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Problem

Small church-related colleges and universities are experiencing financial difficulties. This study assesses the institutional advancement programs at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities. The purpose of this examination was to analyze "what is" to determine the present-day process of the advancement function, and what "ought to be." These data will also suggest potential areas for growth and development.

Method

The study uses a non-experimental, descriptive design. To accomplish the purpose
of the study, the literature on institutional advancement was reviewed to find a useable framework. The instrument used for this study was the one used in Willmer's (1980) study with some modifications. The presidents of nine colleges and universities were surveyed through two questionnaires to determine the present-day activities. A questionnaire was also sent to the chairman of the governing board for each school in an attempt to expand the knowledge of the board's involvement in the area of institutional advancement.

Results

The research was carried out within the framework of five areas of institutional advancement with research questions for each area. The findings were grouped into the same areas: (1) Institutional commitment: The study found significant deficiencies in the percentage of budget allocation for advancement, and number of professional and clerical staff members; (2) Authority and Organizational structure: The study showed that the schools in this study meet and even exceeded Willmer's model on the level of authority and organization; (3) Personnel Resources: A significant lack of involvement with institutional advancement activities of the presidents and the members of the board was found; (4) Advancement Activities and Functions: All schools reported raising funds through a wide variety of activities; all had alumni organizations and publications mailed regularly, but had a weakness in small mailing lists; (5) Evaluation: No formal evaluation processes were found in any schools.

Conclusions

The colleges and universities are trying to raise funds on limited resources. Each school needs to evaluate its institutional advancement activities. Members of the board and
volunteers need to be more involved in fund-raising; therefore, training should be conducted. The presidents need to evaluate their priorities and spend considerable more time on advancement activities.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Fund-raising is a vital part of a higher-education institution's strength, and its importance has never been more critical than in the decade of the 90s with its spiraling education costs (Leslie & Ramey, 1988). Particularly at risk are the small church-related colleges which have few resources (Jones, 1991). Even more endangered are those institutions which have strong denominational affiliations. These colleges face not only the challenge of fiscal inflation, but also of declining enrollment because of competition with public colleges (Myers, 1989).

Bartlett (1989) noted in his study of the role of institutional advancement in Seventh-day Adventist colleges in North America that, during the 1980s, Adventist higher education has confronted declining enrollments and spiraling financial costs, raising questions about the economic viability of maintaining 12 denominational schools within North America (p. 5).

In addition to the declining enrollment and the inflation of the dollar, two other factors contribute to the significant role that institutional advancement must have. First, colleges are experiencing an increase in the number of part-time students. Institutions have traditionally depended upon their graduates for financial support; therefore, the officers for
institutional advancement have to foster loyalty among this growing new student population. Second, the cost of operating a college and university has dramatically increased (Melton, 1996).

Hubbard (1985) noted that, "in seeking support from the community, a church-related college often must counter a history of isolationism. At the same time, the college must find itself competing for funds within its own sponsoring denomination" (p. 12). This is particularly the case with schools in developing countries, where colleges with declining resources are increasingly dependent on private financial support (Wield, 1997). Therefore, colleges must make fund-raising a major priority and devote the needed resources to accomplish the mission of the institution (Melton, 1996). It has been stated that the role of development and institutional advancement is to create an understanding of the institution's missions, services, and accomplishments, and thereby to generate goodwill and voluntary financial support to sustain its educational objectives (The New International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, 1990).

Grohar (1989) noted that the solution to the financial challenges colleges and universities are experiencing is a more effective resource acquisition. Colleges and universities are generally engaged in two types of resource acquisition: student recruitment and fund-raising. Fund-raising is only one part of several other functions that have become known as institutional advancement (pp. 4-5).

Rowland (1986) outlines the functions of institutional advancement to include institutional relations, fund-raising, alumni administration, government relations, publications, enrollment management, and executive management (pp. xiii-xxiii). A similar
outline of institutional advancement functions is shared in a more recent reference: Worth (1993) noted that the activities and programs which generally fall under institutional activities include alumni relations, internal and external communications, public relations, fund-raising, government relations, and enrollment management. Enrollment management includes not only student enrollment but also financial aid and the other programs which exist for retaining enrolled students (pp. 4-5).

**Importance of the Study**

From the literature research done for this study it has been noted that little information has been collected concerning institutional advancement programs, in particular among the Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities outside the United States and affiliated with Andrews University. Two studies were conducted among the Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities in the United States: Bartlett (1989) did a study describing the structure of institutional advancement operating within Seventh-day Adventist colleges in North America. His study included data collection of the institutional advancement structure at 10 denominational colleges.

Grohar (1989) did a study on effective fund-raising policies used at private, church-related undergraduate colleges. Through multiple regression techniques, his study estimated gift income potentials of the 234 church-related colleges studied, using a set of financial resource and environmental position variables. A survey was sent to colleges in each group to determine the extent to which they implemented fund-raising policies identified in the literature.

This study extends the existing literature on the subject by providing a background
for successful institutional advancement programs, as well as suggests effective methods
to assist Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, particularly those outside the
United States, in their accomplishment of their strategic plans and objectives.

**Purpose of the Study**

This study assesses the institutional advancement programs at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities affiliated with Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. The reason that those schools have been selected for this study is that as the researcher I did my doctoral work at Andrews University, and, while there, received information from some administrators that such a study would be valuable. The purpose of this examination is to analyze "what is" by surveying selected colleges and universities to determine the present-day process of the institutional advancement function, to determine "what ought to be" by establishing a theoretical framework from the literature; and by determining the data to judge the present stage of these programs.

In 1981, W. K. Willmer examined advancement programs existing in religious-affiliated colleges and universities. The result of Willmer's study was a model and framework for an effective advancement program for small colleges. Willmer's model consisted of five benchmarks that he believes exist in an advancement program in order for it to be effective: Institutional Commitment, Authority and Organizational Structure, Personnel Resources, Advancement Activities and Functions, and Evaluation Process.

1. **Institutional Commitment**: This facet is determined by the existence of an articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans for Institutional Advancement (IA), budget allocation, and staffing commitment to IA.
2. **Authority and Organizational Structure**: Willmer defined this benchmark as a view of the IA chain of command and structure and the centralization or decentralization of the institutional advancement work within the university.

3. **Personnel Resources**: This facet is determined by the experience and working knowledge of the institutional advancement professional staff and the number of volunteers involved in advancement activities as well as the extent of that involvement.

4. **Advancement Activities and Functions**: Willmer defined this benchmark as the number and variety of fund-raising methods employed and the extent of other advancement functions, such as alumni activities and public relations.

5. **Evaluation Processes**: This facet is determined by the existence of evaluation tools and the extent of their use within institutional advancement (Willmer, 1980).

**Research Questions**

The following research questions, which directly relate to Willmer's benchmarks, guided this study:

1. What is the institutional commitment to fund-raising at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

2. What is the advancement authority and organizational structure of that authority at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

3. What advancement personnel resources exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?
4. What advancement activities and functions are currently utilized at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

5. Do advancement evaluation processes currently exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

**Significance of the Study**

Present and future administrators should find the result of this study useful in planning, organizing, and managing institutional advancement programs. The study also makes recommendations for changes to encourage desired outcomes to benefit Seventh-day Adventist educational institutions and small church-related educational institutions as they make their strategic plans with attention to successful institutional advancement strategies for the future.

**Description of the Colleges and Universities Studied**

This study is limited to four Seventh-day Adventist undergraduate liberal arts colleges and three universities. The colleges selected for this study are: Caribbean Union College, Trinidad; Helderberg College, South Africa; Newbold College, England; and Spicer Memorial College, India. The universities that are selected for this study are: Antillean Adventist University, Puerto Rico; Babcock University, Nigeria, and Montemorelos University, Mexico.
Definition of Terms

The following terms are intended to convey the meanings of words peculiar to this study:

**Assessment:** Banta, Lund, Black and Oblinder (1966) stated that “assessment focuses on an examination of what is, what may occur in the future, or what ought to be. It also includes an examination of what might be needed and what we do with it to achieve desired outcome” (p. 8). This is the assessment process that guided this study.

**Board of Governors or Trustees:** A group of individuals who are legally responsible for the institution as enforced by its by-laws. The board members outline general policies, vision, finances, strategic planning, and other overall decisions.

**Cultivation:** The process of asking a prospective donor to make a financial contribution to an institution. It involves all activities to help a prospect become better acquainted with the programs of the college or university.

**General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists (GC):** The highest administrative unit in the Seventh-day Adventist church organization in the world. Its headquarters is in Silver Spring, Maryland, USA.

**Higher Education:** An education program that is beyond the high-school or secondary level.

**Institutional Advancement:** An institutional effort that includes the function of institutional or public relations, fund-raising, alumni administration, government relations, publications, enrollment management, and executive management.
Liberal Arts Program: A program of studies, such as English language, communication, biology, history, or literature, at a college or university intended to provide general knowledge and to develop intellectual capabilities, such as reasoning and judgement, as opposed to vocational and professional skills.

SDA: An abbreviation for the name Seventh-day Adventist.

Small College: For the purpose of this study, colleges with 2,000 or fewer full time students. This enrollment determination is consistent with the membership requirements established by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Limitations of the Study

There are four major limitations to this study:

1. This study considers only four 4-year liberal arts Seventh-day Adventist colleges and three universities outside the United States of America.

2. This study excludes fund-raising as it is related to governmental grants.

3. Conclusions resulting from this study are intended to apply only to small church-related colleges and universities and may not apply to public educational institutions or other private institutions.

4. The framework used for this study was a model based on data from American colleges and universities, while the higher education institutions used in this study are located at sites around the world. To overcome this potential American bias, at least in part, the validity of the model was established by a three-member panel of experts with extensive experience in the administration of higher education programs throughout the world.
Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 compromises an introduction, a description of the statement of the problem, and the purpose for the study, its limitations, and definition of specialized terms.

Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature. The purpose of this research is to summarize existing viewpoints and to summarize the available literature in relevant areas which review.

1. Brief history of fund-raising and institutional advancement
2. Small church-related colleges and universities
3. Successful institutional advancement strategies
4. Presidential leadership
5. Organizational structure
6. Public relations
7. Alumni relations
8. Governing boards
9. Advancement budget and staffing
10. Evaluation
11. Government relations

Chapter 3 explains the research methodology and procedures used to collect, analyze, and interpret the data for this study.
Chapter 4 reports the findings obtained from the questionnaire on “what is,” and the process of institutional advancement at selected small church-related colleges and universities. This descriptive analysis is divided in accordance with the outline of the questionnaires.

Chapter 5 includes a summary and also discusses what has been found in the study, suggest areas for additional research, and provides recommendations.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the review of literature undertaken for this research. It is divided into the following 12 sections: (1) history of fund-raising and institutional advancement, (2) small church-related colleges and universities, (3) successful institutional advancement strategies with special attention to fund-raising, (4) presidential leadership, (5) organizational structure, (6) public relations, (7) alumni relations, (8) governing board, (9) advancement budget and staffing, (10) evaluation, (11) government relations, and (12) W K Wesley's studies, since his studies resulted in a model and framework of an effective advancement program for small colleges, which was used as a model for this present study.

History of Higher Education and Institutional Development

Andrews (1953) noted that the history of institutional development began with Plato, who in 347 B.C. directed that income from his fields should go towards support of the Academy near Athens (p. 8). Fisher and Quehl (1989) suggest that "the first systematic attempt to raise funds in America was in 1641 when the Massachusetts Bay Colony sent three clergymen to England to raise funds for Harvard University" (p. 11). Harvard
University, the oldest of all American colleges, was established in 1636 with a grant of 400 pounds from the General Court and a gift of 779 pounds, as well as a library from the Reverend John Harvard (Andrews, 1953).

All the private institutions of higher education that came into existence in the United States during the Colonial period were founded by religious denominations (Andrews & Freidman, 1976; Astin & Lee, 1972, Gaebelein, 1951. Mayhew, 1962, Ramm, 1963,). These denominations contributed financially to the support of their colleges, according to Tewksbury (1969), who stated, "Practically all the colleges founded between the Revolution and the Civil War were organized, supported, and in most cases also controlled by religious interests" (p. 55). Ringenberg (1984) stated:

Colleges sprang up rapidly throughout the frontier regions between 1780 and 1860, with the greatest proliferation occurring after 1830. The traditional authority on college founding in the area identifies only 29 permanent colleges as beginning before 1830, while 133 began in the 1830-1861 period. By the eve of the Civil War, the denominations with the most colleges were the Presbyterians, 49; the Methodists, 34; the Baptists, 25; and the Congregationalists 21. The total enrollment in 1860 equaled approximately 30,000. (p. 57)

Ringenberg (1987) added, "To be a college in America before the Civil War was to be a Christian college" (p. 77). After the Civil War period, as Coloaia (1980) notes, admissions for students in colleges skyrocketed. This huge increase in student numbers demanded a rapidly expanding physical plant. In 1914, the University of Pittsburgh hired C. Ward to raise $3 million to develop its campus. Ward brought in people to handle publicity and established a system to implement his plans. In 10 days, nearly $2 million was raised (Cutlip, 1965, pp. 85-86). By 1924, the word "development" began to appear.
Development was first used in fund-raising by President Burton of University of Chicago (Seymour, 1966, p. 115).

The early 1900s showed a significant advancement in alumni giving. Bishop Lawrence raised about $2,400,000 in 1 year from Harvard alumni. He accomplished this through personal interviews, letters, and circulars sent to all alumni. During the depression years of the 1930s, alumni funds made a great impact on the institutions of higher education. In 1935, Columbia University showed a deficit of US $600,000. Through faithful contributions from its alumni, Columbia University was able to pay off its debt (Gerlinger, 1938, pp. 103-104). Through the 40s and 50s, the interest from the alumni grew continuously, and from a total of 442 institutions of higher education, over 1 million alumni contributed, on average, annual gifts of $35.60 each (Pollard, 1958, pp. 94-95).

From 1957, the term “development” as we know it today began to be used. The research in the field was centered on fund-raising, and on methods which were successful in raising funds (Myers, 1989, p. 7). The content or product of advancement programs was the center of the studies, instead of the process of institutional advancement (Willmer, 1981).

By 1980, the term “institutional advancement” started to be used as a way of incorporating all the functions of development and fund-raising (Myers, 1989, p. 7).

Small Christian Liberal Arts College and University

Church-related colleges and universities in the United States in the early 1990s enrolled approximately 1.4 million undergraduates, according to Sandin (1991). Guthrie and Noftzger (1992) mention that students from the church-related colleges constitute 10% of the total undergraduate enrollment in the United States (p. 5). These “invisible
colleges” according to Astin and Lee (1972) “are worthy of study simply because of their large number, the fact that many of them may be in real danger of extinction makes a thorough examination of their problems and prospects imperative” (p. 1). There have been several attempts to find ways of classifying the religious academic institutions. Guthrie and Noftzger (1992) identified four such attempts: Pattillo and MacKenzie (1966), Pace (1972), Cunninggim (1978), and Sandin (1991).

Based on the data from 800 denominational institutions of higher education in the United States, Pattillo and Mackenzie divided the universities into four categories: defender of the faith colleges, non-affirming colleges, free Christian colleges, and church-related colleges and universities (Guthrie & Noftzger, 1992, p. 10).

Pace (1972) in his study among 88 colleges also identified four categories for the church-related colleges and university: (1) institutions with Protestant roots which are no longer Protestant; (2) institutions that remained nominally related to Protestantism but are potentially separating; (3) institutions established by major Protestant denominations, and (4) institutions associated with evangelical, fundamentalist, and interdenominational Christian churches. According to Guthrie and Noftzger (1992) Pace found in his study that institutional distinctiveness and strength of religious affiliations were closely related (p. 11). Guthrie and Noftzger (1992) stated:

The most distinctive church-related institutions, and the ones most likely to survive and even prosper, were those that retained the strongest ties with their respective affiliated denominations. In addition, according to Pace, most of the institutions of the first two categories also would thrive due to the national reputations for the educational quality that they had built. Pace was less sanguine on the survival of many the church-related colleges and universities in the third category. Because these institutions of higher learning had neither a high profile nor a strong
supportive relationship with an affiliated church, therefore their futures seem to be tenuous. (p. 11)

Cunninggim (1978) divided the religiously affiliated colleges into three categories or groupings. Guthrie and Noftzger (1992) describe these three groupings as: (1) The consonant college is an ally with its denomination or a fraction of its denomination but speaks infrequently of its church relationships; (2) The proclaiming college is a witness to its denominational affiliation. This category of college gladly admits a connection to a church; (3) The embodying college is a reflection of its sponsoring church and strives to verify denominational faith and values in every facet of institutional operation (p. 12).

Sandin's (1991) model includes four groupings of religiously affiliated institutions pervasively religious, religiously supportive, nominally church-related, and independent with historical ties (Guthrie & Noftzger, 1992, p. 13).

Christian liberal arts colleges are facing a challenging future, according to Thompson (1995). Institutions must face the fact that a strong fund-raising program and a healthy endowment are critical factors to the survival of the institution. Thompson (1995) found in his study among 18 successful private Christian liberal arts colleges and universities in California that most of the non-denominational affiliated institutions struggle a lot with the issue of philanthropic giving. The religiously affiliated colleges feel that while receiving denominational support, they still feel the tremendous pressure to raise more money to stabilize their viability (pp. 168-169). Based upon his findings among successful, private, Christian liberal arts colleges and universities in California, Thompson (1995) offers the following recommendations in regard to the important issue of fund-raising:
1. Select a president who is qualified to take the primary role in aggressive fund-raising.

2. The board must be consumed with raising financial support for the institution.

3. Ensure that the advancement office is professional and adequately staffed (pp 171-172).

Small church-related colleges and universities in the United States are experiencing great financial challenges. Several studies have shown that the colleges and universities most likely to survive and even prosper are those that retained the ties with their respective affiliated denomination and include a strong fund-raising program.

Successful Institutional Advancement Strategies

According to Duronio and Loessin (1990), few studies have been done on the effectiveness of fund-raising in higher education. Studies in fund-raising have largely focused on fund-raising methods and practices rather than the effectiveness of fund-raising (Melton, 1996, p. 11). In the study of institutional effectiveness in fund-raising, three approaches have been studied according to Brittingham and Pezzulo (1990). They are as follows:

1. Studies of perceived effectiveness: This approach employs an operational definition of effectiveness drawn by an expert panel. Studies like this often attempt to determine the characteristics of effective fund-raising programs through survey of institutions, requesting the staff's professional judgment about what factors are most significantly related to effectiveness.
2. **Studies of effectiveness adjusted for potential**: This approach includes a measure of the institution’s potential for fund-raising and determines effectiveness accordingly.

3. **Studies of objectively defined effectiveness**: This approach describes institutional advancement practices. Objective determinants of effectiveness are based on such factors as total amount of support raised, average gift per solicitation, size of endowment, etc.

Crammer (1967) performed a study of the development of 40 colleges that were members of the Council for Advancement of Small Colleges during the year 1962-63. He developed a list of 49 variables that could possibly have an impact on the success of development efforts. Crammer used the correlation method, and he found the following variables to be significant for the success of development: corporate gifts, organized alumni programs, person-to-person solicitation, accreditation, and organized deferred giving (p. 142).

Leslie (1969) performed a study among 1,200 US colleges and universities, where he focused on the relationship between fund-raising outcomes, institutional characteristics, and organizational and operational fund-raising programs. He received 700 replies, but used a small fraction, 105, which he considered useable and representative of 4-year institutions (p. 5). Regarding the effectiveness of fund-raising, as Leslie defined it (the degree to which objectives are successfully achieved), his study concluded the following:

The cost of raising funds, advancement program expenditures as a percent of gift income, was approximately 15 to 20 cents per dollar with a wide range both ways. As an institution raised more money, its advancement program expenditures per gift dollar decrease. Private institutions which allocated the large portion of their
advancement program budgets in fund raising tended to receive slightly more gift dollars that those which allocated the larger part to public relations activities. (p. 28)

Gabrielsen's study (1975) theorized a model of an advancement program that included fund-raising practices. His study found the following suggestions to be positively identified with successful fund-raising:

1. The advancement program will be directed by a full-time executive officer assisted by a full-time administrative assistant.

