

The Chief Advancement Officer: Role Identification in Fundraising at Public Four-Year
Institutions of Higher Education in the United States

by

Sid Walker, B.S., M.B.A.

A Dissertation

In

HIGHER EDUCATION

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

Andrew Canham, Ph.D., J.D.
Co-Chair of Committee

Michael D. Shonrock, Ph.D.
Co-Chair of Committee

Susan Duncan, Ph.D.

Peggy Gordon Miller, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

May, 2012

Copyright 2012, Sid Walker

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

God has blessed me with family, friends, dreams, goals and opportunities. Pursuit of a doctorate was first a dream, eventually became a goal, and while working at Texas Tech University, I was able to take advantage of the opportunity. My father, Bob Walker, first made the suggestion to obtain advanced degrees. His example, regular reminders, and constant persistence are big reasons for my completion. Before my mother, JoAnn Walker, passed away, she reminded me to finish the doctorate. Mom, thank you for the inspiration to press on toward the goal. My wife, Amy, and boys, Will and Wes, have been patient and understanding throughout the coursework and persevered with me through the dissertation process. Amy, you have been my biggest earthly source of strength. Thank you for sticking by my side as my wife, my best friend, and companion through my complaints, as well as sharing my victories.

Mel Finkenberg and Susan Duncan were first round editors as I began to write. They have read every word (or at least they said they did...) and provided beneficial feedback. Greg Holt and Larry Henderson have been constant friends and sources of strength. Michael Shonrock was an outstanding professor for Futures Studies in Higher Education. He agreed to serve as dissertation committee chair in an emergency when I lost the original chair. He was always encouraging, offered advice in a positive manner, and has been an extremely positive force. Susan Duncan was my professor for two classes and eventually agreed to serve on the committee as my stats guru. She instructed in a way that the statistics made sense. Drew Canham has proven to be a valuable asset on the committee, not only with good campus connections, but also as one who has

recently gone through this trial. Finally, Alyx Shultz has served as my official editor for the dissertation. She has been critical, professional, and encouraging. It is my hope that every student working on a dissertation finds an editor as competent as Alyx.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Higher Education	2
Division of Institutional Advancement	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Council for Advancement and Support of Education	5
Statement of the Problem	6
Research Questions	7
Assumptions	7
Limitations	8
Delimitations	10
Definition of Terms	11
Summary	13
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
History of Fundraising in Higher Education	15
Current Funding of Higher Education	17
Mission of Public Institutions	19
Research on Advancement Efforts	20
The President’s Role in Fundraising	28
A Dean’s Role in Fundraising	30
Historical Evolution of the CAO	31
Summary	32
III. METHODOLOGY	34
Purpose	34
Research Design	34

Population and Sample	35
Instrumentation	36
Pilot Test.....	37
Survey Procedure	38
IV. RESULTS	39
Demographics	39
Note Regarding Research Questions	46
Research Question 1a.....	46
Research Question 1b	47
Research Question 2	48
Research Question 3a.....	50
Research Question 3b	65
Research Question 4	95
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	97
Purpose.....	97
Findings	98
Demographics	98
Significance and Meaning of Data.....	100
Research Question 1a.....	101
Research Question 1b	101
Research Question 2	102
Research Question 3a.....	103
Research Question 3b	104
Research Question 4	105
Assessment.....	106
Recommendations.....	107
Recommendations for Future Research	109
Summary.....	109
REFERENCES	111
Appendices.....	116
A. CAO Fundraising Success Survey Instrument.....	116

