assessment instruments/measures used in the project.
Please list the survey instruments/measures.
Project: Goddard Dissertation re: Fund-raising Presidents

Time of Interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer: Corday Goddard
Interviewee ID No.:
Position of Interviewee: President

(Briefly describe the project)

Questions:
1. Why did you originally want to be president? What keeps you in the position now? What advice would you give to someone considering pursuing a presidency?

2. Can you please describe your level of involvement with fundraising at your institution?

3. What is the best and the worst part, for you, about raising funds for your institution?

4. If I were to speak with your chief advancement or development officer, how would they describe your strengths as a fundraiser? Would they describe any challenges you face? If so, what are they?

5. What, if anything, has surprised you the most about the fundraising work you do now?

6. What in your professional or personal background has best prepared you for this part of your work as president?

7. What would you do differently today than you might have done, say, in your first two years in the position?

8. Are there things you imagined you would do more of as president that your obligations as fundraiser prevent you from doing?
(Thank individual for participating in this interview. Assure her or him of confidentiality of responses and potential future interviews.)

Please submit copies of all survey instruments.

9. Uploaded Attachments

Confidentiality Form for Transcriptionist.doc - 24064 Bytes - application/msword
approval letter.pdf - 77905 Bytes - application/pdf

Comments:
PI Comments
Marilyn Grady is not a graduate student

Remove the "waggle words or phrases"

For instance, "if possible" ... be direct and precise in your procedures...you need to be specific in your approach.

Declare exactly what you will do.

I suggest using a transcriptionist.

Provide the confidentiality agreement for the transcriptionist.

Be consistent in how long the interview will take....
60 minutes is an acceptable amount of time. Be precise in your statement.

Eliminate references to your personal needs...like your travel time. This is about the subjects of your research and their protection.

"As much as possible" is ambiguous...remove the vague phrases.

Provide the reminders so they can be read by the reviewers.

Remove the word "relatively" before open-ended...
Your answer to “follow-up reminders” does not respond to the question.

Please eliminate the “morning, noon, or night” phrase.

be specific in the time needed for the interview.

The message needs to include more information regarding your study. Presidents are prime research subjects, their time is precious. They will decide to participate based on the importance of the research and the qualifications of the researcher. Provide information that is complete so that the individual can make an informed decision.

provide copies of all three communications you mention in establishing contact to interview the presidents.

Please read your informed consent form and correct it.

Please fix the confidentiality statement.

Use the models provided by IRB for guidance as well as other models you have been directed to use.

Fix the statement about access to the records.

Fix the statement about how data will be reported.

Can and are questions can be answered by yes or no responses... they are not appropriate to a qualitative study.

Separate the questions so that only one question is asked at a time...

Use the opportunity to get more depth to the topic from your subjects ... what have been your most successful strategies... who has helped you the most in learning to be expert at fundraising... what advice would you offer to presidents-in-training... what would you suggest to faculty in higher education programs who prepare administrators... your questions need more depth.

URC Comments

ORR Comments
### IRB Application for Continuing Review

**Project Title:** Presidential Fundraising at Independent Colleges in the Midwest: A Case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator Information:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Investigator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Student theses or dissertations must be submitted with a faculty member listed as Supervisory Investigator or Project Supervisor

**Status of Study:**
- Status: Active with subject recruitment completed

---

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB #:</th>
<th>2008038563 EX/IRB Decision Date: 03/24/2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Received:</td>
<td>03/22/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code #:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Project ID:</td>
<td>8563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form ID:</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Approved by the IRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Personnel List:
Please list the names of all personnel working on this project, starting with the principal investigator and the secondary investigator/project advisor. Research assistants, students, data entry staff and other research project staff should also be included. For a complete explanation of training and project staff please go to http://www.unl.edu/research/ot/index.shtml.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>UNL Status</th>
<th>Is Involved in Design/Supervision</th>
<th>Is Involved in Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corday Goddard</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Grady</td>
<td>Supervisory PI</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corday Goddard</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Grady</td>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section II:
When did the study begin? 04/20/2009
What is the estimated completion date of the study? 01/01/2009

How many subjects have completed the study? Total: 12
   Male (if known): 10
   Female (if known): 2

Are there any active participants in the study? No
If yes, how many?

Will new subjects be enrolled in the study? No

Did any subject voluntarily withdraw from the study? Yes

Address any known reasons for subject withdrawal in the space provided.
She said it would be "problematic to stay in the study" because of issues at her institution.

Were there any non-medical problems or complications in the study that affected the subject or others? No

Did any subject suffer an unanticipated problem or adverse event which was reported to the IRB since the last IRB review? No

What is the funding status of the study? Include source and length of funding.
All self-funded
### Section III:

Provide a brief summary of any preliminary results obtained in the study. If the project is still active and no results are appropriate to report to the IRB at this time, this should be stated and explained.

Dissertation is being edited right now. Study is complete, but not published.

Has anything occurred during the conduct of the study which may have altered the risk/benefit relationship?

No

### Uploaded Attachments:

Informed Consent Form-Revised-Final.doc - 43840 Bytes - application/msword

### Comments:

PI Comments

ORR Comments
Confidentiality Agreement

By signing below, you are agreeing that all information shared is to be considered confidential and private, and may not be shared with anyone other than Corday Goddard, doctoral student.

__________________________  _________________________
Signature of Transcriptionist     Date