2. The president and board of trustees will develop a declaration of funds needed which is supported by the development director.

3. The services of a large body of volunteers will be utilized.

4. The college will have clear goals, purpose, and objectives in order to ascertain its direction.

5. The college will formulate a compelling case statement as the basis for fund-raising endeavors.

6. The college will prepare an adequate budget to put flesh to plans.

7. Planning, coordinating, and directing fund-raising efforts will be the basic activities of the advancement office.

Pickett (1977) in his study selected four variables to measure available financial resources: number of families earning $50,000 or more in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) nearest the college, dollar value of grants made by the foundations in the home state; the value added by marketing to the SMSA nearest the college, and the college's number of alumni. Of the four variables chosen, only the number of alumni was a factor in explaining the variation of gift income in Pickett's sample of 184.
educational institutions (pp. 121-122). Pickett selected eight variables to measure each college's position: in-state enrollment, cost of attendance, graduate school attendance of alumni, age of college, value of endowment, federal research and development support, tenure of president, and headcount enrollment. Of these variables, market value of endowment, cost of attendance, age of college, in-state enrollment, and graduate school attendance of alumni were found to be most important (p. 123). Welch (1983, pp. 141, 149) listed 26 activities as factors contributing significantly toward the fund-raising success of California private colleges and universities.

The activities, ranked in order of importance, are:

1. Fund-raising executive solicited major gifts
2. Maintained a prospective donor list
3. President/Chief executive officer established fund-raising policies.
4. Solicited gifts from alumni
5. Fund-raising executive involved in institutional planning
6. Solicited gifts from non-alumni
7. Board solicited donors
8. Involved in prospect research
9. Fund-raising executive solicited business/industry
10. Involved in phonothon
11. Involved in direct mail
12. Involved in annual giving campaign
13. Involved in public relations
14. Board had an active fund-raising committee
15. Developed a case statement
16. Used gift clubs to solicit donors
17. Fund-raising executive negotiated deferred giving contracts
18. Used volunteers to solicit gifts
19. Published a donor recognition list
20. Involved in special fund-raising events
21. Involved in capital giving campaign
22. Solicited gifts from students/parents
23. Involved in deferred giving campaign
24. Solicited gifts from faculty and staff
25. Athletic club was involved in fund-raising
26. Organization as independent foundation. (pp. 117-118)
Glennon (1986) studied 170 small private institutions to determine if any correlation existed between the benchmarks of Willmer’s (1980) model and success in fund-raising. Willmer’s study assessed the institutional advancement process at selected small, independent colleges in the United States. Data were obtained in the following areas: (1) general management, (2) fund-raising, (3) institutional relations, (4) publications, (5) alumni program, and (6) government relations. Willmer also developed a theoretical framework containing five major areas with 23 benchmarks. The five areas included: Institutional Commitment; Authority and Organizational Structure; Personnel Resources; Advancement Activities and Functions; and Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement.

Glennon (1986) suggested that fund-raising cannot be successful unless it is integrated into the life of the university, and the planning must be an integral part of the overall university planning. Glennon’s study found a high correlation between institutional planning and the amount of time a president spends on fund-raising and the amount of revenue received. Glennon (1986) stated:

That the data indicated that the most significant strategy an institution in this sector (small college) can take to improve its fund raising programs is to commit a significant block of the president’s time to the enterprise. From this commitment a cluster of other obvious success predictors will flow. (p. 24)

Bartlett (1989) undertook the first description of the structure of institutional advancement activities within the system of 12 colleges of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America. The research information was obtained from two means of data collection. First, a mailed questionnaire requested specific information pertinent to each college. The second method included a structured telephone interview with key
administrators involved in the practice of institutional advancement on five Seventh-day Adventist college campuses. The study by Bartlett disclosed that:

1. The form and structure of institutional advancement are established at the 12 Adventist colleges and universities.

2. The nature of institutional advancement is established at the 12 Adventist colleges and universities.

3. The presidents are key players in the institutional advancement process.

4. The chief institutional advancement officers and each director of the various elements under the institutional advancement umbrella are committed, enthusiastic, motivated, and vulnerable professionals.

5. The fund-raising function, on at least five campuses, is overburdened and understaffed, which prevents maximum effectiveness and efficiency.

6. Alumni associations are continuing to locate and involve greater numbers of alumni with their alma maters.

7. Institutional relations is chiefly involved with its internal publics, but, with additional budget, personnel, and time, could involve greater contact with the various external publics.

8. Governmental relations is a minor function on most Adventist college and university campuses since contact with the various branches of government is usually the direct responsibility of the president, or a surrogate.

9. Publications have assumed a more vital role in building institutional image and student recruitment over recent years.
10. Various institutional advancement personnel, as well as some college presidents, are not completely sensitive to the degree to which an effective institutional advancement program could solve many of the current dilemmas confronting Adventist higher education.

Grohar (1989) hypothesized the relationship of financial resources and environmental position variables. Data for those variables were gathered from a sample of 234 church-related colleges. By comparing the school's actual income to their potential income, groups of overproductive and underproductive colleges were identified. A survey was sent to colleges in each group to determine the extent to which they implemented 16 fund-raising policies identified in the fund-raising literature. The analyses performed suggested that the overproductive schools were significantly different from the underproductive colleges in the following ways:

1. Overproductive colleges had a higher number of professional staff assigned to institutional advancement.

2. The overproductive schools had larger mailing lists of prospects.

3. The overproductive colleges had a full complement of fund-raising techniques including an annual fund, prospect research, capital giving, and deferred or planned giving.

4. More of the overproductive colleges published a "President's Report."

5. A larger number of overproductive schools had an active trustee committee for development.

Grohar (1989) agrees with Pickett (1977) that advancement programs with adequate staff and budget tend to be highly successful in fund-raising.
In 1989 Myers described the level of institutional advancement in Assembly of God colleges. To achieve this purpose, an institutional advancement program model was used. The model, developed by W.K. Willmer (1980), is an empirically specific model which details from research and literature what the small college advancement program should look like. Data for Willmer’s study were obtained regarding the institutional advancement process in the following six areas: (1) general management, (2) fund-raising, (3) institutional relations, (4) publications, (5) alumni program, and (6) government relations. Data for the Myers study was obtained through a questionnaire which was the same as the one used to gather the original data used by Willmer. Willmer’s study (1980) assessed the institutional advancement process at selected small, independent colleges in the United States. The data for Willmer’s 1980 study were obtained from responses to a questionnaire regarding the institutional advancement process in the following six areas (1) general management, (2) fund-raising, (3) institutional relations, (4) publications, (5) alumni program, and (6) government relations. From the analysis of the received data, Willmer then established “what is” in regard to the actual situation at the responding institutions. Willmer also developed a theoretical framework containing five major areas with 23 benchmarks. The five areas included: Institutional Commitment; Authority and Organizational Structure; Personnel Resources; Advancement Activities and Functions; and Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement.

In Myers’s (1989) study five major elements were included in the model, and questions were developed for those areas: (1) institutional commitment, (2) authority and organizational structure, (3) personnel resources, (4) advancement activities and functions.
and (5) evaluation. In the area of institutional commitment, Myers's sample compared favorably with Willmer's model and other colleges. Myer's research showed that in the area of personnel resources that the college presidents made 70% of the $1,000 personal solicitations compared to 20% in the study by Willmer. In the study of Assembly of God colleges, the Chief Institutional Officer had authority and reported directly to the president, while the colleges had centralized fund-raising methods. The Assembly of God colleges had a workable method in advancement activities and functions. A major finding in Myers's sample was that no formal advancement evaluation process was in place in any of the colleges. Myers concluded that, in order for the colleges to survive the last part of the 20th century, great strides must be taken to improve many areas of the sample's advancement programs (Myers, 1989).

Jones (1991), using a feasibility method, a critical incident survey, and follow-up interviews, conceptualized a suggestion for a model which included the following 14 characteristics forming the foundation for a successful advancement program:

1. The chief advancement office is involved in the management of the institution to allow greater input in decision making and relevance between institutional management and fund-raising.

2. The advancement office is directed by a single officer in charge of the advancement staff.

3. The advancement program includes (a) alumni relations, (b) church relations, (c) fund-raising, (d) enrollment services, (e) institutional relations, and (f) development services
4. The periodic evaluation of advancement policies and methods is to ensure that the best procedures in fund-raising are followed and are in harmony with the mission of the institution and the church.

5. The advancement program is provided with adequate budget and staff.

6. The advancement program reflects the well-formulated goals and objectives of the institution.

7. The advancement program clearly conveys the mission and purpose of the institution to the constituents.

8. The advancement program develops a case statement which identifies the plans, reasons, important leaders, and supporters needed to achieve the objectives of the institution.

9. The advancement program adapts its marketing schemes to the target interest groups.

10. Institutional personnel participate actively in the church ministerial programs

11. The president of the institution is actively involved in solicitations and cultivating gifts.

12. The advancement personnel have a part in choosing institutional board members based on a "board profile" developed by the advancement office.

13. The advancement program considers everyone on the campus a potential fund-raiser for the institution.

14. Volunteers are utilized to encourage others to participate in advancement endeavors (pp. 122-125).
In summary, studies of fund-raising in higher education have largely focused on fund-raising methods and fund-raising practices rather than the effectiveness of fund-raising. Some studies suggest that fund-raising cannot be successful unless it is in the center of the college or university planning. Several studies seem to agree on the importance that the president is the key-player actively involved in soliciting and cultivating donors. Another important part for the success of fund-raising is to actively involve the alumni, the members of the board, and other volunteers in development and institutional advancement activities.

**Presidential Leadership**

Covington (1997) states that university advancement requires a vision and leadership. This author also suggests that leadership entails influencing others to work together toward common goals. An organization’s success grows out of the president’s ability to integrate, organize, energize, and mobilize the organization’s constituents toward the realization of this vision (p. 99).

By virtue of his or her position, the president is the executive head of all institutional activities. The internal and external constituencies look to the president for leadership, support, and direction (Topor, 1986). Hesburgh (1980) stated:

The most important contribution a president can make to institutional advancement is to articulate his vision of the institution so persistently and persuasively that it becomes shared by all constituencies, internal and external, who adopt it as their own. Whatever else he is clear and enthusiastic about, the president must most of all elaborate his specific vision, re-think it as times change, perfect it as he learns from experience, and make his contribution to an evolving sense of institutional purpose. (p. 19)
The importance of leadership in institutional advancement, in particular fund-raising, has been well documented (Colson, 1997; Cook, 1994; Dyson & Kirkmen, 1988; Fisher & Quehl, 1989; Hurtubise, 1988; Janney, 1994; Rodriguez, 1991; Scott, 1994; Slinker, 1988; Thompson, 1995).

Fisher (1988) believes that properly understanding the role of the college or university president in institutional advancement is imperative to address the questions of effective leadership.

Dagley (1988) writes that some presidents deal with the pressures over the different roles they have by becoming full-time managers. In a crisis it is easier to manage than to lead. Dagley (1988) continues:

This response is a serious mistake in times of trouble. Manager-presidents tend to spend most of their time in maintenance activities, dealing with cash-flow management or relatively trivial faculty disputes. Meetings for example, consume too much time. Small, church-related colleges do not need, and cannot afford, this kind of leadership. (pp. 2-3)

The challenge faced by presidents of church-related institutions is to behave in such a manner as to be above reproach, according to Kingsley (1992) He states that the "moral imperative is part of the leadership vision in the church-related college" (p. 70) Kingsley feels that "in church-related colleges especially, good leaders must be good people. They must eschew the tendency toward manipulation, toward letting ends justify means, and towards that self-glory that usually masquerades as self-rightness" (p. 70).

Noll (1984) comments on the issue of the importance of leadership in the church-related colleges, and stated that "against the children of the world, Christian colleges must stand for grace; against the children of grace, the Christian college must stand for the
world" (p. 36). This implies that presidents of church-related institutions are faced with challenges of conflicting natures both internally and externally.

Twenty-eight presidents participated in a national study (Slinker, 1988) which included interviews with nine presidents and a questionnaire to 27 CEO's. Among the 15 recommendations provided to ensure a successful institutional advancement program was the recommendation that the president establish a strong and proactive leadership in advancement as a priority. Vigorous leadership is required to properly position the institution, to realize the institutional mission, and to facilitate awareness, appreciation, and support by the constituencies. The president should also be the one to formulate an advancement strategy which should reflect where the institution has been, where it is now, and where it wants to go. Slinker (1988) concluded that a president's vision coupled with a willingness and capacity for leadership are characteristics that will lead to institutional success (p. iii).

Hurtubise (1988) found in his study among eight presidents of small liberal arts colleges and universities within the San Francisco area that fund-raising presidents believed that they were responsible for creating the fund-raising climate for their institutions. They also believed that their highest priority as presidents was to seek financial support for their institution. Quality and quantity of time are measures for successful fund-raising. The successful fund-raising president not only believes in and practices personal solicitation, but also invites potential donors to the campus as the place from which to ask for a gift. Successful presidents are good educators of their public with use of clearly written goals for 1 to up to 5 years. Hurtubise (1988) concluded his findings
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and recommendations by stating that "presidents must understand that the creation of fund raising climate rests primarily with them. The presidents' leadership will inspire confidence in the institution which in turn will result in donor confidence" (p. 132).

Grohar (1989) believes that presidential leadership is a key factor to the success and effectiveness of the advancement process. The president forms the overall strategy and is at the center of the advancement effort, leading, suggesting, critiquing, challenging, and performing (pp. 57-58).

Duronio and Loessin (1990) found in their study that the president's caliber of involvement in fund-raising activities was vital to a successful program. They stated:

Distinctive presidential leadership in fund-raising was a characteristic in nine (one presidency was vacant) of the institutions with successful fund-raising programs. Additionally, the president's interest in fund-raising and direct participation in fund-raising have increased considerably in each of the institutions over the past ten years. All nine presidents participated in fund-raising activities. Evidence from interviews with the presidents themselves and with other staff members indicates that all of the presidents participated enthusiastically in fund-raising. Many of the presidents replaced former presidents who were less enthusiastic about fund-raising. All nine of the presidents were rated by their chief development officers as being either excellent or very good at fund-raising (pp. 198-199).

Colson (1997) in his study about small church-related colleges affiliated with the Southern Baptist Convention also found that fund-raising was seen as a primary responsibility of the president. Fund-raising consumed far more time than any other single responsibility of the participants in this study (p. 103). Similar findings include studies by Fisher, Tack, and Wheeler (1988) and Sammartino (1982). Presidents have, according to Dowden (1996), multiple roles to perform: visionary, financier, encourager, leader, and servant. Among these perhaps the most important role is that of setting and articulating
the institutional vision (pp. 21-22). This concurs with findings by LeShana (1988), Strauss (1996), and Colson (1997).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) carried out a study on 90 leaders, of whom 60 were CEO's in the private sector and the remaining leaders were from the public sector. Each participant in this study spelled out their importance that a good leader has a compelling vision for the future. The vision derives from the leader's past experiences, an assessment of current strengths and weaknesses, and an appraisal of likely trends. Failure to articulate a vision will lead to lack of direction for the organization, and confusion and lack of self-confidence for members of the organization. By focusing on a vision, the leader operates on the emotional resources of the organization, on its values, commitment, and aspirations (pp. 33, 92-93). Schools need leaders who have a vision of excellence, and who can work with their staff to implement this vision (Imig & Clark, 1990, p. 84).

Like clear vision, a clear mission is also essential for presidential effectiveness in fund-raising (Dowden, 1996). A statement of the mission for an institution explains why it makes the journey. The development of this statement is the responsibility of the president. In creating a mission statement, the president should ensure that faculty, staff, administration, students, alumni, donors, and others have a chance to review and revise the document. The mission statement must be owned by its constituencies. Once adopted, the mission statement should be circulated to all constituencies. Successful fund-raising does not occur without a clearly developed mission statement (pp. 21-23).

According to Dunn (1997), it is very important that the president develop a real commitment to the mission of the institution and to be able to clearly convey it to all its
constituents. Each and every employee must be reminded of his or her individual responsibility to serve the students and live the mission on a daily basis (pp. 127-128).

Neff (1993) stated: “More fund-raising prospects falter because of the institutions’s failure to present a clear mission than for any other factor” (p. 92).

The importance of presidential leadership in fund-raising is well documented in the literature. Most studies seem to agree that successful fund-raising does not occur unless the president is a key-player in fund-raising and devotes a major part of his or her time to cultivating donors and is actively involved in other fund-raising activities.

**Organizational Structure**

Evans (1993) states that “there is little value in proposing an ideal development organizational structure. But, there is merit in identifying the necessary elements that must function together for the development office to achieve its goal” (p. 275). Evans comments regarding the lines of authority that any decision about centralization or decentralization should take the following issues into account:

1. **Commitment to the unit:** The development officer who represents the school or program must know that program well. Senior development officers managing a centralized program would do well to ensure that officers serving units are up-to-date in information on the unit so that they will be able to have a strong commitment.

2. **Goals and planning:** In a decentralized structure, the quality of goal setting and planning may vary a lot between various units. A centralized program provides better opportunities to establish unit goals and plans to coordinate.
3. **Evaluation**: Whether an organization chooses a centralized or decentralized structure, it is important that the program director and the chief development officer meet regularly to discuss evaluation of the service rendered from the institutional advancement office (pp. 280-282).

Pickett (1977) in his study compared decentralized and centralized organizational staffing patterns for advancement functions. He found that in a decentralized pattern, various advancement functions, such as public relations or alumni affairs, report directly to the president of a college. In a centralized pattern, all advancement function personnel report directly to the president of a college. In a decentralized pattern, all advancement function personnel report to a chief advancement officer, who in turn reports directly to the president (p. 44). Willmer in his study (1991) found that 93% of the chief advancement officers reported directly to the president, 98% assume a position in the executive group, and 75% of the institutions have an organizational pattern in advancement which encourages the centralization of authority (p. 103).

Grohar (1989) on the subject of fund-raising organization made the following statement: “It seems then, that the centralized organizational pattern for advancement functions in colleges is the most effective way for providing leadership for advancement programs” (p. 48).

An effective organizational structure for management of institutional advancement activities requires control and clear definition of the chain of command. Responsibilities and guidelines should be clearly established and defined.
Public Relations

With the formation of the publicity office at the University of Michigan in 1897, the age of the departmentalized public relations program in higher education had begun. (Bongfiglio, 1990, p. 36).

In 1930, Benner, a professor of education at Teachers College, published a report on the type of public relations work performed on campuses. In his study among 300 colleges Benner discovered that 75% of the private institutions employed an official primarily responsible for public relations (Porter 1958, p. 422). Benner's study revealed:

(1) publicity for an institution was the goal of the public relations work in the 1920s; (2) the public relations worker fulfilled his responsibility mainly by serving as a press agent for his or her institution; and (3) recognized the need that in order for public relations activities to be effective, they had to be related to institutional goals (Porter, 1958, pp. 428-429). A random survey of 275 institutions by Fine (1941) revealed that from 1900-1937 the number of publicity officers on college and university campuses had grown from 4 to 205, that an overwhelming proportion of large public and private colleges and universities maintained some form of publicity department, and that 51% of publicity bureaus polled were staffed on a full-time basis (pp. 19-28).

In 1958, professionals from the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association gathered in West Virginia to discuss the issues facing institutional advancement. The published proceedings of this conference, known as the Greenbrier Report, gave shape to institutional advancement as it is known today. The conference was called “Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education.”
A Conference on Organizational Principles and Patterns of College and University Relations. Participants included university presidents, management experts, professional fund-raising consultants, and educational administrators (Jordan & Mort, 1958, p. 6). The official report of the outcomes of the conference was prepared by Porter (1958), who identified four objectives of a public relations program in higher education as:

1. To assist in establishing the institution's proper image in the public mind and increasing public awareness of that image
2. To help the institution to earn understanding, support, and sympathy
3. To improve communication within the institution, and between the institution and the community it serves
4. To assist in developing good students, a strong teaching staff, and high academic standards (pp. 23-24).