ABSTRACT

State appropriations for higher education continue to decrease as the cost of higher education continues to increase. The extent to which this funding dilemma can be passed to the students via higher tuition and fees is limited. Financial support from sources outside the institution can help replace lost revenue from the state. Private fundraising is the mission of the Advancement Office, under the direction of the Chief Advancement Officer (CAO). Research exists on a president's role in fundraising and to a lesser extent a dean's role in the process; however, little has been written on the best role for a CAO to achieve fundraising success. The survey sample consisted of CAOs at four-year public institutions in the U.S. who were members of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The research was based on two independent variables, CAO education and experience; and one dependent variable, fundraising success at the CAO's institution. The survey was designed around four research questions in search of factors that determine a successful CAO. Feedback from the researcher-designed CAO Success Survey provided beneficial data from current CAOs. Factors identified as most important in the fundraising success of a CAO included involvement of the president, partnerships with the deans, positive reputation of the Advancement Office, a CAO with an advanced degree, management experience, and a supportive staff. It is the CAO's job to implement these factors and lead the Advancement Office to success through productive fundraising efforts.

LIST OF TABLES

4.1 Highest Degree Earned by CAO.....	39
4.2 CAO Major Field of Study	40
4.3 CAO Certified Fund Raising Executive Status.....	40
4.4 CAO Job Title	41
4.5 CAO's Number of Years in Current Position	42
4.6 CAO's Number of Years of Experience in Higher Education.....	42
4.7 CAO's Total Number of Colleges and Universities Employed.....	43
4.8 CAO Years of Professional Experience.....	43
4.9 Summarized Effects of a CAO's Fundraising Efforts	44
4.10 Effects of a CAO's Fundraising Efforts Before and After Arrival at Institution.....	45
4.11 Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Experience and Fundraising Effects	47
4.12 Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Measures of Fundraising Efforts.....	49
4.13 Comparison of CAO Degree and President Involvement in Fundraising.....	51
4.14 Comparison of CAO Degree and Dean's Involvement in Fundraising	52
4.15 Comparison of CAO Degree and Relationship between Athletics & Advancement.....	52
4.16 Comparison of CAO Degree and Internal Reputation of Advancement Office	53
4.17 Comparison of CAO Degree and External Reputation of Advancement Office	54
4.18 Comparison of CAO Degree and Alumni Giving Percent per Year.....	54
4.19 Comparison of CAO Degree and Unrestricted Annual Gifts per Year	55
4.20 Comparison of CAO Degree and Total Giving per Year	56
4.21 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and President's Involvement in Fundraising .	57
4.22 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Deans' Involvement in Fundraising.....	58
4.23 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Relationship with Athletics.....	59
4.24 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Internal Reputation of Advancement	60
4.25 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and External Reputation of Advancement.....	61
4.26 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Annual Alumni Giving Percent	62
4.27 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Unrestricted Annual Gifts	63
4.28 Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Annual Total Giving	64
4.29 Summarized Chi-Squared Analysis of CFRE Status and Fundraising Success	65

4.30	Comparison of CAO Title and President’s Involvement in Fundraising.....	66
4.31	Comparison of CAO Title and Deans’ Involvement in Fundraising	67
4.32	Comparison of CAO Title and Relationship with Athletics	68
4.33	Comparison of CAO Title and Internal Reputation of Advancement Office	69
4.34	Comparison of CAO Title and External Reputation of Advancement	70
4.35	Comparison of CAO Title and Alumni Giving Percent per Year.....	71
4.36	Comparison of CAO Title and Unrestricted Annual Gifts	72
4.37	Comparison of CAO Title and Annual Total Giving.....	72
4.38	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and President’s Involvement.....	73
4.39	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Deans’ Involvement	74
4.40	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Athletics Relationship	75
4.41	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Internal Reputation.....	76
4.42	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and External Reputation.....	77
4.43	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Alumni Giving Percent.....	78
4.44	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Unrestricted Annual Gifts	79
4.45	Comparison of CAO’s Years in Position and Annual Total Giving.....	80
4.46	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and President’s Involvement.....	81
4.47	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Deans’ Involvement	82
4.48	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Relationship with Athletics. 83	
4.49	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Internal Reputation.....	83
4.50	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and External Relationship.....	84
4.51	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Alumni Giving Percent	85
4.52	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Unrestricted Annual Gifts ...	86
4.53	Comparison of CAO’s Years in HE Fundraising and Annual Total Giving	87
4.54	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and President’s Involvement.....	88
4.55	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and Deans’ Involvement	89
4.56	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and Relationship with Athletics	90
4.57	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and Internal Reputation.....	91
4.58	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and External Relationship	92
4.59	Comparison of CAO’s Number of HEIs and Annual Alumni Giving Percent.....	93