Universities were advised to organize their programs and coordinate their advancement functions in order to lighten the fund-raising responsibilities of each president. The report also recommended the appointment of an administrative coordinator at each institution who, in cooperation with the president, would be responsible for alumni relations, fund-raising, and public relations (Richard & Sherrat, 1988, p. 11).

Conklin (1989) points out that the purpose of public relations on any campus is to engender understanding and support for the campus. The noun "understanding" presumes that a certain level of institutional self-identity has been achieved, that a college or university is aware of its mission and has a plan to carry out this mission. Before public relations can do its job of communication and influence, the college or university must
have gone through a self-evaluation to know its limitations and reasons for existing. The word “support” is also important. Most advancement sectors of colleges and universities seem to have an organization where the public relations function reports to the development office. Therefore, it is presumed that they also will have an interest in providing resources for the institution (p. 91). Conklin (1989) stated:

The chief public relations executive of the institution, no matter who has the title, is the president. The institution’s constituencies see him or her as personifying the institution. As the chief public relations officer, the president's most important task is to articulate the vision. (p. 92)

The advancement professional in the area of public relations should, according to Glancy (1996), be able to use the institution’s strategic plan as a road map for public relations efforts (p. 121).

Glancy (1996) mentions the results from a survey made among the Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities member institutions. The first study was done in 1985 and dealt with a wide variety of advancement concerns. The survey was later updated in 1989 and 1994. In the last survey, 1994, the three most important institutional public relations goals were: (1) attracting prospective students (85%), (2) building and holding goodwill for the institution (67.1%), and (3) adding to the college’s academic reputation (54.2%).

Marketing research must be an important part of the development of the plan for PR, according to Glancy (1996). In the 1994 study among the Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities members, 35% responded that they had done a readership survey of their publications within the last 3 years. But a majority of the institutions in these surveys had not done so because of lack of financial resources, lack of time, or lack
of expertise. Unfortunately this leads to the conclusion that management decisions are made on perceptions instead of reliable data (p. 124).

Topor (1988) says that it is important that the public relation office conducts publications audits on all its productions, such as newsletter, magazine to alumni, etc., by asking the following questions: (1) What ideas are selling? (2) What message do they deliver? (3) Are the materials coordinated? (4) Do the publications look like they came from the same place? (5) Are they properly identified? (6) Does the name of the institution appear on each? (7) Does the copy suggest a common parent organization? and (8) Does each institutional component represent itself separately at expense of the parent institution? (p. 8).

Glancy (1996) mentions that publications are not an end in themselves, but a means to an end, and therefore should also be reviewed from that perspective (p. 130).

Internal and external relations are critical factors for the success of institutional advancement because a college or a university depends on public confidence and support. As with other activities and functions of institutional advancement, the president must set the tone and recommend strategies and direction.

**Alumni Relations**

The alumni office exists for two major reasons, according to Webb (1996): to “provide diverse and quality programming for alumni, and to provide opportunities for alumni to engage in a lifetime of service, including financial support, to their alma mater” (p. 303). Webb says that the work of the alumni office is crucial, because a college or university has no greater resources that the former students, its alumni. When the alumni
office is able to garner support, it represents not only financial resources but others as well (p. 303).

Krimmel (1996) says that in the late 1700s and early 1800s, schools began to realize that there was a need for the organization of alumni as a group. In 1821, Williams College created a society of alumni to gain support to improve this school (p. 73). The same approach was used at Johns Hopkins University, according to Seymour (1966), by William Welch, who raised millions of dollars from its alumni in the 1920s. These funds received made it possible for Johns Hopkins to become a leader in the area of medicine (p. 75). Cutlip (1965) tells about another successful advancement story in alumni giving at Colgate University. Their campaign goal was $1 million. The slogan for this alumni campaign was “333” devised from the reality that this institution boasted of 3,300 alumni (pp. 262-264).

Drew (1983) says that during the depression years of the 1930s, alumni funds exerted a real impact (p. 20). Gerlinger (1938) mentions that Cornell University, facing a major financial difficulty with a debt of $150,000 in 1932, went to its alumni with a request for financial assistance, and through a stream of small gifts from the alumni the financial problem was eliminated (p. 104).

By the year of 1956, 398 colleges and universities in the United States reported receiving alumni funds annually (Fellows & Koenig, 1959). Krimmel (1996) mentions that through the creation of these alumni groups and attempts to raise funds, a more formal organization of alumni developed. These came into being to organize even smaller groups of alumni and to formally solicit alumni for financial support (p. 73).
Charles Eliot expressed his view on the great importance of alumni in stating:

It is, of course, largely by the extent of the support accorded to a college by its own graduates that the world judges of the right of that college to seek cooperation of others in planning for the future. An institution that cannot rally to its financial assistance the men who have taken its degrees and whose diploma is their passport into the world is in a poor position to ask assistance from others. It is not merely what the alumni give: it is the fact they do give that is of supreme importance. (as cited in Pollard, 1958, p. 91)

Many changes have taken place during the past 150 years, according to Kremmel (1996), to develop and refine the purposes and programming behind the alumni office. In the 90s there is a great interest in dedicating institutional support to the different alumni programs (pp. 73-75).

A national survey, according to Brittingham and Pezzulo (1990), found that about one quarter of the people who have attended college have at some time given to their undergraduate institution. One quarter of the people who have not given indicated that they have never been asked! Furthermore, alumni of religious colleges are more likely to give, followed by those of independent colleges and public institutions. Women were slightly more likely to give, and this increased with income level (pp. 39-44). Recent studies in this area as reported in the Adventist Review ("Newsbreak", 2000) shows that the alumni giving at Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities has increased significantly since 1980, but is behind the national average. The alumni giving percentage among private colleges in the United States is 35%, while the average for Seventh-day Adventist colleges is 20% (p. 20).

Baade and Sundberg (1993) sampled 750 private and public colleges in the United States from 1985 through 1990. They found that "liberal-arts colleges relied more on
alumni giving than did universities and public colleges, receiving contributions consisting of 10.2% of the average annual expense in 1990" (p. B1). Baade and Sundberg stated:

Given the importance of graduates' attachment and pride in their alma maters, a comprehensive fund-raising strategy ideally would begin at the time students are recruited. It appears that colleges and universities are more likely to find that generous alumni evolve from students who are the most compatible with the institution's character and mission from the very beginning of their college careers (p. B2)

Alumni programs should provide affirmation to an institution's mission, goals, and objectives. Alumni relations should stimulate and guide the potential graduates as well as to graduates and to keep alive the desire to be an active part in the development of the institution.

**Governing Board**

Because of the role members of a board have for the conduct of the institution they serve, it follows that the way in which they do their job also must come under scrutiny (Basinger, 1991). She suggested that this interest in academic governance is fueled by the increasing importance of higher education as a social institution (p. 24).

According to Cowley (1980), the American college and university system of governance has its roots in the European and English colleges influenced by John Calvin. Calvin had the idea that the public interest should be in the hands of the public through citizen involvement with the governing of the church, the city, and the university. The first introduction of "laymen" (non-academics) to a governing body was when Calvin opened the Academie de Geneve in 1559 with a "Small Council", appointed by the civil government, made up of members of ecclesiastical individuals and laymen responsible for
all appointments to the Academy (p. 33). Following the model established by the Geneva Academy, the University of London opened in 1575 with a lay governing board of curators. The board had responsibility for administration of financial matters, appointments of the staff, and management of the university properties (Cowley, 1980, p. 34). In 1959, Trinity College was established (Kerr & Gade, 1986), and this institution was governed by a so-called bicameral form of governance. An internal board of academics was assigned ownership and operational responsibilities for the college while a board of visitors, consisting of seven laymen, provided for the outside supervision (p. 18). Three colleges, Harvard, William and Mary, and Brown, chose the so-called bicameral model of governance, with an internal board made up of the president and the faculty responsible for the operation of the college and an external board with lay representation responsible for oversight operations. After a period, this model with dual boards failed due to conflict between the boards (Kerr & Gade, 1986).

Hofstadter and Metzger (1995) note that Princeton College is known to be the first Colonial college to give all the power to trustees for the governance of its operations. The charter of Princeton College gave the trustees the power to co-opt themselves and to retain full powers of management of the university. Princeton gave rise to the characteristic pattern for American private college government (p. 143).

Rudolph (1990) mentions that after the Revolutionary War, a trend emerged in which educational institutions replaced clerical domination of their governing board with lay persons, especially business people. The changes in American society demanded trained and experienced management. Bankers, lawyers, and merchants, who had achieved
wealth due to their business, were appointed to governing boards for their ability to contribute and raise funds. Others who had gained recognition through professional or political achievements were appointed for their advisory capabilities (p. 173).

In 1986, Kerr and Gade published the results of a study on the conduct of college and university governing boards. They felt that one of the major purposes of an effective lay board of trustees included “making possible thoughtful consideration of the performance of the total institution, as well as of its constituent parts, and of the requirements of the past, present, and future” (p. 137). The role of the governing board in advancement goes well beyond that of raising funds, according to Andringa (1996). Its involvement in public and alumni relations is equally critical to the institution’s health (p. 145). The governing board and the president may be described as having an “exchange relationship” in which each relies on the other for information, credibility, and support, enabling each to perform its role effectively (Blau, 1986). In this exchange relationship, Chater (1993) notes that the president provides knowledge, expertise, and time, while the board provides a historical perspective and intellectual dialogue. In return, the president receives support from the board, and the members of the board receive recognition for their service (p. 129). Greer (1996) adds that “effective governance promotes vision and a sense of collective mission. It is explicit and open about what options to explore and how to reach decisions” (p. 15). According to Andringa (1996), the governing board has 10 key functions that relate to an advancement-conscientious board member. They are:

1. Clarify the mission for effective advancement.

2. Assume an advancement-sensitive strategic plan and goals.
3. Establish policies to guide advancement efforts.

4. Select and nurture an advancement-skilled president.

5. Ensure financial solvency and integrity.

6. Learn the board’s governance model.

7. Recruit and train advancement-oriented trustees.

8. Participate in advancement work.


10. Evaluate for maximum advancement effectiveness (p. 146).

Nason (1993) states that the governing board is responsible for ensuring that all activities of the institution are in accordance with the institution’s mission. It has to ensure that the mission is clear, and that all decisions are guided by its mission (pp. 101-102).

This idea is shared by Willmer (1993) who states that “it is the president’s and board’s responsibility to serve as catalyst is assuring the clarity of the mission” (p. 37).

Chait, Holland, and Taylor (1991) refer to a study made in the late 1980s concerning the effectiveness of 22 private college governing boards, where the focus was on the governing board as a group. Their study found that specific characteristics distinguish strong boards from weak boards. Effective boards showed an awareness and a respect for the system of shared governance. Effective boards were guided by the institution’s mission and history. Effective boards were also committed to diagnosing their strengths and limitations and openly discussing their mistakes (pp. 95-101).

Peter Drucker (1989) in an article entitled “What Business Can Learn From Nonprofits” says, “The key to making a board effective is to organize its work.
Andringa (1996) states that the board members or trustees have to realize that they are “ambassadors of good will”, that they should participate actively in advancement work. Board members can open doors and can talk to friends who may become major donors. One good reason they are recruited is for their network of friends (pp. 152-153). Andringa refers to a study made by the Coalition for Christian Colleges and Universities (1994) which found that:

1. Ninety-nine percent of responding trustees contribute to their church.
2. Sixty-eight percent rank their church as the top recipient of their personal giving.
3. Ninety-eight percent contribute to the college where they serve as trustees.
4. Twenty-six percent ranked the college as the top recipient of their personal support. (p. 153)

One survey question asked the board members to identify why they limit their involvement in fund-raising. Among the seven alternatives given lack of time and training took the top two places (p. 153). Andringa (1996) states:

Fundraising should not be a burden for a trustee, but a privilege. Our Christian colleges and universities should pay careful attention to the interest and needs of each trustee and develop trustee fundraising strategies so each one is comfortable with his or her role and assures maximum, overall effectiveness. (p. 154)

Andringa (1996) emphasizes that every board, in dealing with advancement issues, should have at least one subcommittee. It should serve as a group sounding-board for the president and chief advancement officer. They key principle in any board committee work is that the committee “speak to the board, and not for the board” (p. 155). Another important function for the board is self-evaluation of the board process. A board generally thinks it is hard to evaluate its president, but it is an even more difficult task to evaluate itself. The board should appoint an outside facilitator to assist. It is also important to get
an assessment of how the officers and committee chairs are functioning on behalf of the board (pp. 155-156).

In the survey among Christian colleges and universities (Andringa, 1996), one survey question asked institutions to make a list of six indicators used to evaluate the effectiveness of the board members. The respondents ranked trustee effectiveness in the following order:

1. Attendance at board meetings
2. Service on board committees
3. Fund-raising
4. Availability to serve the college
5. Wise counsel and expertise
6. Ability to give dollars.

It is interesting to note that the trustees’ ability to give dollars ranked last! Board members were also asked to rank their level of satisfaction with their own personal involvement. The results showed a high level of board involvement in establishing fund-raising policies but with a limited satisfaction in the solicitation of funds (pp. 154-156).

Andringa (1996) concludes by saying the survey may have shown that the members of the board among Christian colleges and universities recognize that they are not doing as well as they should in the area of advancement and development. Therefore, it is time to improve the training, selection, evaluation, and volunteer leadership (p. 157).

Thus it appears that without assistance from the members of the governing board, colleges and universities cannot be expected to reach their fund-raising goals and
objectives. The role of the governing board also goes beyond that of raising funds; their involvement in public and alumni relations is equally critical to the success of the institution’s health.

**Advancement Budget and Staffing**

Seymour (1960) stated: “You can’t raise money without spending money, within reasonable limits the return is likely to be commensurate with the investment” (p. 5).

Because the cost of raising money has so many variables, according to Fisher (1991) arriving at useful guidelines is difficult. Each type of fund-raising program will have its own cost demand and structure: mass direct mail, annual giving, corporate and foundations solicitation, special events and benefits, capital campaigns, and planned giving. A further complication arises when the organization allocates such indirect costs as rent, administration, and facilities to each institutional program (pp. 107-108).

The National Society of Fund Raising Executive Committee on Public Education, published a review of the subject of the cost of raising money in their “Task Force Report” (Greenfield, 1988). The following figures for cost estimates of different kinds of fund-raising programs are drawn from that report.

1. **Mass direct mail.** Mass direct mail programs are appropriate only for a few organizations. The high cost of a first mailing, as much as $1.50 per dollar raised from a postulated 1% response, therefore cannot be the basis for deciding on the investment.

2. **Individual annual giving appeals.** Annual mail appeals are made to members, past donors, and likely prospects, therefore the costs run far less than mass direct mail
costs. For a large mailing, the cost can be as low as 10 to 15 cents for each dollar response.

3. Corporate and foundation solicitation. The cost of preparation for each prospective solicitation will be considerable; donations, once made, are likely to be higher than most individual contributions. The cost per dollar raised therefore can be as little as 7 to 10 cents per dollar raised.

4. Special events and benefits. Events serve other purposes than fund-raising, but they are expensive. A net cost of 50 cents for every dollar raised is not excessive, therefore board members must ensure that, with the enthusiasm and inexperience of volunteers, costs do not get out of control.

5. Capital campaigns. Because capital campaigns have a limited time commitment, depend on volunteers, and bring in large donations, their cost per dollar is low. Costs per dollar raised will presumably be less with higher dollar goals. Five to 10 cents per dollar raised is reasonable, and 15 cents or even higher for each dollar is acceptable.

6. Planned giving. Much planning time and cultivation goes into each planned donation, but the gifts are likely to be large. In planned giving, a cost of 25 cents per dollar is considered a reasonable guideline (pp. 108-109).

Fisher & Quehl (1989) suggest that the development office is one of the few programs of nonprofit organizations such as a college or a university that pays for itself. Budget allocation is an investment, but how big that investment should be is a difficult judgment to make. An organization can approximate its fund-raising allocation by applying
an average cost-per-dollar-raised figure of 20 cents to the estimated total contributions needed (p. 110).

Willmer (1993) says that one measure of institutional commitment is the allocation of adequate resources and allocation of budget and personnel to advancement. Willmer's study found that 6 to 11% of a college educational and general budget goes toward advancement, the smaller percentage at colleges with an enrollment of less than 2,500, and the larger percentage for those colleges with 500 or fewer students. The advancement office should also have adequate professional and clerical support. Staff size should relate to the program's objectivity. An understaffed program is detrimental (p. 39)

The budget allocation for institutional advancement activities is a crucial consideration in accomplishing the objectives. No ideal percentage has been established for needed funding, but studies suggest that a minimum of 4 to 8% of the total budget is being spent by small church-related colleges and universities.

Evaluation

According to Fisher & Quehl (1989), the governing board should work closely with the schools' executive officers, to make sure that there is periodic evaluation of development programs. In no other way can it have confidence in the financial health of the organization. Experience shows that competent executive directors and development staffs welcome rather than fear program evaluations; they are confident an objective assessment will confirm their present practices and direct the way to new opportunities (pp. 112-113).
All advancement programs should, according to Willmer (1981, p. 87), have a process of periodic evaluation. Glancy (1996) agrees with Fisher & Quehl (1989) and Willmer (1981) on the importance of a process of evaluation, upon each project’s completion an evaluation has to be done to know how closely the institution came to meeting its objectives. Willmer (1993) stresses the importance of assessment involving the internal programs but also the attitudes of the constituents of the institution. Willmer believes that potential areas of evaluation should include:

1. Who is giving to your institution and why?
2. How effective is the communication of the primary publications?
3. Who is attending the institution and why?
4. What is the cost to raise a dollar? (p. 40)

A study by the Council of Advancement and Support of Education (1990) offers the following recommendations and conclusions:

1. *Measure results in terms of return on investment.* Viewing development expenditures as a return on investment can be misleading, but such a view helps institutional officials to be reminded that development expenditures are not simple administrative expenses, but investment in revenues.

2. *Be sure to differentiate between the costs of development, alumni relations, and other constituent relations.* The study points out that, too often, boards of trustees and others add up the cost of all “advancement activities” as one budget. Nothing could be more misleading. The study revealed that with established programs, about 60% of total advancement spending went to fund-raising and the balance to alumni and constituent relations.
3. Keep track of expenditures and dollars raised per student and per alumnus. It is very important to be able to see figures broken down by individuals, which strengthens the accountability.

4. Measure funds raised per staff member to help individual goal settings. The study found that, on average, each full-time professional staff member raised more than $900,000/year.

5. Monitor line-item development expenditures. The study showed that, on average, about two thirds of total expenditures for fund-raising went for personnel, with the remaining balance going to support services, supplies, travel, and communications, etc (p. 28).

All institutional advancement activities need to be assessed periodically. It is important to know how effective the used methods are, and the findings from the assessments will serve as a guide for future improvements.

Governmental Relations

The president is the prominent voice of the institution in the role of working with local, state, and nationally elected officials, according to Harris (1997, p. 40).

In their book Presidential Leadership, Fisher and Koch (1996) state that “to become influential, a president must be visible” (p. 169). Fisher and Koch emphasize the importance of external relations to the success of the president and the achievement of the college’s mission (pp. 169-170). Dunn (1997) agrees and adds, “By immersing myself in the community and getting to know the persons who are in positions of power, I have made a difference for the college. To raise funds or build business partnerships, you must
know the players" (p. 129). The president should understand that the mission of the
college needs to be voiced also to the external community; and legislators and
governmental contacts are important to both public and private colleges (Dunn, 1997, p.
132).

The president of a college or university must understand that the mission of their
institution must be voiced also to the external community, to legislators and governmental
contacts. Before being able to raise funds in the community, the institution must know its
partners.

The Research of W. K. Willmer

W. K. Willmer's studies provide the foundation for this study; in addition, this
chapter presents his major findings. For 30 years Wesley K. Willmer has been involved in
higher education in teaching and administrative roles at Wheaton College, Robert
Wesleyan College, and Seattle Pacific University. During the writing of this study he is the
vice president of university advancement at Biola University in La Mirada, California,
where he is responsible for enrollment management, alumni relations, university relations,
marketing, development, and intercollegiate athletics (Willmer, 1996).

Willmer's first study, published in 1980, was his dissertation for the Graduate
School of the State University of Buffalo. This study assessed the institutional
advancement process at selected small independent colleges in the United States. The
population of this sample was 191 member colleges of the Council for the Advancement
of Small Colleges, using advancement data from the fiscal year 1977-78. The enrollment
of the institutions varied greatly, starting with only 79 students and increasing to
approximately 2,000 students, with a mean student population of about 950 students (Willmer, 1980). The data for Willmer’s 1980 study were obtained from responses to a questionnaire received from 141 colleges, 73% of the study population. Data were obtained regarding the institutional advancement process in the following six areas: (1) general management, (2) fund-raising, (3) institutional relations, (4) publications, (5) alumni program, and (6) government relations. From the analysis of the received data, Willmer then established “what is” in regard to the actual situation for the advancement activities at the responding colleges. After a literature review, Willmer developed a theoretical framework containing five major areas with 23 benchmarks. The five areas included: Institutional Commitment; Authority and Organizational Structure, Personnel Resources; Advancement Activities and Functions; and Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement. Each of those is described below:

**Institutional Commitment**

Institutional Commitment was divided into three areas: articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans; budget allocations; and staffing commitment.

**Articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans**

1. Institutions should have a long-range plan that includes projected program changes and a long-range budget.

2. An institution’s objectives should be written and be clearly known to the advancement office.

3. The advancement officer should have a written annual goals/objectives.
Budget allocation

1. Four to 8% of the total expenditures and general budget should be for advancement.

2. A dollar should be raised for every 25 to 40 cents spent for the advancement process - not exceeding 100 cents.

Staffing commitment

1. A range of two to five professional advancement personnel should be employed.

2. Between two and five supporting staff should be employed.

Authority and Organizational Structure

Authority and Organizational Structure was divided into advancement management authority and advancement function centralization and organization.

Advancement management authority

1. The chief advancement officer should report to the president of the institution.

2. The chief advancement officer should have a position in the top executive officer’s group.

Advancement function centralization and organization

1. The institutional advancement function should be centralized managed.

2. The organizational model should foster organization.
Personnel Resources

Personnel resources were divided into professional staff and volunteers.

Professional staff

1. The advancement manager should be experienced in advancement, knowledgeable of the institution, educated with preferably a doctorate degree, and assigned a title carrying authority.

2. The president should be an active fund-raiser and promoter of advancement activities making more than eight calls per month.

Volunteers

1. Trustees and other volunteers should be involved in advancement activities.

2. The college should have an active, working trustee committee and a public relations activity group compromised of people outside the institution.

Advancement Activities and Functions

Advancement activities and functions were divided into fund-raising activities and advancement programs.

Fund-raising activities

1. Fund-raising should include efforts to raise unrestricted support, capital, giving needs, and deferred gifts.

2. Gift solicitation should be made by the trustees, president, staff, and volunteers. Gift acknowledgment should be within 1 to 3 days, and the mailing list should be as long as
as possible.

Advancement programs

1. At least two to four voluntary government relations contacts should be conducted each year.

2. Small colleges should have regional alumni chapters, fund the alumni organization, and have a special alumni program for recent graduates.

3. Between 1.4 and 2.0 professional full-time staff equivalents should be allocated to institutional relations.

4. The publications should include a centralized publication policy and the mailing of a principal publication at least quarterly.

Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement

Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement was divided into institutional goals and advancement practice, and evaluation tools.

Institutional goals and advancement practice

Advancement programs should contribute to the major public relations goals of attracting prospective students, raising funds, and building and holding goodwill for the institution.

Evaluation tools

The advancement process should include a readership poll of publication recipients and market analysis of donor constituency in addition to the communication program.
Willmer concluded his study (1980) by assessing the above benchmarks with the data received from the responding colleges. Institutional commitment as reflected by a college having a long-range plan, written institutional objectives, and written annual advancement goals and objectives were the strengths among the majority of the institutions in 91% of the colleges. However, a weakness was that 33% of the institutions did not have a long-range plan (p. 203). The study found that the mean percentage of the institutions' general expenses and expenditures reserved for advancement activities was 65%. Willmer noted that “as enrollment size gets smaller a larger percentage of the institution’s budget must be spent for advancement” (p. 203). The results, in regard to the cost of fund-raising per dollar raised, fell within Willmer's benchmark guideline of 4-8% (p. 204).

In the area of authority and organizational structure, Willmer's study found that in the majority of institutions seems to work well. Indicators of a good advancement process include the fact that the chief advancement officer report to the president and is part of the executive officer’s group. The advancement function should be centrally managed and the organizational model should be designed accordingly. Ninety-three percent of the chief advancement officers (CIAO) reported directly to the president, 98% had a position in the top executive officers’ group, and 75% of the CIAO had a centralized advancement function. On the issue of publications policy, 69% had a centralized policy, and 86% cleared news releases through one office (pp. 205-206). According to Willmer, the personnel resources had a more dramatic effect than any other of the five assessed areas.
For the CIAO, 92% had an appropriate title, 82% had a good working knowledge of the institution, and 72% had 4 or more years of advancement experience. Nevertheless, the presidents of the institutions in this study were not active fund-raisers; 85% of them made only seven or fewer calls per month. In addition, 78% reported to have no public relations committee with members outside the institutions. When it came to the involvement of the trustees, 48% made no solicitation calls whatsoever. Willmer noted that in smaller colleges there seems to be a tendency to recruit advancement staff who are not highly educated. Willmer's study revealed that only 23% of the directors had a doctorate, 33% had only a bachelor's or associate degree, and 18% of the chief advancement officers had only 3 or fewer years of experience (pp. 206-207).

The responding colleges showed an improvement in advancement activities and functions. All institutions made real efforts to secure annual gifts, 70% sought deferred gifts, but only 42% had conducted a major capital campaign in the last 3 years. A noted weakness was that only 32% of the professional staff were making eight or more face-to-face solicitation calls each month.

Another weakness noted in the alumni activity was that 47% of the colleges had no active alumni chapters; in addition, 75% of the schools had no alumni activities for graduates (pp. 207-209).

Finally, the data from this study revealed that evaluation was the weakest area of the five assessed. Only 19% of the institutions had conducted a market analysis to determine who gives and why. Only 20% had measured the effectiveness of their communication programs by such methods as a readership poll (pp. 209-210).
In 1985, Willmer did a follow-up study in which the primary purpose was to provide the Chief Institutional Advancement Officer (CIAO) at small colleges with data about the institutional advancement process at colleges with limited resources. Respondents provided data from the 1983-1984 fiscal year.

Willmer used the same questionnaire as in the study of 1980 with some modifications. The questionnaire was mailed to 272 member institutions of the Council of Independent Colleges, and 190 or 70% of them responded. The majority of them, 85% or 162 institutions, had an enrollment between 500 and 2,000 (Willmer, 1987). As in his first study, Willmer used the same assessment tool: the five benchmarks of an institutional program. Willmer, in this new study, noted some improvements in comparison with his first study. A major change was found in the size of the professional staff. In 1980, the mean size of the clerical staff was 5.0 professionals; in the 1985 study it had increased by 62% to 8.2.

In the area of personnel resources, some changes were also noted when compared to the 1980 study. For example the CIAO more often had a higher educational degree, with 34.6% of the 1985 CIAO having a Ph.D., compared to only 23% in the 1980 study (Willmer, 1987). The area which showed few changes between those two studies was the area of authority and organizational structure. Willmer's 1985 study showed that the overall majority of the CIAO's had an appropriate title, reported to the president, and was a member of the executive cabinet. The 1985 study also showed that the advancement functions were coordinated through one department (Willmer, 1987).

In conclusion, Willmer, in his 1985 study, made some adaptations to the
framework he developed in 1980. In his first study, he suggested an advancement staff size of two to five professionals with two to five support employees; the 1985 study increased the advancement staff to five to nine professionals and three to seven support staff. Willmer also suggested in his framework that the presidents should double the amount of $1,000 plus calls to prospective donors, from 10% of his working time to 20% (Willmer, 1987).

In 1989, Willmer served as a project director and editor for a new study. This time an institutional survey was mailed to 77 members of the Christian College Coalition, with a response rate of 74 or 96% (Willmer, 1990). The number of advancement professionals increased from a mean of 5.0 in 1980, to 8.2 in 1985, to 11.2 in 1989. In the area of personnel resources, Willmer devoted a major part of the 1989 study to discussing the role of the president in the advancement function. In the section dealing with this issue, several practical guidelines for developing and maintaining effective presidential fund-raising leadership were mentioned:

1. The president should clearly articulate the college's mission and provide the vision for the future.

2. The president should approve, monitor, and evaluate all fund-raising plans, objectives, and timetables.

3. The president should spend a significant amount of time with major donors and prospects.

4. The president should work to ensure adequate internal support for the fund-raising plan and the development personnel.
5. The president should develop, train, and motivate trustees as fund-raisers.

6. The president should select a high-quality senior development officer.

7. The president should allocate sufficient opportunities in fund-raising.

8. The president should consider, discuss, and encourage integration of Christian faith and fund-raising practices.

9. The president should demonstrate integrity in fund-raising tasks.

10. The president should motivate and provide training of the development staff (Willmer, 1990).

Willmer (1990) concluded this report with a discussion on public relations. Results from the survey indicated that among the responding colleges, 15.1% of the total advancement expenditures were given to public relations. It was also found that the size of the professional staff had remained unchanged since the 1985 and 1989 studies.

In 1992, Willmer made a new survey by gathering data from 308 member institutions of the Council of Independent Colleges. A majority of those institutions, 80% or 247 of 308 completed the questionnaire. The instrument used for the 1992 study was the same as the one used in the 1980 and 1985 studies. As in the 1989 study, Willmer served as project director and editor of the published results (Willmer, 1993).

In the first chapter of Willmer's book, identifications are given of the responding institutions. In chapter 2 of the book, the presentation focused on executive management as it related to advancement. He suggested that any advancement executive must have five basics in order to be successful: an appropriate budget, sufficient authority, adequate staff, an involved president, and supportive trustees (Willmer, 1993).
The 1992 study indicated that smaller schools tend to include admissions and
curch relations under the advancement department much more frequently than do the
larger institutions. In the area of advancement, it was found that 97% of the CIAO’s
reported directly to the president, a slight increase from Willmer’s first study in 1980 with
93%. Advancement staffing showed a significant increase compared with Willmer’s
previous studies. In the 1985 study, administrative staff sizes ranged from 3.9 to 6.7. In
the 1992 study, the range of that mean increased from 9.65 to 15.1. In addition, it was
noted that 43% of the institutions reported that they planned to increase staff sizes over
the next 2 years. Another noted funding was that in this last study by Willmer, about 60%
of the CIAO’s had been in their institutional advancement position for less than 3 years.
The findings also showed that for almost one fourth or 22% of the respondents, the
CIAO’s were more than 55 years old (Willmer, 1993).

One chapter in the book dealt with fund-raising success strategies and was
authored by Dowden. The top three sources for gift income in this 1992 study were from
alumni, other close friends, and foundations. These respondents also reported that
personal contact is the most effective fund-raising method. Of the $1,000 and above
donors, it was noted that 78% of them were solicited either by the advancement personnel
or by the president. The findings in the 1992 study also showed that unrestricted funds
indeed are an important part of the total program; more than 50% of the fund-raising
efforts are devoted to unrestricted funds. The methods for raising the unrestricted funds
were through personal contact, direct mail, and telemarketing (Willmer, 1993).
The third chapter of the book edited by Willmer (1993) and authored by Felicetti dealt with the advancement roles of the small college president. A significant finding from the 1992 study was that only 12 of the presidents had any experience in the advancement area prior to being appointed president!

Felicetti also noted that according to Willmer’s study (1992) an average of 43% of the president’s time was allocated on institutional advancement activities. Of that time 40% was spent on fund-raising. The author also echoed the same idea that Willmer and others have stressed: the importance of the president’s involvement and commitment to the area of institutional advancement. If not present, there will probably be a negative effect on the development of the institution (Willmer, 1993).

The next chapter in Willmer’s book (1993) authored by Neff was on the issue of trustee involvement. The author commented on two major findings in the 1992 study: (1) 85% of the respondents stated that their trustees were not adequately trained in fund-raising, and (2) the majority of the respondents were dissatisfied with the lack of efforts by the trustees in fund-raising (Willmer, 1993).

On the issue of public relations, Carol Halstead authored another chapter. She noted that in the 1992 study the top four goals have remained intact since the 1980 study. Those goals are in order of importance: (1) attracting new students, (2) building and holding goodwill for the institution, (3) fund-raising, and (4) improving the college’s academic reputation (Willmer, 1993).

The last chapter was authored by Rodriguez on alumni involvement. He noted one change from the other studies by Willmer: Institutional expenditures in alumni affairs had
increased by 77.8% from the 1985 study, but the size of the staff had decreased.

Rodrigues noted that there is a great need for alumni volunteers to work actively with other alumni in achieving the overall goals for giving (Willmer, 1993).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Overview of the Study

The main objective of this research was to determine the level of development of the institutional advancement programs in selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities affiliated with Andrews University, and to compare the effectiveness of those programs when possible. The first task was to find a model of what an institutional program should look like and apply this model in the chosen programs. After substantial research in the area of institutional advancement, it has been found that one model exists which can be used as an assessment tool. After evaluation of this model, I found that the model could be used as a framework for this present study. The 23-item survey of Willmer (1980) was made up of five sections addressing the area of institutional advancement. The five major areas included: Institutional Commitment, Authority and Organizational Structure, Personnel Resources; Advancement Activities and Functions, and Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement.

Institutional Commitment

Institutional Commitment was divided into three areas: articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans; budget allocations; and staffing commitment.
Articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans

1. Institutions should have a long-range plan that includes projected program changes and a long-range budget.

2. An institution’s objectives should be written and clearly known to the advancement officer.

3. The advancement officer should have written annual goals/objectives.

Budget allocation

1. Four to 8% of the total expenditures and general budget should be for advancement.

2. One dollar should be raised for every 25-40 cents spent for the advancement process.

Staffing commitment

1. A range of two to five professional advancement personnel should be employed.

2. Between two to five supporting staff should be employed.

Authority and Organizational Structure

Authority and organizational structure was divided into two major areas: advancement management authority, and advancement function centralization and organization.
Advancement management authority

1. The chief advancement officer should report to the president of the institution.

2. The chief advancement officer should have a position in the top executive officer's group.

Advancement function centralization and organization

1. The institutional advancement function should be centrally managed.

2. The organizational model should foster centralization.

Personnel Resources

Personnel resources were divided into professional staff and volunteers.

Professional staff

1. The advancement manager should be experienced in advancement, knowledgeable of the institution, educated with preferably a doctorate degree, and assigned a title carrying authority.

2. The president should be an effective fund-raiser and promoter of advancement activities making more than eight calls per month.

Volunteers

1. Trustees and other volunteers should be involved in advancement activities.

2. The college should have an active, working trustee committee and a public relations advisory group comprised of people outside the institution.
Advancement Activities and Functions

Advancement activities and functions were divided into fund-raising activities and advancement programs.

Fund-raising activities

1. Fund-raising programs should include efforts to raise annual unrestricted support, capital, giving needs, and deferred gifts.

2. Gift solicitation should be made by the trustees, president, staff and volunteers. Gift acknowledgment should be within 1 to 3 days; and the mailing list should be as large as possible.

Advancement programs

1. At least two to four voluntary government relations should be conducted each year.

2. Small colleges should have regional chapters, fund the alumni organization, and have a special alumni program for recent graduates.

3. Between 1.4 and 2.0 professional full-time staff equivalents should be allocated to institutional relations.

4. The publications program should include a centralized publication policy and the mailing of a principal publication at least quarterly.

Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement

Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement was divided into institutional goals and advancement practice, and evaluation tools.
Institutional goals and advancement practice

Advancement programs should contribute to the major public relations goals of attracting prospective students, raising funds, and building and holding goodwill for the institution.

Evaluation tools

The advancement process should include a readership poll of publication recipients and market analysis of the donor constituency in addition to the communication program (Willmer, 1980).

Instrumentation

Based on those areas described above, the following research questions have been developed to answer the question “what is”:

1. What is the institutional commitment to fund-raising at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

2. What is the advancement authority and organizational structure of that authority at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

3. What advancement personnel resources exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

4. What advancement activities and functions are currently utilized at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s
model/benchmark?

5. Do advancement evaluation processes currently exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer's model/benchmark?

The instrument was formulated by drawing on the reliability of questions used in W. K. Willmer's 1980 dissertation, and from a new questionnaire updated by Willmer (1996), as well as from my own work experience. Willmer studied the advancement process among 273 member institutions of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC). No Seventh-day Adventist colleges or universities are members of the Council of Independent Colleges, but they share the common characteristics of smallness and the need to survive with limited resources. The questionnaire solicits information on the present state of the advancement policy and procedure. In addition to seeking answers to "what is," the questionnaire also assists in revealing areas for growth and development. The data are collected through the use of a questionnaire. The Survey A (see Appendix A) was made up first by the institutional identification of the school such as number of full-time students, history of the institution, etc., followed by six major sections addressing the institutional advancement activities of each of the selected schools.

First Section: Advancement Management

In this section of 11 questions, respondents are asked to provide information on the functions included in their institution's advancement office, long-range planning, goals, and objectives.
Second Section: Fund-raising

This section also consists of 11 questions where the respondents are asked to provide information such as on the percentage of the monetary distributions of funds received, existence of capital campaign, and the respondents’ view on the reasons why major donors and other friends provide financial support.

Third Section: Public Relations

This section consists only of four questions where the respondents are asked to provide information on market analysis, existence of a public relations advisory group, and the image the institution tries to convey.

Fourth Section: Publications

This section also consists of four questions, where the respondents are asked to provide information on the format and frequency of their general publication, and also whether readership polls have been conducted or not.

Fifth Section: Alumni Programs

This section consists of eight questions where the respondents are asked to provide information on the scope of their alumni program.

Sixth Section: Government Relations

This last section consists of only two questions where the respondents are to provide information on activities intended to improve their institution’s relationship with the government and the number of visits they have with their government.
At the development stage of Survey A, I received information from two university
administrators in the United States that the individual responsible for a major part of
institutional advancement activities, in particular fund-raising, is in most cases, the chief
executive officer, the president. Suggestions were therefore made to have a special set of
questions to determine the background, experience, and training of each college or
university president, as well as some questions on his or her view of their effectiveness as
fund-raiser, and whom they seek advice from in the area of fund-raising. This is mentioned
because this approach differs from Willmer's study where he requested information on
training and background from the advancement officer, not from the president.

The purpose for Survey B is to expand the knowledge of the existing personnel
resources, which are part of this study. Surveys A and B were sent and addressed to the
president of nine small selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities to gather
more information.

Survey B (see Appendix A) was not divided into any sections, only addressed as
"general information." The respondents were asked to address questions such as length of
their tenure, experience in fund-raising, training and education, and long-range planning.
This survey also included eight questions in which the respondents are asked to rank and
rate items on a Likert Scale. Presidents were asked to rate items on a list of five factors in
terms of what provided them with most guidance as a fund-raiser. They were to rate these
items on a scale from 1 to 7 where a ranking of "1" indicated low importance and "7"
indicated very important.