4.60 Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Unrestricted Annual Gifts 94
4.61 Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Annual Total Gifts..... 95

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Funding from state sources is decreasing as the costs of higher education are increasing. Much of the rising costs are being passed on to the students, but there is one source of funding that can help ease the financial dilemma in higher education.

Fundraising from sources outside the campus is the responsibility of the advancement office, which is led by the chief advancement officer (CAO). However, according to Sturgis there is disagreement on the most appropriate role of the CAO that leads to successful fundraising (Sturgis, 2006). The goal of this research is to identify the best role for a CAO at a public four-year institution in the United States.

The traditional funding model used by public colleges and universities nationwide is facing a difficult future due to a decrease in financial support traditionally supplied by state legislatures (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008; Ehrenberg, 2006; Proper, Caboni, Hartley, & Willmer, 2009). Lingenfelter, Wright, and Bisel (2005) reported that attention was necessary in areas such as state support, student enrollment, higher education costs, tuition, student aid revenue availability, and economic conditions. These concerns remain critical.

Institutions have been affected by the recent global economic crisis and are being forced to reduce capital expenditures, maintenance expenses, and personnel costs. Freezing and reducing budgets, delaying and canceling building projects, and eliminating faculty and staff positions (Thompson, Katz, & Briechele, 2010) are symptoms of the

current economic crises. Eduventures, a research and consulting firm for higher education, released the findings of a survey of members of a consortium of colleges and universities who reported that they believed budget cuts have affected all departments of their institutions, especially the advancement (fundraising) division. Notably, 75% of the consortium's public member institutions have faced reduced budgets in their advancement offices (Eduventures, 2009). Important to note, the mission of college and university advancement divisions includes the core goal of annually increasing financial support. While the advancement division in every institution of higher education must annually strive to increase financial support, the means by which this goal is accomplished is evolving due to the current economic crisis and decisions made by state legislatures to decrease appropriations for higher education (Holmes, 2010).

Higher Education

Higher education in the United States is comprised of community colleges, private institutions, and traditional four-year, public universities. Private institutions do not receive state financial support and therefore have a history of and dependence on fundraising. Public institutions have traditionally received state dollars to help fund annual operating budgets (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). However, state financial support for higher education has been declining since the mid 1970s (Archibald & Feldman, 2006). In addition to the significant decrease in state funding, the crisis is further complicated by the rate at which operational costs for higher education are rising. This combination of increased costs and decreased state funding affects access and affordability (Satterwhite & Cjeda, 2005). Therefore public institutions, both two-year

and four-year, are becoming more dependent on fundraising programs in the Advancement Division.

Lederman and Jaschik (2011) found that leaders of public institutions identified the biggest challenges they must face in the near future as budget shortfalls and changes in state support, based on a recent survey among college and university presidents done by *Inside Higher Ed*. In addition to these reported challenges, a majority of the presidents surveyed acknowledged the need to rethink the traditional models of higher education in the U.S. (Lederman & Jaschik, 2011). Arizona's Pima Community College's chancellor, Roy Flores, stated, "For public colleges, the state money we've lost is not going to be replaced, ever. But the responses we're seeing are the same ones we've been trying for the last quarter century. We can't use the same strategies" (Lederman & Jaschik, 2011). Similarly, the chancellor of UNC-Greensboro stated, "We really need to focus our attention on alternative sources of revenue, even beyond private philanthropy. We need to be more entrepreneurial" (Carlson, 2011, p. A9). Self-sustaining programs must be developed and implemented, such as alliances with corporations and partnerships with other colleges and universities in order to survive the changes in financial support within public higher education.