The respondents were asked to rank such characteristics as "Enthusiastic
President," which they believe enhance the giving climate among their constituencies for their institution, also on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 indicated low importance, and 7 being very important. In other questions, the respondents were asked to either rate or rank areas such as the roles the president has in the area of institutional advancement, and how they view their role as president. Other questions also asked them to rate their own effectiveness as fundraiser, and to identify who primarily is responsible for the goals and visions of the institution. The last question to rate was, How would you rate the following statement? Please, circle the number which best represents your rating? "The President more than anyone else at my institution, creates the climate in which fund raising takes place." The rating was based on a scale of 1 to 6, where "1" indicated strongly disagree to "6" strongly agree. Finally, a question asked the respondents to indicate the percentage of time they spent on fund-raising activities for their institution during an average week.

In this study among some selected small church-related colleges and universities, a questionnaire (Survey C) was also sent to the respective chairmen of the boards for each school in an attempt to expand the knowledge of the board's involvement in the area of institutional advancement. This approach was also a suggestion from a member of a validity panel (to be described later in this chapter) for this study inasmuch as no such study had been made before. The main purpose of Survey C was to obtain information about the role institutional advancement had in 1998 at the school with comments from the chairman of the governing board. Research suggests that the board members or trustees should realize that they have to actively participate in advancement work. The
board members open doors and do important networking among friends who may become donors (Andringa, 1996, pp. 152-153).

The survey to the chairmen of the boards included eight general questions and one optional question. The first three open-ended questions requested information on (1) his or her opinion on the function of the office of Institutional Advancement; (2) how the office of the president is supposed to relate to the area of institutional advancement; and (3) how the governing board includes the office of the president in those activities. Survey C (see Appendix A) also included three questions regarding the major roles for the governing board with regard to fund-raising; those characteristics which could enhance the giving climate; and the role of the president. Also included were questions regarding who is responsible for defining the vision, and the role the governing board has in matters of institutional advancement. The last question was optional and requested an assessment of the effectiveness of the governing board for the year 1998 in regard to fund-raising activities.

Validity

Survey A-C was reviewed and critiqued by a three-member expert panel. (See Appendix C.) The professional panel consisted of one president of a small church-related university and two administrators with extensive experience in the administration of higher education at small church-related colleges and universities.

The instrument was tested for face, content, and construct validity. The members of the panel were guided by a three-page document, instructions to validity panel (see
Appendix C) to rate the content of each item, and to decide whether an item is appropriate by writing one of the following numbers to the left of each item:

1 = reject the appropriateness of the question/item
2 = accept the question/item with some reservation
3 = accept the item as is.

The members of the validity group were also requested to assess each item for clarity. To make this assessment, each participant read each item and decided whether there were terms or phrases that could be changed to improve the reader's understanding. If some changes were required, he or she indicated this by writing above the question/item. The members of the validity panel were also asked to evaluate the length of the questionnaire, whether the format was attractive, and if there were enough items. Finally, the validity panel members were asked whether all items clearly related to the indicated purpose of the questionnaire. If not, they were asked to make suggestions for change. Following this, appropriate changes were made to the instrument.

Reliability

After the experts' recommendations were incorporated into the surveys, the instruments was pre-tested on two subjects. These individuals had extensive experience as professors and senior officers at a church-related college and university. The number of individuals chosen for the pre-test is sufficient according to Borg and Gall (1983).

Data Collection

This study uses a non-experimental, descriptive design. It utilized components
developed by W. K. Willmer (1980), with small changes made in consultation with a senior officer at a small church-related university. The data were collected with the use of three surveys (see Appendix A).

Surveys A and B were mailed to the presidents of nine colleges and universities affiliated with Andrews University with a letter from the researcher (see Appendix A). Also included were a cover letter from Dr. Niels-Erik Andreasen, President, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, an introduction of the researcher, a statement of the purpose of the study, and a request for cooperation from the schools selected for this study. The cover letter included information that the questionnaires should be returned by fax or by mail before the end of April 1999, and that the cost for postage or fax would be reimbursed by the researcher. A second letter was sent by e-mail 4 weeks after the original mailing with a request for participation by those who had not yet responded (see Appendix A).

The presidents from eight of the nine colleges and universities who participated in this study visited Andrews University from April 28 - May 6, 1999. This gave me an additional opportunity to talk to those who had not yet responded. No meetings were scheduled until the factual questionnaires had been received. One president expressed regret that the institution he represented could not participate in the study, since he believed they were too new to the area of institutional advancement.

In an attempt to receive the highest possible responses, in mid-May 1999, I e-mailed the remaining institution that had not yet responded, and requested its participation. Also, a new reminder by e-mail was sent in mid-June 1999 to the institution...
that had not responded. Shortly after this final reminder I received one more response, which meant a 78% return rate.

**Data Analysis**

Upon receipt of the returned questionnaires, Surveys A-C, the data were not considered large enough to warrant the use of a statistical program for interpretation and comparison. For that reason, the data were tabulated manually. Comparative and interpretative comments were made on each item of the surveys, usually following the presented findings, using descriptive statistics of percentage, and mean. Each institution was coded alphabetically (A-H) to ensure that individual and institutional identity were kept confidential as promised in the cover letter.

Each section of Survey A was measured against the benchmarks of W. K. Willmer (1980), including his follow-up studies of 1985 and 1993, to determine the effectiveness of the institutional advancement programs at each institution in this study. Assessment was also done with more recent research in similar areas of study.

The responses to Survey B requesting information on the training and background of the chief executive officer were compared to a similar study by Hurtubise (1988). Hurtubise analyzed presidential attitudes toward and participation in fund-raising at selected small, independent colleges and universities in the United States. The data of Hurtubise were obtained by personal interviews of eight presidents within the San Francisco Bay area. The responses to Survey B were also compared with what Willmer found in his assessment, in the section with personal resources, of his 23 benchmarks and from other relevant studies.
Analysis of Survey C to the chairmen of the boards followed the same pattern as the analysis of Survey B. Comparisons were made with the findings of Willmer's study with the 23 benchmarks in the area of personnel resources and with more recent studies relating to the function of the governing board such as by Greer (1996). Since four of the questions were open-ended, I searched for themes of the same ideas. In addition, some of the responses were compared with the presidents' responses since the same questions were asked them.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

This chapter presents a descriptive analysis of the data received from responding colleges and universities to Surveys A-C. These data show "what is" happening in the area of institutional advancement at seven Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities situated outside the United States and provide the basis for comparing and assessing these results to Willmer's (1980) model of "what ought to be" occurring among some small, private colleges and universities, in the area of institutional advancement. This framework developed by Willmer suggests a set of standards designed to access the process of institutional advancement at the small college. This framework is, according to Willmer (1981), a starting point for the school in the development of their institutional advancement efforts and can also be used for the testing and evaluation of existing programs. The framework should also be available for management decision input (pp 69-70). The framework includes five main sections: institutional commitment, authority and organizational structure, personnel resources, advancement activities and functions, and evaluation. The descriptive analysis of data will follow the five main sections and is compared with the findings from the study of Willmer. In addition to the five sections, the presentation of findings will include a section on institutional identification, with
information on each institution’s enrollment, age of institution, and years of operations of
the advancement office. Enrollments are reported as full-time students for fall quarter, 1998.

Of the nine colleges and universities selected and contacted for the study, one declined to participate, citing the fact that it was such a young institution and that its situation was so unique, that it was impossible for it to participate. One other institution declined to participate but gave no reason. The seven remaining institutions of higher learning in this study returned their responses for a return rate of 78%. It should be noted that since some of the colleges and universities chose not to answer all questions, the data analysis will be made only among the institutions that chose to respond to that question. For example if six of seven institutions respond to an item, the six becomes 100%. If four of the six respond one way, this will represent 67%, and the other two responses represent 33% of the responses to that item.

The institutions that participated in this study are limited to four Seventh-day Adventist undergraduate liberal arts colleges and three universities. The colleges are: Caribbean Union College, Trinidad; Helderberg College, South Africa, Newbold College, England, and Spicer Memorial College, India. The three universities participating in the study are: Antillean Adventist University, Puerto Rico; Babcock University, Nigeria; and Montemorelos University, Mexico. The identities of these colleges and universities are not specifically revealed in this report.
Institutional Identification

This section provides information of the institution's enrollment, and the numbers of years the institution has existed.

Enrollments are reported as full-time students for fall quarter, 1998. Five of the six responding schools (83%) had an enrollment of 1,000 or less. One school (17%) reported an enrollment of 1,501 students or more.

Of the responding schools, three (50%) are between 25 and 50 years old, and the remaining three institutions are older than 51 years.

Institutional Commitment

Research Question 1: What is the institutional commitment to fund-raising at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's model/benchmark?

Indicators of institutional commitment are found in the following areas: articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans; budget allocation to advancement efforts; and commitment to sufficient staffing.

Six schools indicated that they had a long-range plan for institutional advancement and that this plan also includes projected program changes and a long-range budget. In addition, the majority of the responding schools, five of six, 83%, have written goals and objectives for the advancement office.

The last two findings are in full compliance with the recommendations in Willmer's study and his framework (1980). Willmer (1981), in commenting on his findings in the 1980 study, said that an institution without a long-range plan for the institutional
advancement activities will be ineffective and lack constant direction (p. 73). It should be obvious that goals are important, because they indicate where the institution is heading and what the school wants to achieve. The goals should be consistent with the strategic plan for the institution as a whole and as accepted by the board of directors.

A second indicator for institutional commitment is the budget allocation to advancement efforts. As one of the most well-known authors in fund-raising has said, "You can't raise money without spending money within reasonable limits; the return is likely to be commensurate with the investment" (Seymour, 1960, p. 9).

Three of the four colleges and universities that provided information on their total institutional expenditure use an average of 47% of their budget for institutional expenditures for their fund-raising efforts. The least amount of funds goes to the institutional advancement efforts through alumni relations, where the reporting institutions spend from 10% to 33% of the total budget.

Another way to analyze a school's advancement expenditures is to determine the percentage of the institution's total budget allocated to advancement expenditures. Two of the four responding schools use 1% of their total budget to advancement expenditures, while the other two schools spend 5%.

Willmer's framework suggested that 4-8% of the total budget should be for advancement functions. This suggestion was based on results from Willmer's own study (1980) and also from other studies showing the same trend: Leslie (1977) and Pickett (1977). Willmer's figures, built on the 1980 study, were revised in 1985 to a suggestion that, on average, 6 to 11% of a college's educational and general budget should go toward
advancement, the smaller figure at colleges with enrollments of 2,000 to 2,500 and the larger figure for those with 500 or fewer students (Willmer, 1993, p. 39).

The third measure of an institution's commitment to the institutional advancement process is the amount of staff hired to carry out the different advancement functions. Staff needed for those functions include professionals and support/clerical staff. It can be said that the professional advancement personnel are only as good as their support staff. Advancement personnel should be able to spend a considerable amount of their time out of the office meeting with prospective donors and constituencies. This can only be implemented if there are support/clerical staff available at the home office, assisting with organizational matters, recording and providing competent information to whomever necessary.

In this study among some small church-related colleges and universities, two institutions with an enrollment of up to 500 students each employed two full-time professionals for the area of institutional advancement. The remaining three institutions indicated that they have one full-time employee for their support staff.

Regarding whether they planned to enlarge their advancement staff in the next 2 years. 50% of the schools, three of six, planned to do so; 33%, two of them, had no plans, and the remaining school representing 17% did not know.

The framework of Willmer (1980) specified that two to five clerical staff are needed to be able to develop a successful institutional advancement program. Willmer in his follow-up study (1987) recommended a change to the framework of 1980, that five to nine professional advancement personnel should be employed, and three to seven
supporting (clerical/secretarial) staff should be employed (Willmer, 1993). Willmer (1980) believes that it is logical to suggest that the larger the enrollment, the larger the staff should be in order to perform the variety of functions required (p. 73). This trend was found in Willmer's 1980 study and in the two other studies he did in 1985 and 1993. The only trend noticeable in this study among selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities is that relative to Willmer's model they are heavily understaffed, both in number of professionals and clerical support staff.

**Authority and Organizational Structure**

*Research Question 2:* What is the advancement authority and organizational structure of that authority at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's model/benchmark?

This section focuses on assessment of two organizational concerns: advancement management authority and advancement function centralization and organization.

Six institutions (100%) responded that the chief advancement officer (CAO) reports directly to the president. In a majority, four of the six schools (67%), the chief advancement officer is part of the executive officer's group. It is important to note that in two institutions (33%) they have chosen to not include the chief advancement officer in the top executive officer's group.

The framework of Willmer (1980) suggested that the chief advancement officer should report to the president of the institution. There should be, according to Cook (1994), a close relationship built on confidence and respect between the president and the chief advancement officer (p. 4). Moore (1987) in his study of independent undergraduate
colleges found that when presidents and senior development officers demonstrate a high level of similar approaches they are also more successful in their institutional advancement efforts (pp. 40-44). In addition, Wilmer (1981) believes that authority and the possibility to give input to the management of operations and participation in the policy-making decisions are needed prerequisites for an effective working relationship. Therefore, the framework of Willmer (1980) suggested that the chief advancement officer should have a position in the top executive officer’s group (p. 77).

Five of the six (83%) responding institutions in this study are managed and coordinated through a central office for advancement. Only one institution (17%) indicated that it chose to not have a centralized office. According to Willmer’s framework, the institutions’ functions should be centrally managed.

**Personnel Resources**

*Research Question 3:* What advancement personnel exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer’s model/benchmark?

It should be obvious that to have a successful institutional advancement process, a school needs qualified personnel resources. These personnel include the president of the institution, the advancement staff, members of the board, and other volunteers. This section assesses the personnel resources available in two major areas: (1) professional staff and (2) volunteers and members of the board and others.

The findings indicated that in three of the seven responding schools (43%) the presidents were rather new in their capacity as head of the institution, with 2 or less years
of experience as a president, and that a majority of those (66%) had less then 2 years of experience as fund-raisers. Two presidents (28%) had between 3-4 years of experience both as presidents and as fund-raisers. The remaining two presidents (28%) have 9 or more years of experience, both as president and fund-raisers. Only one president had some kind of fund-raising experience before entering into his or her position as president. The remaining six of seven presidents (86%) have received their training as fund-raisers while working as presidents.

Of the seven presidents, the majority (71% or five of seven) have a doctoral degree, and the remaining 29% a master’s degree. Also a majority (86% or 6 of 7) are in the age-range of 41-50 years. One president (14%) was 61 years of age or older.

Four of the seven (57%) presidents had experience from higher education as a college or academic administrator prior to taking on the new assignment as president. Two respondents (29%) had a position outside education prior to the presidential assignment, and 14% came with experience from the clergy before becoming a president.

The research implies that the title and experience of the person responsible for the institutional advancement process play an important role in the ability of an advancement officer to function effectively (Gabrielsen, 1975; Rowland, 1977; Willmer, 1981, 1985, 1993). Of the two institutions responding to the question about the title of the person who is responsible for institutional advancement activities, one institution responded, “Vice President for Development” and the other responded “Director of Development.”

Willmer’s framework (1980) suggested that the advancement manager should be experienced in advancement, educated with preferably a doctorate, and assigned a title...
that carries authority.

As has been noted above, a majority of the chief executive officers/presidents have doctoral degrees and carry a title of authority. Five (71%) have only 4 or fewer years of experience as fund-raisers, and the remaining 29%, two of the seven respondents, have 9 or more years of experience.

As was noted in chapter 2, the president is the one who must be the key person for institutional advancement efforts. Several studies have shown that the president must be responsible for creating the fund-raising climate and the vision for his or her institution (Dyson & Kirkmen, 1988; Hurtubise, 1988; Thompson, 1995).

The following section discusses the president and his or her role particularly in fund-raising.

Respondents were asked to rank what gives them most guidance in the area of fund-raising. The things that give most guidance to the president were the use of a fund-raising consultant, on-campus development officer, and published material on fund-raising. The least important guidance for the president was from members of the board and from fund-raising workshops. On the follow-up question, What is the most important source of guidance? four of six (66%) responded with fund-raising consultant/on-campus development officer, the board (17%), and fund-raising material (17%).

The respondents believe that their most important role as presidents is to provide leadership to the employees. The second most important role is to promote the image of the institution; third, to seek financial support. The least important role was to assist with developing curriculum.
The questionnaire also included some additional questions in an attempt to expand the understanding of the president's attitudes toward fund-raising, on the present way of dealing with donors, methods used, and who is responsible for vision and goal setting. As have been presented in chapter 2, the president as the head of the institution also must be the individual who has the major responsibility for setting the goals and vision for the institution in the area of institutional advancement and fund-raising.

The respondents were asked to rank the methods most frequently used for follow-up with a first-time donor. Four of the six presidents (67%) indicated that the most frequently used method was a personal visit by him or her to the donor's home or office. The second most used method, according to four of the six presidents, was to invite the donor to visit the campus. The third most used method, according to four of the six presidents (67%), was a phone call from the president to the potential donor soliciting a gift. The method used least, after a potential first-time donor was identified, was to give the person's name to the appropriate person so he or she could make the follow-up contact with the prospective donor.

The involvement of the chief executive officer, the president, in fund-raising efforts include, as discussed in chapter 2, to define and implement the vision and goals of the institution. Eighty-six percent (six of the seven) of the responding presidents believed that they are responsible for defining the vision of their institution. The remaining president believes the faculty has the major responsibility for defining the vision.

Four of the seven (57%) presidents responded that they are responsible for establishing the fund-raising goals for their institution. The remaining three responding
presidents (43%) believe that this is a combined effort between the president and the chief
development officer.

When asked how effective they are as fund-raisers, the presidents were modest in
their opinion of themselves. Four of seven (57%) believe they are above average,
indicating a "4" on a scale 1 to 6 where 1 indicates "very ineffective" and 6 "very
effective." Two of seven responding presidents (29%) indicated a rating of "3." One
president had the opinion that he or she was very ineffective, giving a rating of 1.

Six of seven (86%) of the presidents strongly agree to the following statement:
"The president more than anyone else at my institution creates the climate in which fund­
raising takes place."

How much time the presidents spend with fund-raising efforts can also be used as
a measure as to how effective they are in fund-raising. Time spent does not necessarily
measure success, but at least it gives an indication of their dedication and involvement.

When presidents were asked what percentage per 40-hour week was spent on
fund-raising, two responded that they spend 5%, two stated that they spend 10%, and two
others spent 20% of their 40-hour week on fund-raising. Four of five (80%) of the
presidents made up to three off-campus visits per month to prospective donors during
1998, using up to 4 hours per work week of 40 hours. One president indicated that each
off-campus visit lasted 2-3 weeks. The two presidents who indicated that they spent 20% of
their 40-hour week on fund-raising also reported making a total of four visits per month
to prospective donors.

Willmer reported in 1985 that, on average, 44% of the president's time was spent
Another category of needed personnel resources for the advancement efforts, such as fund-raising, is the unpaid workers, the volunteers, and trustees/members of the boards. As presented in chapter 2, the research shows that board members or trustees have to realize that they should participate actively in advancement work. Board members can open doors, and one good reason they are recruited is for their network of friends (Andringa, 1996, pp. 152-153). When the institutions were asked to indicate what percentage of advancement work was done by its volunteers, four schools gave their responses. The volunteer group doing the highest percentage of volunteer work was the alumni with 39%; the second most active group for volunteer work was the faculty with 30%. Members of the board spend an average of 12% of their time for advancement work, giving them third place as a group of volunteers among the four institutions responding to this particular question. Willmer's framework suggests that members of the board should actively be involved in advancement activities.

In this study, a questionnaire was also sent to respective chairmen of the boards in an attempt to understand the board's involvement in the area of institutional advancement. Seven chairmen of the board responded, but two responses could not be used. One had to be discarded since it represented the institution which was new to the area and decided to decline participation. The other represented a school which declined to participate in this study.

Eighty percent of the responding chairmen of the boards indicated that development of strategic plans is a function for the office of institutional advancement.
Also 80% of the responding chairmen of the boards think that building good relationships and public relations are to be a function to their office. One institution, representing 20%, does not include the area of fund-raising as a function of the board. The governing board for this school has delegated the fund-raising efforts to the assistant to the vice president for development.

On the question of how the office of the president should relate to the area of institutional advancement, all responding chairmen of the board indicated the importance that the president and the chief advancement officer work closely together. One respondent (20%) indicated that the president should provide guidelines for the fund-raising efforts.

The third open question to the chairmen of the board asked how the governing board relates to the office of the president in matters of fund-raising. Sixty percent, three of the five responding chairmen, agree that the governing board should encourage the administration in their fund-raising efforts, and also 60% emphasized the importance of the president working closely with the chief advancement officer and being involved in fund-raising.

When asked to rate the importance of the main roles for the governing board in regard to fund-raising on a rating scale from 1 to 10, where 1=low importance, and 10=high importance, 60% of the chairmen of the governing boards answered that the two most important roles are: (1) to ensure that adequate budget is established; and (2) to identify potential donors. According to 40% of the chairmen another main role for the governing board is to identify potential donors and ensure that planning is conducted.
When asked to rate the characteristics that enhance the giving climate among the constituencies, 60% of the chairmen of the boards gave the highest ranking, value “10,” for the reputation of the faculty. Another important characteristic which the board believes enhanced the giving climate was if the institution had an enthusiastic president, which was given a value of “10” from two chairmen and a value of “9” from another chairman. The third most important characteristic which the chairmen of the board believed enhanced the giving climate was if the institution had a known purpose and mission, which was given a lowest rating of “7” and highest rating of “10” from the five responding. The characteristic “hard working board members” was given a lowest ranking of “4” and highest ranking of “8,” making it the least important factor in enhancing the giving climate.

The question on “characteristics that enhance the giving climate among the constituencies” asked of the chairmen of the board was also asked of the presidents, and a comparison of responses follows. Sixty-seven percent of the presidents gave the characteristics “hard working board members” the highest ranking with a lowest value of “4” to the highest “7.” The second most important characteristic which enhances the giving climate among the constituencies according to the president’s view is the “reputation of the faculty” and “enthusiastic president,” giving it a lowest value of 2 to a highest of “5.” The least important factor according to the president’s view is the characteristic “known purpose and mission,” which was given a lowest ranking of “1” to a highest of “5.”

The presidents of the schools and the chairmen of the boards seemed to have major differences in regard to their view on the importance of an “Enthusiastic president”...
Another area where the presidents and the chairmen of the governing board of institutions seemed to have a divergent view was the importance of “known purpose and mission” of the institution. It was also found that the presidents and the chairmen of the boards seem to disagree on the importance of “hard working board members” as a characteristic that would enhance the giving climate among the constituencies.

Another question that was asked both of the presidents and the chairmen of the boards was regarding the “ranking of roles of the president.” Eighty percent (four of the five) of the responding chairmen of the board think that the president should be involved in seeking financial support for their institution, giving it a lowest ranking of “8” to the highest “10” and a mean of 9.0. Another major role according to 60% of the respondents is to provide leadership to the employees, giving it a ranking of “10.” The remaining two respondents gave a value of “4” and “6,” giving the role “provide leadership to the employees” a mean of 8.0. According to the responding chairmen of the board, the third most important role of the presidents should be to “promote the image of the institution,” where two respondents gave this role a value of “10” and the remaining three respondents with a range between “1” to “8” with a mean of 7.2. The fourth most important role of the presidents is, according to the chairmen of the governing board, to “assist with the development of the curriculum,” where two respondents gave it a value of “10,” and the remaining three respondents a value of “5,” with a mean of 7.0.

The question on the different roles of the president was also asked of the presidents in Survey B. Their responses are presented as follows, to enable a comparison with the responses from the chairmen of the boards. Note that in the survey of the
presidents, another ranking was used with a scale from “1” to “5,” where 1=important role, and 5=least important role.

Three responding presidents believe that a major role they have is to “provide leadership to the employees,” where two gave it a value of “2” and one a value of “1,” with a mean of 1.66. The second most important role of the presidents according to the responding presidents should be to “promote the image of the institution,” where two gave it a value of “1” which indicates an important role, and the other a value of “4,” with a mean of 2.0. The third most important role for the presidents, according to the respondents, is to seek “financial support” giving it a value in a range of “2” to “3,” with a mean of 2.66. The least important role they have is to assist with “developing the curriculum,” giving it a value in a range of “3” to “5,” with a mean of 4.0. One of the responding presidents indicated to the open-ended alternative “roles of the presidents” that another important role of the president is in “developing strategic direction” giving it a value of “1.”

When comparing the findings from the question on “roles of the presidents” between the responding presidents and chairmen of the boards, the most striking difference is the view on the importance of “seeking financial support.” Seeking financial support should, according to the 80% of the responding chairmen of the board, be a major role for the presidents, whereas the presidents gave this a lesser importance, and rated it as their third most important role.

To the question “What role should the board play in matters of institutional advancement including fund-raising?” four of the five (80%) chairmen of the governing
board reported that the board should support, give encouragement, and act on the recommendations and suggestions for strategies for institutional advancement from the development director and the chief executive officer/the president.

On the question of who primarily is responsible to define the vision for their institution, three of five (60%) responding chairmen thought it was a duty of the board. One chairman (20%) indicated that this should be a cooperative effort involving the faculty, the president, and the board. Another respondent indicated that the primary responsibility to define the vision is the president. When the presidents were asked who primarily defines the vision, 86% (six of the seven) of responding presidents indicated that it is the president's responsibility to define the vision for their institution. The remaining president, 14%, felt this to be a responsibility of the faculty.

The last question of the chairmen of the governing board was optional, and it requested an assessment of the board's involvement in the matters of fund-raising during 1998. The rating was on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1=low involvement, and 10=high involvement. Of the five responding, the majority, 60%, gave it a rating between “5” and “7” for the board’s involvement in fund-raising. Twenty percent felt that the board had a rather low involvement, giving it a rating of only “3.” The remaining respondent (20%) indicated that there was no involvement at all for the board in the area of fund-raising, and should not be.

**Advancement Activities and Function**

*Research Question 4: What advancement activities and functions are currently*
utilized at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how do they compare with Willmer's model/benchmark?

Advancement activities are functions that are carried out by programs. These activities and the number of types give an indication of the institutional advancement processes that exist. The successful institutional program is described in a carefully formulated program. In particular, among the small colleges, fund-raising is the most critical part of the institutional advancement program (Willmer, 1981, pp. 83-84). This section develops the framework in two major areas, fund-raising activities and other advancement activities.

**Fund-raising Activities**

The face-to-face solicitation made to the prospective US$ 100-plus donors, according to the three responding colleges and universities, is first made by the staff and second by the Director of Development. The third group who has a role in solicitation of gifts from prospective donors is the board of governors. The schools as part of determining results of their fund-raising activities were asked to indicate the percentage of monetary contributions from eight different categories. Fifty percent of the respondents received their highest monetary contributions from the alumni, 25% receive it from churches, and the remaining 25% receive their monetary contributions mostly from international agencies.

In Survey A the seven small church-related Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities were asked to indicate which of the following functions were part of their institution's advancement office: (1) Fund-raising, (2) Alumni affairs, (3) Photo service,
(4) Physical plant planning, (5) Church relations, (6) Public relations, (7) Publications, and (8) Others, please specify. As could be expected, fund-raising and alumni affairs were in operation in five of the six schools responding (83%). In addition, a majority of the schools (67%) reported that publications were part of their institutional advancement activities. Another area which also is a major part of institutional advancement activity is public relations, which exists in half (50%) of the schools responding.

In addition, as indicated in the open-ended alternative “others,” two institutions (33%) included marketing and strategic planning as a function of the institutional advancement activities. One institution also includes immigration activities and guest housing as part of its advancement activities.

On the question relating to the size of the mailing list to prospective donors, three institutions have the following numbers of names/institutions on their lists: Institution A with 5,000, institution B with 700, and institution C with 3,500.

Of the six responding schools only 16% had conducted a market study (who gives and why) with their donor constituencies. Fifty percent of the responding schools indicated that they had a special activity, a “club” for major donors, and 50% of the schools indicated that they had a major capital campaign within the last 3 years. The same institutions that indicated that they have had a major capital campaign indicated that they also planned to have a major capital campaign in the next coming 3 years. Seventy-five percent of the schools indicated that there is an active effort made to bring major donors to the campus. When asked to indicate the total amount of private gifts received during 1998, the four schools responding to this question indicated a range of US$ 75,000 -
325,000 for capital development, and between US$ 15,000 - 75,000 for operations/unrestricted use.

In the final question in the section on fund-raising activities, the respondents were asked “What do you think is the main reason your institution receives gift from major donors?” From the six responding institutions, all (100%) indicated that it was because of a “love for their alma mater.”

The fourth recommendation from Willmer’s model focuses on the existence and variety of advancement activities as described with the fund-raising activities. His model suggests that those programs should include efforts to raise annual restricted support, capital, giving needs, and deferred gifts. Gift solicitation should, according to Willmer’s model, be made by trustees, the president, staff, and volunteers, and the mailing list should be as long as possible. As has been presented, most schools in this study of selected small church-related Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities use a wide variety of advancement activities to attract donors to support the institutions.

**Advancement Programs**

As has been presented in this study, an effective institutional advancement program should include the following six areas: advancement management, fund-raising, public relations, publications, alumni programs, and government relations. So far this study has dealt with advancement management and fund-raising activities. The remaining presentation of findings will deal with the four areas that can provide the support needed for a successful institutional advancement effort. Respondents were given eight kinds of images that their institution tried to convey and asked to rank their importance. The
selections of image were: quality of academics, fiscal stability, service to others, teaching quality, character buildings, research activity, spiritual commitment, and prestige occupations of the alumni. If the image was of great importance, the respondents were to indicate “1,” ranging to “5” if of little importance.

All of the six responding schools indicated with a ranking of “1” that spiritual commitment has great importance as the image their institution tries to convey to its public. The second most important image is shared by “quality of teaching” “quality of academics” and “character building” where 83% gave it a ranking of “1.” The third most important image to convey was to provide an image of “service to others” and fiscal stability,” which were rated with “1” “great importance” from 67% of the respondents. The least most important image to convey to their public according to 50% of the responding schools was “research activity” and “prestige occupation of alumni.”

One of the six (17%) of the responding institutions indicated that it had a special public relations advisory group outside the institution. All responding institutions (100%) have either a magazine or a newsletter, and also all institutions include a centralized publication policy, and the mailing is done at least twice annually.

All of the responding institutions indicated that they have an alumni organization, four of six (67%) of which are funded by the institution they represented. Fund-raising was part of the responsibility of five of the six (83%) alumni associations. All six institutions (100%) have regional alumni chapters, and 100% of them are active. Sixty-seven percent of the responding institutions have a special program for recent graduates. All six of the responding institutions noted that they have off-campus meetings from 1 to
25 times annually. Three of the schools noted that between 7% to 25% of their alumni made a gift to their school for the year of 1998.

Within 1998, six of the schools indicated that they have conducted dinners and visits with their government, either on the state or local level. Sixty-seven percent of the institutions, four of the six, have had at least one (maximum 5) activity in an attempt to improve the institution’s relationship with the government. The other two respondents, representing 33%, have conducted between 6 to 10 activities in an attempt to improve their relationship with the government. These activities are, in the majority of institutions (67%), handled by the chief executive officer. One of the responding institutions indicated that it also included the academic deans in these contacts with government officials. One other institution responded that building governmental relationships is a joint effort by the president and the person responsible for public relations.

Willmer’s framework recommended the following in regard to the advancement programs:

1. At least 2-4 voluntary government relations events should be conducted each year.

2. Small colleges should have regional chapters, fund the alumni organization, and have a special program for recent graduates.

3. Between 1.4 and 2.0 professional full-time equivalents should be allocated to institutional relations.

4. The publications program should include a centralized publication policy and the mailing of a principal publication at least quarterly.
Evaluation: An Integral Part of Advancement

As was discussed in chapter 2 all advancement programs should have some kind of process of annual evaluation. It is important that an institution knows who is giving and why, and to know how effective the publications are in the communication process.

Institutional Goals and Advancement Practice

According to Willmer (1993) one type of internal evaluation measures the advancement program against its stated public relations goals. It asks whether there is consistency and a correlation between the public relations goals and the institutional advancement program (pp. 38-40).

This study found long-range plans for the institutions, and also public relations activities. However, only one institution had chosen to have a special public relations advisory group. As suggested in Willmer's model (1980), section 3 on "personnel resources," the school should have a public relations advisory group comprised of people outside the institution. Willmer's framework in regard to institutional goals and advancement practice suggests that the advancement programs should contribute to the major public relations goals of attracting prospective students, raising funds, and building and holding goodwill for the institution.

Evaluation Tools

Willmer's last framework dealt with the evaluation tools and recommended that the advancement process should include a readership poll of publication recipients and market analysis of the donor constituency (1980).
As discussed in chapter 2 the advancement process includes the evaluation tools designed to listen closely to various constituencies. Feedback from the institution’s constituencies provides the information needed for change and redirection. One way of measuring the effectiveness of communication to the constituency is to conduct a market analysis. A question was asked as to whether the institution had conducted a market analysis on who gives and why. One of the four responding institutions indicated that they had. The other three institutions responding (75%) had not conducted a market study to determine who gives and why. The respondents were asked to indicate if within the past 3 years they had measured the effectiveness of their communication program among various constituencies. Eighty percent, four of five of the responding schools, indicated that they had not. One institution had done an evaluation within the last 3 years. Another evaluation tool consisted of conducting a reading poll. Therefore, the respondents were asked if within the last 3 years they had conducted a readership poll of the recipients of their publication. Again 80% of the responding schools indicated that they had not. One institution had not.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This study assessed the institutional advancement programs at seven selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities all having an affiliated program with Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. The purpose of the examination was to analyze "what is" by surveying selected colleges and universities to determine the present-day process of the institutional advancement function, in order to determine "what ought to be."

Three senior administrators of higher education (see Appendix C, Validity Panel) reviewed the questionnaire for face, content, and construct validity. The professional validity panel consisted of one president of a church-related university, and two senior university administrators with extensive experience in the administration of higher education at small church-related colleges and universities. The members of the review panel were guided by a three page document with instructions (Appendix C). After receiving written and oral comments and recommendations from members of the validity panel to research questions, the research instrument was pre-tested with two university administrators who also have extensive experience as professors.
The research was carried out to address the following five research questions:

1. What is the institutional commitment to fund-raising at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's framework?

2. What is the advancement authority and organizational structure of that authority at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's framework?

3. What advancement personnel resources exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's framework?

4. What advancement activities and functions are currently utilized at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's framework?

5. Do advancement evaluation processes currently exist at selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, and how does that compare with Willmer's framework?

This summary chapter will address the five research questions, draw final conclusions, suggest recommendations, and offer suggestions for further research. The five research questions were built upon the framework model that Willmer developed in his 1980 dissertation. Each research question of this study is equated with one of the five areas of Willmer's framework. Each question calls for a conclusion which draws from the current "what is" level of advancement work among the responding schools in the respective framework area. In response to each research question, conclusions will be
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made as a comparison between the existing level and what Willmer recommended from his framework. The data from the survey questions are organized within the respective five areas and conclusions are drawn.

Institutional Commitment

Willmer's model starts with an assessment of a school's institutional commitment to advancement. That commitment is determined by the existence of articulated goals, long-range plans, budget allocations to advancement, and staffing commitment. The data show that all of the colleges and universities had a long-range plan for institutional advancement. Almost all, 83% of the schools, also have written goals and objectives for the advancement office. In Willmer's (1980) study, 91% of the schools had written goals and objectives, and the study shows that the schools in this study are close to that mark.

The budget allocation of the institutional advancement efforts showed a weak sense of institutional commitment. This study showed that the schools spend a low percentage of their total budget on the advancement efforts, from a low of 1% to a high 5%. Willmer's (1980) framework suggested that 4 to 8% should be allocated from the total budget for advancement functions. In a follow-up study by Willmer (1985), these figures were revised to a suggestion that schools need to spend between 6 and 11% of their total budget for advancement. Willmer in the follow-up study found that the schools with an enrollment of 500 or fewer students need to spend the larger percentage.

Each of the schools in this study employed an average of one professional staff member, and also one clerical personnel for all the activities in the area of institutional advancement, including the offices for alumni, public relations, and fund-raising. Willmer's
framework suggested the need to have between two to five professional staff and also two to five clerical staff to be able to develop a successful institutional advancement program. While 50% of the schools indicated that they are planning to enlarge their advancement staff in the next 2 years, the current level is well below Willmer's recommended level.

It seems that while the necessary investments are made in hiring the chief operating officer for advancement, the provision of support resources is not adequate. This can create a situation in which the development officer does not have enough funds to travel, meet with prospective donors, nor purchase needed office equipment, etc. As the study found, and which was reported in chapter 4, the majority of the presidents of the small church-related colleges and universities in this study believe personal contacts with prospective donors is the most effective method of raising funds.

Authority and Organizational Structure

The second part of Willmer's framework pertains to the advancement office authority and the organizational structure. Willmer assessed this area by determining to whom the chief institutional advancement officer reports, the different levels of decision-making authority the chief advancement officer has, and the degree to which the fund-raising efforts are centralized through the advancement office.

The data show that the selected small church-related schools in this study are strong in the area of advancement authority and organizational structure. All respondents indicated that the chief advancement officers reports directly to the president. Also a majority (66%) of the chief advancement officers are part of the executive officer's group.
The study also shows that the majority of schools (83%) are managed and coordinated through a centralized office for institutional advancement. The study shows that the Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities studied meet and even exceed Willmer’s model when it comes to their level of authority given institutional advancement and organizational structure.

**Personnel Resources**

Willmer’s third framework relates to the personnel resources who assist in the institution’s advancement efforts. Personnel resources were defined as the extent of experience from advancement personnel, the use of volunteers and trustees in advancement efforts, the involvement of the president in advancement, particularly with fund-raising, and the existence of a public relations advisory group.

As was described in chapter 2 the researcher has followed the recommendation from a senior officer at an American University, also member of the validity panel for this study that the study, suggesting that there be questions as on the background and training of the chief executive officer/president. These questions were included since the senior officer working with the selected colleges and universities in this study had an understanding that the president of the respective schools are the ones who deal primarily with the area of fund-raising. This is mentioned since it is an expansion on the assessment and framework of Willmer where he requested information on training and background from the advancement officer other than the president. The results shows that 43% of the presidents in this study had 2 or less years of experience as president, and that a
majority 66% had 2 or less years as a fund-raiser. Only one of seven (14%) had some kind of fund-raising experience before he or she became president. The remaining presidents (86%) seem to have received their training in fund-raising while serving as president. A majority of the presidents (57%) had experience from higher education as a college administrator prior to becoming president. One of the respondents came with an experience from the clergy before becoming a president, which is not surprising, since all of the schools in this study are small church-related colleges and universities. The remaining 29% came with work experience outside education before their assignment as president. Research seems to support the findings of this study that presidents of small church-related colleges and universities learn their fund-raising skills through on-the-job training. Cook, in his 1994 study, found that some “presidents acquire their fund-raising knowledge and training primarily through on-the-job administrative experience” (p. 3).

A majority of the presidents (66%) responded that the use of fund-raising consultants and on-campus development officers is the most important source of guidance. The least important guides for the presidents were from the members of the board. This last finding seems to indicate that a majority of the presidents in this study have not experienced the benefits that members of the board can provide as partners in fund-raising as well as in the other areas of institutional advancement. It is also possible that the members of the board lack experience as fund-raisers and how to be a good institutional spokespersons, and therefore are unable to assist the president. Members of the board have a crucial role to play in the fund-raising process since they, through their own giving, can be an inspiration for others as well. As Notre Dame University president Reverand
Edward Malloy (1999) stated in his book a "Monk's reflection" (p. 24, italics added): "Fund-raising has to be a shared responsibility among the members of the board, and other central figures of the college or university".