Division of Institutional Advancement

A Division of Institutional Advancement is comprised of those departments dealing with external relations: alumni, communication, marketing, and development. The operation can be extensive; therefore, in order to be successful, the programs, methods and management styles should be efficient and effective. The CAO is the

individual charged with fundraising under the supervision of the president or chancellor (Sturgis, 2006). It is critical to have the right person in this key position in order to maximize private gifts and contributions for the institution.

Some form of advancement office has been established on most college and university campuses. Even community colleges have become aware of the added benefit of fundraising, as evidenced by five recent dissertations on the topic (Ciampa, 2009; Garcia, 2009; Gentile, 2009; Jones, 2008; Karns, 2008). Fundraising has become an integral part and an increasing source of revenue throughout higher education. Colleges and universities of all varieties have increased their focus on fundraising from private sources to supply an increasing portion of their budgets (Cook, 1997).

Purpose of the Study

The CAO is given different titles, serves in a variety of capacities, and possesses numerous responsibilities. Consistently, he or she is the person charged with oversight of the advancement office, but the manner in which that responsibility is carried out can vary. The topic of this research is recommended in a previous study. “It is apparent that the chief development officer is the constant driving force behind university fundraising. Additional studies should address the significance of the CDO (Chief Development Officer) to the overall success of the fundraising campaign” (Satterwhite, 2004, p. 147). There is limited research on the role of a CAO, although extensive work exists about the president’s role in fundraising (Hodson, 2010). Research also exists on the role of an academic dean in fundraising (Rosser, Johnsrud & Heck, 2003). The purpose of this

study is to identify the most appropriate role in fundraising for a CAO at a public, four-year institution of higher education in the United States.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education

There are 626 public, four-year institutions in the U.S. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Of that group, 512 institutions are members of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). This association is the leading organization for advancement professionals. One of the stated purposes of CASE is to help its members build stronger relationships with their alumni and donors, as well as raise funds (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2011). The survey sample for this study was CAOs from four-year public institutions in the U.S. who are members of CASE. Only 292 out of the 512 member institutions identified the individual responsible for fundraising as a CAO. Therefore, the survey was distributed to these 292 CAOs.

Individual members of CASE compose the targeted population from which the sample was selected. This sample was contacted using a researcher-designed survey, which was vetted through a pilot test using 12 CAOs. The instrument was influenced by the surveys from three recent studies, all pertaining to CAOs: a profile of respondents' demographic data from a sample of research institutions (Dean, 2007), a model for skill acquisition in the advancement field (Lanning, 2007), and a survey of private institutions in search of key management practices (Murray, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Public institutions of higher education across the country have traditionally received a percentage of their funding directly from their respective state governments. However, competition and demand for state resources have increased dramatically; therefore, the allocation for higher education has eroded (Ehrenberg, 2006). The cost of higher education continues to increase while the funding an institution receives from the state is decreasing. Often the difference is charged directly to the students through increased tuition and fees. The State of Texas passed tuition deregulation legislation beginning in the 1980s, which allows institutions to increase tuition and fees, within limits (Potter, 2003). When tuition dollars cannot be increased further, public institutions will become more reliant on other sources of revenue and private contributions are one of the best alternatives (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). Therefore, public institutions of higher education have been forced to follow the example set by private institutions and implement fundraising programs and procedures to increase funding from external sources.

The central focus of an advancement office is fundraising and likewise, its mission is to increase financial support for the institution. However, advancement offices are organized differently, operate in a variety of ways, and the appropriate CAO role for successful fundraising is not clearly defined. The most common roles include manager of fundraising efforts, researcher, active solicitor, and campus leader (Sturgis, 2006). Due to the lack of an exact role, the issue warrants investigation which leads to the topic of this study: role identification for the CAO at four-year public colleges and universities in the United States.