The schools in this study are small and church-related, some of them also situated in remote areas and some in developing countries where the institution has a lack of needed resources such as regularity of electricity and water supplies. It could therefore be assumed that these special conditions provide an even larger degree of challenges than for most colleges and universities, as for instance, in the United States. The board's role in advancement is, nevertheless, according to Neff (1993) "critical" (p. 91). The recruitment of members to boards is particularly difficult in denominationally affiliated schools where board members are nominated and approved by regional church bodies, thus hindering the chances to find the best choices, the ones with the best capabilities, such as in the area of fund-raising (Dowden, 1996, p. 33). In a small church-related college or university there is also a need for board members who may not have an abundance of financial resources but instead have academic expertise, are biblical scholars, and have a broad network of contacts.

In spite of the special challenges of small church-related colleges and universities, the president, as the key player in fund-raising, must ensure the selection of board members who have the ability to be good role models in giving, and who have a broad network of friends, also outside their own constituencies, and who themselves also are successful fund-raisers. One way to assist the schools to this end is to institute a sub-committee of the board, a development committee that will assist with the overall strategic
planning for institutional advancement. Other responsibilities of such a committee would be to assist in the selection of proposed donors, the cultivation and encouragement of board members to be active partners.

The ultimate goal of all activities of a Christian school should be to communicate the mission as Christian institutions, impacting the world for God through the lives of the faculty, staff, members of the board, and the students. Each Christian board member should welcome the opportunity to share the abundance that God has provided, and he or she should know that God expects each one to be a good steward of the resources given of Him (I Chron 29:14, Hag 1:3-11). As was reported in chapter 4, all responding presidents indicated that “spiritual commitment” has the greatest importance as the image for their schools. The president is the person who must ensure that a Christian school demonstrates the integration of Christian faith into all fund-raising activities.

An interesting finding in this study is that the presidents believe that their most important role is to provide leadership for the employees, while secondarily it is to promote the image of the institution, and they seem not to give the highest importance to seeking financial support for the institution. Hurtubise (1988), in his analyses of presidential attitudes and participation in fund-raising at some small independent colleges and universities, found that, of his responding presidents, 50% believed that seeking financial support for their institution should be their highest priority (p 85).

As mentioned above in chapter 2, the importance of presidential leadership and his and her active involvement in fund-raising is crucial for the success of the institution. The findings indicated that, of the responding presidents, six of seven strongly agreed to the
statement “The president more than anyone else at my institution creates the climate in which fund-raising takes place.”

It is important that the board selects a president who has the depth of experience and interest to focus his or her attention on the area of institutional advancement, especially fund-raising. He or she should have a passion to lead with boldness and vision, to drive the institution toward its objective and mission. Vision is not everything, according to Reverend Edward Malloy (1999), president for University of Notre Dame, “but surely it is at the heart of presidential leadership” (p. 12). The findings in this study among some small church-related colleges and universities indicated that the majority of presidents (six of seven) believed it was the president’s responsibility to define the vision for their institution. When the chairmen of the board were asked the same question, the majority (60%) indicated that the definition of the vision was a responsibility of the board.

It could be assumed that there exists a need for discussion between the members of the board of governors and the chief executive officer, the president, on the future of their institutional advancement programs and the responsibilities for officers involved.

It is also important that the president be able to spend enough time to cultivate prospective donors. This study found that two of the responding presidents set aside 20% of their time (in a working week of 40 hours i.e., 8 hours per week for fund-raising activities). Actually the result showed that a majority (67%, four of six) of respondents spent 10% or less per week on fund-raising.

Researchers such as Boardman (1993) believe that if the president does not devote enough time to increasing the major gifts, the expected outcome will fail (p. 80). The
determination of what is “enough time” is obviously rather subjective. A study among 77 Christian colleges and universities revealed that on the average presidents spend 40% of their time in fund-raising, 24% for public relations, 13% for admission, 12% for alumni affairs, and the remaining 11% for other advancement activities (Council of Advancement and Support of Education, 1990).

Most commentators seem to agree that successful fund-raising does not appear unless the chief executive, the president, is in the forefront of all institutional activities, in particular seeking financial support. Cook (1994), in a national study of 50 university presidents, stated that “presidents no longer have a choice in whether or not to engage in fund-raising” (p. 2). Dowden (1996) also stressed the importance of having the president spend a significant amount of time with major donors and prospects. In typical fund-raising efforts, 20% of the donors give 80% of the gifts. The 20% includes the individuals from whom the president must contact and personally solicit funds. The institution’s success, the success of the fund-raising efforts, and the president’s success depend on it (p. 28). Malloy (1999), president for Notre Dame University makes this important remark:

For a modern president to be ineffective as a fund-raiser is to invite a short term of leadership. Colleges and universities can no longer accept unenthusiastic or sluggish fund-raising performances at the top, and any president who finds it distasteful, or is unable to articulate effectively a vision of the institution that potential benefactors find attractive, should move on and pass the mantle to others. (p. 30)

An interesting finding from the survey to the chairmen of the governing board for the schools in this study, was that a majority (80%) believed that the president should be involved in seeking financial support, which seems to sharply contrast with the responses from the presidents of the schools where it was given a lower importance. These findings
could possibly indicate that the plans and goals for institutional advancement need to be better evaluated by the board. The expectations and role of the president should be clearly outlined for and known by each member of the board.

The findings indicated that the volunteer group doing the highest percentage of volunteer work was the alumni. This finding is supported by researchers such as Baade and Sundberg (1993) who report that financial contributions from alumni constitute the single most important source of voluntary support for higher education. At the same time the author notes that the research has failed to provide the kind of detailed analysis that would help individual colleges and universities to formulate the most effective policies (p B1). One struggle for the small church-related colleges and universities in gaining financial support is that they produce only a few graduates each year, which means that the much-needed alumni support is limited.

Members of the board as a volunteer group in the institutions studied seem to have a low involvement in the area of fund-raising; the involvement was only 13%.

Willmer’s research showed that the effective advancement office made an extensive use of both volunteers and members of the board in the area of institutional advancement. In the responses from the chairmen of the boards it is interesting to note, that three of five respondents indicated that the two most important roles for the governing board are to “identify potential donors” and to “ensure that adequate budget is provided.” In addition, all of them indicated how important it is that they as a governing body also “cultivate the potential donors.” These findings could possibly indicate that the members of the board for the schools in this study want to be involved in the fund-raising
Members of the governing boards of small church-related colleges and universities must be aggressively involved with raising financial support for the institution. Board members are expected to contribute what they reasonably can and to participate where they can be helpful in ensuring that adequate resources are obtained. But it is not recommended that a board member has to make a major contribution to be able to stay on the board. Such an arrangement does not take into account the many other skills needed.

Donors are interested in knowing what has been done by the leadership of the institution, and what the members of the executive board have achieved. Therefore it is very important that members of the board do everything possible to facilitate the allocation of needed resources.

The governing board also has a responsibility to evaluate its performance. According to Fisher (1991) there is one proven procedure for successful evaluation of boards, and that is to establish a “committee on governance” with its main objective being to review the board’s effectiveness in the area of fund-raising. This committee will recommend candidates to the board, work on board procedures, and encourage board members’ participation in fund-raising (pp. 131-132). Drucker (1992) suggests that board members whose performance consistently falls below the preestablished performance goals and expectations should resign or at least not stand for reelection (p. 223).

The final area of an effective program for institutional advancement, according to Willmer’s framework, involves needed personnel resources and includes the need for an advisory group for public relations. The schools in this study were weak on this issue; only
one of the seven schools had created such a resource group.

### Advancement Activities and Functions

The fourth framework developed by Willmer involved the existence and variety of institutional advancement activities and functions at each college or university. Included was also the size of the mailing list and alumni programs. The colleges and universities in this study did well in this framework of Willmer's model.

Of the eight activities listed for the purpose of this study, the top four activities in the findings from Willmer's study - fund-raising, alumni affairs, publications, and public relations - were also indicated as the most important advancement activity by the majority of the schools in this study. An interesting finding was that none of the small church-related schools in this study seems to have included the category "church-relations" as being part of advancement activities.

All schools in this study reported having an alumni organization, and in a majority of the schools fund-raising was a major activity and responsibility. The responding schools indicated that 25% of their alumni made a gift to the schools in 1998. All schools indicated having off-campus activities and a majority (four of the six) responding schools had implemented a special program for recent graduates.

The importance of good alumni contacts cannot be overemphasized. Without a strong base of committed and dedicated volunteers, as the alumni group can be, it can be assumed that colleges and universities will experience even more financial challenges. All schools in this study reported that they either had a magazine or a newsletter that was mailed to the alumni and other friends of the institution at least twice annually.
Alumni relationships should be an ongoing process from the time a student enrolls in a program and continues to when he or she will be an alumnus. Each alumnus needs to feel informed about what is happening at their alma mater and to have a sense of belonging that translates into supporting the institution with time, funds, and other resources. An important aspect that will inspire alumni to support the institution later is how they were treated as students; therefore, faculty, staff, and administrators should work at treating every student as the most important customer while they are attending the college and university.

The schools in this study had a weakness in the size of their mailing lists. A majority of schools in this study had fewer than 1,000 students enrolled, and the average size of mailing lists was fewer than 700. Willmer (1981), in comments about his framework, stipulated that the advancement list of donors and other friends of the schools should be as large as possible.

**Evaluation**

According to Willmer, the final framework was the area of evaluation. The advancement program should include a readership poll of publications and market analysis of the constituent donors.

Only one of five responded that within the past 3 years their school had measured the effectiveness of their publication and communication program among the various constituencies. In addition, only one of four responded that they had conducted a market study to determine who gives and why.
It is recommended that small church-related colleges and universities, like those in this study, allocate more time and funds to the process of evaluation of their institutional advancement activities. As discussed in chapter 2, it is of utmost importance that an institution have a chance to receive feedback from its constituencies. The information provided through a market analysis and readership poll will provide important information needed for change, correction, and redirection. It was encouraging to note that all schools had their own publication distributed at least twice a year to alumni and friends.

Each institution needs up-to-date information on how successful it is with respect to the image that the school tries to convey to its public. Decisions should be built upon reliable data. Therefore, market research should be part of each institution's public relations plan. It seems that smaller institutions with limited budgets sometimes conclude that they have no ability, time, or expertise to use in developing methods for evaluation.

Willmer found that the institutions that allocate the time and funds for evaluation will increase their advancement effectiveness, which in turn means that this extra cost is an investment in revenue. The evaluation will most likely pay for itself. A fund-raising consultant can be used for development and feasibility studies.

A feasibility study is an external examination of an organization's constituencies in order to access the potentials for attracting capital donations. A development audit is internal and should focus on the effectiveness of the different programs and activities. It should involve a full review of the mission and objectives, the efforts to attract funds, the organization, human resources, and budgets. It should also include the board responsibilities and its participation. The outcome of such an audit is comprehensive.
analysis with recommendations. A development audit should be done in order to obtain an assessment on the present stage of operations, and might precede a capital campaign.

The following questions could be used as a starting point to stimulate further reflections when assessing the effectiveness of institutional advancement:

**Alumni Relations**

1. Are there written goals and objectives that support the mission of the institution?

2. Does each member of the staff have information on his or her responsibilities?

3. Does the alumni office staff work in close cooperation with volunteers, alumni, administration, and other staff?

4. Does the institution make sure that each staff member can participate in professional development annually?

5. Is there an evaluation procedure for evaluating the staff?

6. Does the alumni office have accurate records of each alumnus which should include name, address, year of graduation, major, present occupation, and accomplishments?

7. Does the alumni association have a policy of recognition for alumni who have a record of professional or civic achievements and/or financial contributions?

8. Does the alumni association organize regional meetings? If so, do these meetings assist in achieving the goals for the institution?

9. Is the accounting system developed to determine the direct cost of each program?
Fund-Raising

1. Are there written goals and objectives for the different activities? If yes, how measurable are the goals? Also, who are the participants in the strategic planning for fund-raising?

The administration and the governing board needs to have answers to the following question:

2. Who needs and wants our services, the program we offer?

3. Are the resources allocated for fund-raising sufficient for meeting fund-raising goals?

4. Do the key officers have individual, annual, measurable fund-raising goals?

5. Are there developed guidelines on how to identify prospective donors, and to cultivate them for solicitation? Also, how is a donor acknowledged and recognized?

6. Do special proposal submission policies exist? If so, have those policies been clarified with funding organizations?

7. Are there existing fund-raising efforts and resources focused on and in accordance with the strategic plan for the institutional advancement program?

8. Do the two key persons for fund-raising, the president and the chief advancement officer, spend the time necessary in cultivating prospective donors?

9. Are the members of the governing board providing leadership as role models, both in giving and in fund-raising?
10. Have a sufficient amount of volunteers been recruited and trained to assist in
the fund-raising efforts?

11. What is the working relationship between the chief operating officer for fund­
raising and staff and faculty? Is there a plan for how to solicit funds from faculty and staff?

12. Is there a formal process for evaluation of the staff members?

13. Do members of the staff attend yearly training and professional development
programs?

14. Is there an accounting system in place to determine the cost of each program
and activity?

Public Relations

1. Is there a written strategic plan with short- and long-term advancement goals
and objectives?

2. Is there a marketing research tool to determine how well the school is doing in
meeting its objectives?

3. Are the resources allocated for public relations sufficient to accomplish the
goals and objectives?

4. Is there a method for evaluation of the staff?

5. Does the institution have a crisis management plan? If not, are there plans on
how to deal with an emergency.

6. Does the institution annually review the advancement materials produced to
determine if they are consistent with goals and objectives? Do they represent the
institution correctly?

7. Are cost-estimating and bidding procedures cost-effective? Do they comply with the ethical policies of the institution?

8. Is the accounting system used able to show direct and indirect costs, program by program?

9. Does the institution evaluate the public relations office activities? Do such reviews occur on a regular basis? If yes, what are the methods used?

10. Does the public relations office staff have yearly professional development activities including participation in conferences?

In addition to the questions stated above, the following question should guide all the advancement activities: Are we accomplishing our institutional objectives and goals or only engaging in legitimate but unfocussed activities?

When an institution reviews its advancement program carefully, it should be possible to provide a picture on “what is happening” in general, but also to clearly identify the major strengths and weaknesses in its institutional advancement programs, and areas where improvements are needed. Such analysis should also include a thorough review of existing opportunities and future threats.

Conclusions

The schools in this study, a selected sample of Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities, are situated on the following four continents: (1) Asia, (2) Central America, (3) Northern Europe, and (4) West Africa. Some are located in remote
locations and all are struggling in their efforts to do an effective job of institutional advancement. The following conclusions summarize the findings:

1. The Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities in this study are trying to raise funds and other resources on limited budgets, and are also depending on the efforts of one advancement officer who seldom has the support personnel needed in the home office for the day-to-day operations. In addition, the school's use of volunteers to attract needed funding is insufficient.

2. There is a lack of evaluation of institutional advancement work. Willmer in his study emphasized how important it is that each school re-evaluate all its activities on a ongoing basis. The findings in this study indicate that few schools seem to spend time or resources in searching the strength and weaknesses of their advancement program, and therefore do not have enough information for decision making about how to improve in the area of institutional advancement. With this in mind it is remarkable what the schools have been able to achieve.

On the other hand, if the institutions used tools for assessment and audits for organizational effectiveness, it would most likely be easier to correct and re-direct the different advancement activities, and it can also be assumed that it would benefit all involved to be more cost effective. It could also be assumed that the cost for those advancement efforts, such as for fund-raising, would be reduced by having more active and involved volunteers, such as alumni and members of the governing board.

3. The colleges and universities in this study, all located outside the United States and having affiliated programs with Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, are
using a wide variety of institutional activities. All but one believes in having a centralized organizational structure and have a chief advancement officer who reports direct to the president and who is also a member of the chief executive officer’s group.

4. The institutions in this study do not use the members of their board as active partners in the different activities of institutional advancement. The findings indicated a low involvement. Willmer’s research suggested that successful advancement offices made an extensive use of the members of the board. It is encouraging to note that the chairmen of the boards in this study believe that the two most important roles the board has are to identify potential donors and to ensure that an adequate budget is provided for institutional advancement. In addition, they also believe that another major role for the governing board is to cultivate donors.

5. There is a lack of needed fund-raising experience and focus on the part of the chief executive officer. Only one of seven had some kind of fund-raising experience before becoming president, and few of them spend more than 10% of their time for fund-raising activities. The presidents of the colleges and universities with successful institutional advancement programs spend a major portion of their time cultivating prospective donors and represent the institution to the public at large.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the schools in this study thoroughly re-evaluate the budget appropriations to enable them to provide the operating funds for needed travel, conferences, and promotion. Also, funds should be allocated to hire support personnel.
minimum one full-time secretary/assistant for each of the following major areas in institutional advancement: development, public relations and alumni affairs.

2. It is recommended that the president and others who are key players in the selection process for new members of a board make sure that they find members who are interested in taking an active part also in fund-raising. Members of the board, the trustees, are expected to play a leadership role in all areas of executive management, including fund-raising.

3. It is recommended that small church-related colleges and universities make it their policy that a significant role of the board members should be active participation in fund-raising. They should be able to contribute personally and encourage others to do likewise.

4. It is recommended that the boards of small church-related colleges and universities, such as those in this study, establish a “committee on governance” with its main objective being to review the board’s effectiveness in the area of institutional advancement.

5. It is recommended that the schools in this study create an advisory group for public relations, which should be composed of people outside of the institution with their own professional public relations experiences.

6. It is recommended that each school in this study, as well as other similar schools, makes sure that its mailing list includes all alumni and other friends of the school so that everyone who has been a student or has had other connections with the school will
receive up-to-date information about the school. It can be assumed that with larger mailing lists of alumni there will be an increase in needed funds and other resources.

7. It is recommended that small church-related colleges and universities develop effective evaluation criteria for their programs to be used as a basis for audits. It is also recommended that the schools use someone outside their own organization to perform this audit, perhaps a fund-raising consultant. The unbiased and knowledgeable assistance of someone not intimately involved in the affairs of the school can give insight and understanding and should be able to review the operations from a wide perspective, identifying areas that need to be re-directed and also confirming what is working well. A fund-raising consultant can be used for development audits and feasibility studies.

8. It is recommended that each institution conduct training seminars and workshops on advancement methods and techniques such as how to cultivate donors and solicit funds. It is important that the president recruit, train, and motivate members of the board as active fund-raisers. Other areas which should be addressed are: proposal writing, fund-raising planning, and how to be effective as an institutional spokesperson. It is recommended that these workshops be conducted by qualified fund-raising consultants. A fund-raising consultant can bring experiences learned from working with other institutions and therefore provide a fresh perspective on institutional advancement.

9. It is recommended that the presidents of small colleges and universities re-evaluate their priorities, and spend considerably more time in fund-raising activities and other areas of institutional advancement. The president should not hesitate to delegate other important duties, such as development of curriculum and administrative issues, to his
or her associates, and focus instead on institutional advancement, with the major goal being to increase financial support for the institution.

10. It is also recommended that in their future search for new candidates as chief executive officer, the boards of small church-related colleges and universities try to recruit individuals who come with previous experience in fund-raising. In this way the president can provide effective leadership and be better prepared to guide the institution to increased financial support and greater stability.

Suggestions for Future Research

Based on the literature review and the findings from this study, there is a need for additional research in institutional advancement of higher education, in particular with regard to the small church-related colleges and universities. The following suggestions for further research are based upon the findings of this study:

1. A follow-up qualitative study should be conducted with the institutions in this study, in the next 2 and 4 years, to assess the level of success in the area of institutional advancement. Such a study could also assess the role, if any, the suggested public relations advisory committee had played.

2. Research is needed to find out the extent to which small church-related colleges and universities, such as those in this study, are using fund-raising advice and counsel and how this has contributed to the success of that school's institutional advancement efforts.