Research Questions

The focus of this study is based on the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the education and the experience of the CAO and the results of fundraising at the institution?
2. Is there a significant difference in fundraising results prior to the CAO's arrival and fundraising results after the CAO's arrival?
3. Is there a correlation between education and experience of the CAO and the difference in fundraising results prior to and after the CAO's arrival?
4. What is the most appropriate role for the CAO as the head of fundraising for a four-year public institution of higher education based on the difference of the fundraising results prior to and after the CAO's arrival?

The following variables will be used to guide the research survey:

- Education of the CAO
- Experience of the CAO
- Institution's fundraising results prior to CAO's arrival
- Institution's fundraising results after CAO's arrival

Assumptions

1. Funding provided by state governments to institutions of higher education will continue to decrease as a revenue source for annual operating budgets.

2. University administrators and the fundraising staff at public institutions understand and accept the responsibility of and the increasing need for a higher level of private financial support.
3. Public colleges and universities understand their mission to provide access and affordability to the students in the state.
4. The CAO understands the overall goal of the development operation to raise funds for the institution, as well as to build its endowment.
5. The CAO realizes that fundraising is a team effort.
6. Private financial support will become increasingly important in allowing public institutions to continue to operate and offer higher education opportunities.

Limitations

The focus of this study is limited to public higher education institutions within the United States who are members of CASE; therefore, the findings should not be generalized to colleges and universities in other countries. Even the transferability across all public institutions in the United States should be made with caution due to differences in age, size, and mission of each institution.

Similarly, this study is not indicative of the nation's private colleges and universities. Even though similarities exist between public and private institutions regarding operations, revenue sources are less similar. Private institutions receive no direct state funding. Although the percentage of state funding at public institutions is

decreasing, it remains substantial enough that the state could be considered the second largest revenue source (Ehrenberg, 2006), with tuition being the largest funding source.

Procedures and protocol among development offices at public institutions across the country varies. Some institutions have a young fundraising operation with a limited staff; others are established programs with an extensive staff. Smaller institutions may have only one fundraising professional and an assistant, whereas a mature development operation can consist of several layers of management and a variety of operations. Examples of the components within a mature fundraising office include: annual giving, major gift officers, planned giving, corporations and foundations, accounting, database management, investment services, gift processing, research services, stewardship, and recognition.

Another limitation is the priority placed on fundraising by the president or chancellor of the college or university. College presidents are spending an increasingly significant portion of time in development work (Proper et al., 2009). However, participation levels and time devoted to fundraising varies according to the individual serving as president. Most presidents at public institutions likely agree on the importance of fundraising, both for current operations and the institution's future. A president involved in fundraising builds the development team through identifying and selecting the most appropriate CAO, as well as personally takes a leadership role in the process (Satterwhite, 2004).

Individual differences among presidents and CAOs represent a limitation. In addition to time commitment, the amount of exposure, previous training, leadership style,

personality, work ethic, and management style have an impact on an institution's fundraising success.

Delimitations

This study centers on the individuals that lead the advancement operation of an institution, regardless of title. The research will consider a CAO's level of education and amount of experience. In most cases the CAO reports to the president and has a staff for whom they are responsible. This individual will likely be involved in many additional assignments which can alter or affect the success of the fundraising operation (Sturgis, 2006). Some of these added duties could be strategic planning, accreditation visits, service on university committees, changes in personnel, and often a presidential change.

This study will only consider public institutions of higher education within the United States. Public colleges and universities are experiencing downward trends in financial support provided by the state and must concentrate on other sources of revenue (Hossler, Lund, Ramin, Westfall, & Irish, 1997). The challenge of replacing the second largest source of financial support is sobering, but fortunately is being implemented on a gradual basis. One beneficial legislative move to help offset the loss of state funding has been tuition deregulation (Potter, 2003). This allows some flexibility to the state's higher education institutions, but it cannot totally compensate for the revenue loss from state sources and further emphasizes the need for private support. Costs of higher education are rising faster than inflation. Care must be given to the rate of increase for tuition and fees so that an institution does not price itself above the students' ability to pay (Mumper, 1996).

Definition of Terms

Many industries and fields of study have their own vocabulary and fundraising in higher education is no exception. The following terms are used throughout this study:

- Advancement, development and fundraising are interchangeable terms for the process of raising private financial support in higher education.
- Chief Advancement Officer (CAO) is the head of fundraising for an institution of higher education. Titles include Vice President, Vice Chancellor, President of the Foundation, Executive Director, and more.
- Chief Development Officer (CDO) is synonymous to CAO.
- Public institutions are institutions which receive appropriated funding from its state legislature (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008).
- Private institutions are institutions which receive no direct funding from the state.
- Endowment is a permanent fund that is invested; only annual earnings are used as support and the principal is not accessible.
- Annual funds are contributions given on an annual basis, often for unrestricted support collected via phone, direct mail, and electronic mail through mass appeal, usually less than \$1000 per gift.
- Major gifts are specific in purpose, solicited on an individual basis and are normally contributions of \$10,000 or more which can be paid over a few years.

- Planned giving (or deferred giving) refers to eventual gifts through a donor's estate, such as annuities, bequests, life insurance, trusts, and other vehicles that allow a donor to fund a gift upon their death.
- CASE is the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, an association for higher education advancement personnel.
- CFRE stands for Certified Fund Raising Executive, sponsored by the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP).

Summary

State funding for public colleges and universities continues to decrease while the costs of higher education continue to climb. Tuition and fees are gradually increasing, thereby transferring the lost revenue from the state to the students. However another funding mechanism that has become common place is fundraising from external sources, mainly alumni and friends. Private fundraising is the mission of the Office of Institutional Advancement on most college campuses and the CAO is the person responsible.

The goal of this study is to identify the best role for the CAO at a public four-year institution in the U.S. for successful fundraising. This will be accomplished using a survey distributed to CAOs at public four-year colleges and universities who are members of CASE. The predictor variables used are a CAO's education and experience, while the outcome variable is the CAO's fundraising success at their current institution.

This dissertation consists of four additional chapters. Chapter II is the literature review which concentrates on the history of fundraising, current funding of higher education, the mission of public institutions, research on advancement efforts, the role of the president and dean in fundraising, as well as the historical evolution of a CAO. Chapter III contains the research methods that will be used to contact the target sample, collect data through the survey, and analyze comparative data regarding the specific role of the CAO in the fundraising operation. It includes the purpose, research design, population and sample, instrumentation, and procedures. Chapter IV is the description and analysis of the data. Finally, Chapter V is the discussion and assessment of the findings of this study, as well as the recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Fundraising has become a key component in the success of any institution of higher education in the United States. Private colleges and universities receive no direct financial support from their state governments and have relied on private funding throughout their history (Ehrenberg & Rizzo, 2004). Conversely, public colleges and universities began as state-supported institutions providing an educational opportunity to the state residents (Hossler, Lund, & Ramin, 1997). “Traditionally, public higher education has been viewed as a social good that yields benefit to the nation as a whole” (Ehrenberg, 2006, p.47). As needs have shifted for many states, priorities have emerged which more urgently require a state’s resources. Prioritized needs, such as “Medicaid, elementary and secondary education, and the criminal justice systems” (Ehrenberg, 2006, p.46), all fall before higher education. In turn, the importance of funding from the state to support higher education has become less significant and less urgent. As a result of rising operating costs and declining state appropriations, public institutions have been forced to find new funding sources (Archibald & Feldman, 2004).