3. The present study should be expanded to other small church-related colleges and universities, using the same methodology.
4. A study is needed to review what qualities are most desirable for a board member to be a successful fund-raiser, and on what qualities the board is presently using to select new members.

5. A study is needed to evaluate small church-related colleges and universities as to what methods are used for self-evaluation and assessment.

6. A study should evaluate what the boards of small church-related colleges and universities view as the most important qualities when selecting a president.

7. A study should assess how successful small church-related colleges and universities relate to and use their alumni for institutional advancement.
APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(SURVEY A)

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about your programs in broad fields of institutional advancement: fund-raising, public relations, alumni affairs, and government relations whose purpose is to advance the understanding and support of your college or university. If any answer is not readily obtainable, please use an average or estimation. The phrase "Institutional Advancement" will be presented throughout the survey by the letters IA.

Institutional Identification

Name of institution: ____________________________________________
Name of respondent: ___________________________________________

1  Total educational and general expenditures, including student aid, of the institution. 
   USS ________________

2  Check the number of (FTE) full time students for Fall quarter, 1998
   ___  Less the 500  ___  1001 - 1250
   ___  501 - 750   ___  1251 - 1500
   ___  751 - 1000   ___  1501 and above

3  How long has your institution been in existence?
   ___  0 - 25 years
   ___  25 - 50 years
   ___  above 50 years

4  Are your institutional advancement functions managed and coordinated primarily through one department?  ___ Yes  ___ No
5. If not, what is the title, not the name, on the person who is responsible for those activities? .................................................................

6. If yes, for approximately how many years has this office existed? ____ years.

ADVANCEMENT MANAGEMENT

7. Check the functions which are included in your institution's advancement office:

_____ Fund-raising
_____ Alumni affairs
_____ Physical plant planning
_____ Church relations
_____ Public relations
_____ Publications
_____ Others, please specify ..........................................................................................................................

8. Total institutional expenditure, including salaries and benefits, to perform the functions checked above. US$ ____________

9. Please, subdivide into these three categories:

US$ ____________ Fund-raising
US$ ____________ Public relations
US$ ____________ Alumni affairs

10. To whom does the chief administrator responsible for advancement activities report?

_____ President _________ Other (specify)

11. Does this administrator have a position in the top executive officer's group?

_____ Yes _____ No

12. What is your total number of IA professionals? ____

Please, subdivide:

_____ Fund-raising _____ Public relations _____ Alumni
13. What is your total number of IA clerical/secretarial personnel? ___
   Please, subdivide:
   ___ Fund-raising   ___ Public relations   ___ Alumni affairs

   (In question 12 & 13: If a person shares responsibilities, show 0.5 in two locations).

14. Do you plan to enlarge your advancement staff in the next two years?
   ___ Yes   ___ No   ___ Don’t know

15. Does your institution have a long-range plan that includes projected program changes
    and a long-range budget?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

16. Does the advancement office have written goals and objectives?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

17. Are you using professional counsel for managing any aspect of your advancement
    program?  ___ Yes   ___ No

    **FUND-RAISING**

18. The percent of all SUS 100=plus donors and prospects solicited face-to-face by
    members of the your: Board ___ %, president ___ %, staff ___ %, volunteers ___ %,
    others ___ %.

19. What percentage of your total monetary contributions are received from each of the
    following donor categories:

    alumni ........................................... ___ %
    parents ........................................... ___ %
    members of the board ....................... ___ %
    faculty .......................................... ___ %
    businesses ..................................... ___ %
    churches ....................................... ___ %
    international agencies .................... ___ %
    others, please specify ................... ___ %

    Total = 100 %
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20. What percentage of volunteer work on behalf of the college’s fund-raising efforts is contributed by the following:

- alumni ........................................................... ___% 
- parents .......................................................... ___% 
- students ....................................................... ___% 
- members of the board ...................................... ___% 
- faculty .......................................................... ___% 
- individuals (other than above) ......................... ___% 

Total = 100%

21. What is the size of your total mailing list? .................

22. Have you conducted a market study (who gives and why) of your donor constituency? _____ Yes _____ No

23. Do you have a special “club” for major donors? _____ Yes _____ No

24. Have you had a major capital campaign in the last three years? _____ Yes _____ No

25. Do you plan to have a major capital campaign in the next three years? _____ Yes _____ No

26. Is an active effort made to bring potential major donors to the campus? _____ Yes _____ No

27. Indicate the total private gifts received during 1998:
   - capital US$ ______
   - operations/unrestricted US$ ____________

28. What do you think is the main reason your institution receives gifts from donors?

29. Within the past 3 years, has market analysis been conducted measuring the effectiveness of your communication program among various constituencies?
   _____ Yes _____ No
30. Are the institution’s press releases cleared through a central office?
   ____ Yes  ____ No

31. Does your institution have a public relations advisory group comprised of people outside the institution?  ____ Yes  ____ No

32. What kind of image is your institution trying to convey? Rank these image elements from “1” if of great importance, ranging to “5” if of little importance.
   ____ quality academics  ____ character buildings
   ____ fiscal stability  ____ research activity
   ____ service to others  ____ spiritual commitment
   ____ teaching ability  ____ prestige occupations of alumni

PUBLICATIONS

33. What is the format of your institution’s principal general publication?
   ____ magazine  ____ newsletter  ____ other

34. Frequency of mailing the above:
   ____ quarterly  ____ bi-monthly  ____ monthly  ____ other

35. Do you have an institutional policy which requires that all publications be approved by one central office?  ____ Yes  ____ No

36. Have you conducted (within 3 years) a readership poll of the recipients of your publications?  ____ Yes  ____ No

ALUMNI PROGRAMS

37. Do you have an alumni organization?  ____ Yes  ____ No

38. Is the alumni organization funded by the institution?  ____ Yes  ____ No

39. Is fund-raising part of the responsibility of the alumni association?  ____ Yes  ____ No

40. Do you have regional alumni chapters?  ____ Yes  ____ No
41. If yes on q. 40, are they active? ___ Yes ___ No
42. Do you have a special alumni program for recent graduates? ___ Yes ___ No
43. How many off-campus meetings do you conduct annually? ____
44. What percentage of alumni made a gift during 1998? ___%

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

45. Within 1998, how many voluntary activities such as dinners and visits have been conducted to improve your institution's relationship with your government (on state or local level)?

___ 1 - 5
___ 6 - 10
___ above 10

46. Who is the person (title, not name) responsible at your institution for governmental relations? ____________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

Please, return this questionnaire latest April 25, 1999 by fax to: # + 616-473-2811, or by e-mail: gustav@andrews.edu. If you have no access to fax or e-mail, kindly return your responses by air mail (such as DHL). Please, let me know the extra cost involved (US dollar), and I will send you a reimbursement.

Sincerely,

Janeric A. Gustavsson
PhD candidate
P O Box 176
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
USA
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONS TO PRESIDENTS (SURVEY B)

A. Name of institution

B. Name of officer

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Excluding 1998, how many years have you been President at this institution?
   - 0-2
   - 3-4
   - 5-6
   - 7-8
   - 9 or more

2. Excluding 1998, how many years experience do you have in professional fund-raising?
   Please, include years as President.
   - 0-2
   - 3-4
   - 5-6
   - 7-8
   - 9 or more

3. What position did you hold immediately prior to becoming president?
   - Academic Administrator
   - Development/Advancement Officer
   - Other college administrator (specify)
   - Faculty member
   - Clergy
   - Position outside higher education

4. What is your highest academic degree?
5. What is your age range?

- ___ 31 - 40
- ___ 41 - 50
- ___ 51 - 60
- ___ 61 and above

6. A case statement may be defined as a document which clearly states what the institution is, what the institution plans to do, and why the institution deserves support.

During 1998, did your institution have a written case statement?

- ___ yes
- ___ no

7. Does your institution have a written fund-raising goal for the next:

- twelve months ___ yes ___ no
- 3 years ___ yes ___ no
- 5 years ___ yes ___ no
- beyond 5 yrs ___ yes ___ no

8. Did your institution have a written fund-raising plan (actual fund-raising activities/programs) for 1998?

- ___ yes
- ___ no

9. Does your institution have a written fund-raising plan (actual fund-raising activities/programs) for the next:

- twelve months ___ yes ___ no
- 3 years ___ yes ___ no
- 5 years ___ yes ___ no
- Beyond 5 yrs ___ yes ___ no

10. Please rate the following in terms of their importance in actually providing you with guidance as a fund-raiser. Circle the number which best represents your rating.

(1 = Low importance to 7 = Very important).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Board</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising consultant(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus development officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published materials - fund-raising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11 Which one in # 10 is the most important source of guidance to you as a fund-raiser?
____________________

12 Please rank the following characteristics which you believe enhance the giving climate among your constituencies for your institution (1=Low importance, and 7 being Very important).

___ Hard working board members
___ Reputation of faculty
___ Known purpose and mission of your institution
___ Enthusiastic President
___ Other, please specify .................................................................

13 Listed below are different roles a president may play at an institution of higher learning. Please, rank how you view your role as President at your institution (1=important role and 5 being least important role):

___ Promote the image of the institution by being active in the community
___ Seek financial support for the institution
___ Assist with developing curricular
___ Provide leadership to employees
___ Other, please specify .................................................................

14 How many times a month did you personally make off-campus visits to prospective donors during 1998? ______

15 Generally, once a potential first-time major donor is identified, rank in order only those methods most frequently used by you to follow-up with this potential donor (1 being the most frequently used method and a 5 being the least frequently used method).

___ Letter from you which solicits a gift
___ Invitation from you to come to campus
___ Personal visits by you to his/her home or office
___ Telephone call from you soliciting a gift
___ Give the person's name to the appropriate person so he/she may follow-up with prospective donor
___ Other (please specify) ....................................................................
16. Who primarily is responsible for defining the vision of your institution? (Please, check only one).
   ____ Faculty
   ____ Board
   ____ Outside consultant
   ____ Other, please specify ..............................................................

17. During 1998, who primarily was responsible for establishing the fund-raising goals at your institution? (Please, check only one).
   ____ President
   ____ Board
   ____ Outside consultant
   ____ Other, please specify ..............................................................

18. How would you rate yourself in terms of your effectiveness as a fund-raiser during 1998? Please, circle the number which best describe your rating.

   Very ineffective     Very effective
   1  2  3  4  5  6

19. How would you rate the following statement? Please circle the number which best represents your rating:

   "The president more than anyone else at my institution, creates the climate in which fund-raising takes place".

   Strongly Disagree          Strongly Agree
   1  2  3  4  5  6

20. During an average week in 1998, what was the percent of your time you personally spent on fund-raising activities for your institution? (E.g., 10 hrs fund-raising/40 hour week = 25%).

   ____ %

Thank you so much for your time and very valuable assistance!

Sincerely yours,
Janeric A. Gustavsson
P O. Box 176
Berrien Springs, MI 49103, USA
APPENDIX A

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain information about the role Institutional Advancement (alumni & public relations, fund-raising, and governmental relations) have for your college and/or university in your SDA division. Another purpose is to advance the understanding and support of your colleges and/or universities. A questionnaire have also been sent to the President of the institution.

QUESTIONS TO:
THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
(SURVEY C)

A Name of the institution: ________________________________
B Location: ____________________________________________
C Name of chairmen: ___________________________________
D SDA Division: _______________________________________

1 What is the function of the office of Institutional Advancement (or related office) for the above institution?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

2 How does the office of the President relate to the area of Institutional Advancement?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

3 How does the Governing board include the office of the President in matters of fund-raising?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

4 What is according to you the main roles for the Governing board in regard to fund-raising? Please rate the following in terms of their importance on a scale from 1 to 10 (1=Low importance, and 10=Very important).
   Ensure that planning is conducted ______
   Be involved in that planning ______
Ensure that adequate planning is established
Set the examples for others by giving
Identify potential donors
Cultivate potential donors as directed by
development staff at the institution

5. Please rate the following characteristics which you believe enhance the giving climate among the constituencies for your institution (1=Low importance, and 10 being very important).

Hard working board members
Reputation of the faculty
Known purpose and mission of the institution
Enthusiastic President
Other, please specify ............................................. ............

6. Listed below are different roles a President may play at a institution of higher learning. Please, rate how you view the President’s role at your school (1=Low importance, and 10 being Very Important).

Promote the image of the institution by being active in the community
Seek financial support for the institution
Assist with developing curricular
Provide leadership to employees
Other, please specify ............................................. ............

7. Who primarily is responsible for defining the vision of this your educational institution? (Please, check only one alternative)

_____ Faculty
_____ President
_____ Board
_____ Other, please specify ............................................. ............

8. What role should the board play in matters of institutional advancement including fund-raising? _____________________________________________________________
OPTIONAL:

9 How has the board of governors for your institution been involved in matters of fund-raising 1998? Please rate the level of involvement from a scale 1 to 10 (1=low involvement and 10 high involvement). ______

All individual and institutional identity will be kept confidential as the result will be reported as an aggregate, not by individual or institution. Please, return this questionnaire latest April 15, 1999 by fax to: +616-473-2811. Please, let me know the extra cost involved (US dollar) and I will send you a reimbursement.

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND VALUABLE ASSISTANCE!

Sincerely yours,

Janeric A.Gustavsson
PhD candidate
P.O.Box 176
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
USA
E-mail: gustav@andrews.edu
March 5, 1999

To whom it may concern:

This letter serves to introduce Mr. Jan Eric A. Gustavsson, a doctoral candidate at Andrews University. He is currently working on his dissertation which studies the Institutional advancement activities among SDA colleges and universities outside the United States. The research will be compared with findings at other Christian colleges and universities to determine the effectiveness of our development programs.

I think you will find the research to be of great interest and assistance to you and to our educational institutions in general.

I am asking you to please take a little time to assist him in this research. Brother Gustavsson has agreed to present the findings of his research at a future meeting with our affiliated schools.

Thank you in advance for your kind cooperation. I trust this effort will be one way whereby our institutional advancement programs may be strengthened.

Sincerely,

Niels-Erik Andreasen
President
March 3, 2000

Dear Dr.,

As you have noted from a letter of introduction by Dr. Niels-Erik Andreasen, president of Andrews University, I am researching the Institutional advancement program at Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities who are affiliated with Andrews University, for my dissertation topic. I trust that this research will benefit the work you are doing for Him in all your efforts to educate your students.

I kindly request your participation in this study. The data collection is divided into two parts:

1. One questionnaire with 46 questions divided into the following areas: Advancement management, fund-raising, public relations, publications, alumni programs and government relations. If your institutions has officers for those areas it would be good if those individuals could make their responses for respective sections.

2. One questionnaire with 20 questions with response from you as the president.

As the researcher I can ensure that all individual and institutional identity will be kept confidential as the results will be reported as an aggregate, not by individual or institution. Please, return this questionnaire latest April 15, 1999, by fax to: (616) 473-2811 or by express mail (such as DHL), see address below. Please let me know the extra cost involved (US dollar) and I will send you a reimbursement.

I thank you in advance for your kind assistance, and I am looking forward to hear from you.

Sincerely,

Janeric Gustavsson
8788 College Avenue
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
USA
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January 8, 1999

Council for Advancement and Support of Education
Suite 400
11 Dupont Circle
Washington DC, 20036

Dear Sir/Madame,

I am hereby kindly requesting your permission to use a questionnaire published in *The small college advancement program: Managing for results* written by Dr. Wesley Kenneth Willmer, 1981.

I am currently working on my Ph.D. dissertation in Educational Administration at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, and plan to use the questionnaire to collect some data.

I would be very grateful if you could kindly send me a copy of the mentioned book and the most recent one by Dr. Willmer. Please, inform me on the cost for the books and any other related charges.

Thank you in advance for your kind assistance.

Yours sincerely,

Janeric Gustavsson
8788 College Avenue
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
Tel. (616) 471-5777
February 3, 1999

Janeric Gustavsson
8788 College Avenue
Bartian Spring, Michigan 49103

Dear Mr. Gustavsson,

Consistent with our phone conversation, you have my permission to use the Council of Independent Colleges Institutional Advancement Survey. I have enclosed a copy of the one published in 1993 by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. It is from the book, *Winning Strategies in Challenging Times for Advancing Small Colleges*, which I edited.

I wish you well in your endeavors.

Cordially,

[Signature]
LETTER OF REMINDER FOR PARTICIPATION IN STUDY

April 7, 1999

Dear Dr. ...

For about 4 weeks ago I sent you a letter requesting your participation in a study regarding institutional advancement activities at your institution. The questionnaire included questions on the different institutional functions at your school, and regarding your role as a president in institutional advancement. The survey was accompanied with a letter of introduction on the purpose and need for this study from Dr. Niels-Erik Andreasen, President for Andrews University.

I have so far not had the opportunity to hear from you with a completed return. The survey is a key element to the doctoral dissertation I hope to be able to complete. I would therefore very much appreciate if you kindly could take some few minutes of your time to assist me with this survey. I need your response as soon as possible, latest May 15, 1999.

Your return can as mentioned in my original letter to you, be sent by fax or mail. If you prefer to send it by mail, I also requested you to kindly use express service through DHL. I will of course reimburse you for the extra expenses.

If you already have responded and sent your return, I thank you so much for your kindness and time. I am looking forward to receive your response, soon.

Sincerely yours,

Janeric Gustavsson
8788 College Avenue
Berrien Springs, MI 49103
USA
Fax: (616) 473-2811
APPENDIX C

VALIDITY PANEL

1. Dr. Niels-Erik Andreasen
   President, Andrews University
   Berrien Springs, MI 49103

2. Dr. Merlene Ogden
   Dean, Affiliations & Extension Programs, Andrews University,
   Berrien Springs, MI 49103

3. Dr. William E. Richardson
   Dean, College of Art & Sciences, Andrews University
   Berrien Springs, MI 49013
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONS TO VALIDITY PANEL

Enclosed is a survey which attempts to access various institutional strategies used by selected Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities affiliated with Andrews university, Berrien Springs, Michigan. There are five area of concern in regards to the instrument:

A. Institutional Commitment: This is determined by the existence of an articulation of goals, objectives, and long-range plans for institutional advancement, budget allocation, and staffing commitment.

B. Authority and Organizational Structure: The chain of command and structure, and the centralization and or decentralization of the institutional advancement work within the university.

C. Personnel Resources: This is determined by the experience and working knowledge of the institutional advancement personnel staff and the number of volunteers involved in advancement activities and the extent of that involvement.

D. Advancement Activities and Functions: The number and various fund-raising methods employed as well as the extent of other advancement functions, such as alumni activities and public relations.

E. Evaluation Processes: The existence of evaluation tools and the extent of their use within institutional advancement determines this facet, according to Willmer (1993).

You are kindly asked to review the enclosed questionnaires and do the following:

A. Rate the content of each question/item and decide if it is appropriate by writing one of the following numbers to the left of each item:

1=reject the appropriateness of the question/item
2=accept the question/item with some reservation
3=accept the item as is

B. Assess the item for clarity.

To make this assessment, read each item and decide whether there are terms of phrases that could be changed to improved the readers’ and listeners’ understanding.
If you decide some changes is required, please indicate it by writing above the question/item.

C. Answer the following questions:
   1. Is the questionnaire
      __ too long? __ too short? __ about the right length?

      Suggestions for change: .................................................................

   2. Is the format attractive? __ Yes __ No

   3. Are there enough items? __ Yes __ No

Please, feel free to use the margins or the back of the pages for comments, questions, or suggestions on how to make this a better instrument. Also feel free to add, delete, or revise items.

When you have finished your critique as outlined above, please complete the questionnaire with your personal responses. Please, indicate the length of time it took you:

10 min __ 15 min __ 20min __ 30 min __ Other min __

Since the purpose of the questionnaire is to evaluate strategies for institutional advancement activities at selected colleges and universities outside North America, affiliated with Andrews University, decide whether all items clearly relate to the purpose of the questionnaire?

__ Yes __ No

Suggestions for change .................................................................

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND VALUABLE ASSISTANCE!

Sincerely,

Janeric Gustavsson
REFERENCE LIST
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