As state funding allocations for higher education continues to decrease and costs continue to rise, the importance and necessity of private funding is evident (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). Many universities and colleges established an advancement office, a department responsible for raising financial support to ensure the financial stability of an institution. The advancement office oversees all fundraising activities and programs to secure external funding for an institution (Panas, 2005). Types of procured funds include

private contributions; donations and gifts, which are most commonly received from individuals; corporations and foundations; as well as other types of gifts, most commonly in the form as cash, pledges, and assets, which include property, securities, annuities, trusts, and other estate gifts (Brakeley, 1980)

The necessity and development of an advancement office within institutions generated a new need, with a unique and eminent position, the director of the advancement office. The director of the advancement office is most commonly referred to as the Chief Advancement Officer (CAO). The responsibility of the CAO is to raise and increase outside financial support for the institution (Sturgis, 2006). Across the entire range of institutions, from community colleges to major research universities, the role of the CAO and his/her advancement office is the pursuit of commitments for financial resources (Satterwhite, 2004). While there is minimal research on the role and function of a CAO, the amount of research on a president's role and a dean's role in fundraising is extensive (Cook, 1997; Hodson, 2010; Waugh, 2003). As state funding for higher education continues to decrease, the role of the CAO and mission of the advancement office becomes more important.

History of Fundraising in Higher Education

Philanthropy has been a part of the higher education landscape for centuries. Notably, in 1636 John Harvard donated the most significant gift that had been documented and his generosity was instrumental in the establishment of the private institution that bears his name (Rhodes, 1997). Private schools do not receive traditional funding from the state and have had a long history of dependence on fundraising (Cook,

1994). In contrast, public institutions have historically and largely relied on state government funding, with a relatively small percentage of the annual budget derived from tuition and fees (Archibald & Feldman, 2006). State funding for higher education has been decreasing for 30 years and “aggregate state effort has fallen by 30% since the late 1970’s” (Archibald & Feldman, 2006, p. 618). This trend in state funding caused many institutions to look to private fundraising to supply an increased percentage of their budgets. Many public institutions began fundraising programs during the mid-1970s, and by the early 1980s institutions were seeking opportunities in the private sector to assist with financial needs. Gradually, over the past three decades, public institutions have matched private institutions in their commitment to and reliance on private funding (Cook, 1997).

Seymour (1988), Panas (1988), and Brakeley (1980) developed early fundraising models for CAOs within institutional settings. These three authors wrote about professional fundraising early in the development of institutional advancement, establishing a blueprint for CAOs. Seymour (1988), an early authority on professional fundraising, helped fundraising evolve into a recognized profession. Brakeley (1980) stated that Seymour is “one of the deans of this business of ours and one of the greats of yesteryear” (Brakeley, 1980, p. ix). The earliest books on fundraising were not specific to higher education but more broadly applied to a wide variety of fundraising throughout the non-profit sector. Common terms that were used in early non-profit fundraising circles included *cause*, *participation*, and *support*, as well as *purpose*, *policy*, and *program* (Seymour, 1988). These terms translate into current higher education fundraising phrases such as *case statement*, *constituency* and *capital campaign*. Panas

(1988) was an early advocate for fundraising specific to higher education. He was instrumental in the transition of the development office into a place of permanence in higher education. As one of the earliest fundraising consultants, he authored the bestseller, *Mega Gifts: Who Gives Them, Who Gets Them* (2005). In 1988, Panas challenged his readers, “Unless you try something beyond what you have already mastered, you will never grow” (p. 21). Brakely (1980), Panas (1988, 2005), and Seymour (1988) established the necessity of the Advancement Office within most colleges and universities.

Current Funding of Higher Education

Public higher education receives funding from two main sources: state appropriations and students (i.e., tuition and fees). However, priorities have shifted; there are more demands for state revenues and greater challenges to meet legislative funding requests (Ehrenberg, 2006). State financial support for higher education has become a lower priority, reducing the emphasis on the basic mission of public higher education: providing access, affordability, and diversity for residents (Eckel & King, 2004). State governments are faced with the dilemma of having to justify essential state services, including higher education, in an environment of decreasing budgets and increasing demands (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). Increased funding needs for Medicaid, K-12 education, and the criminal justice system have put more pressure on the use of state tax revenues, resulting in state budget deficits (Ehrenberg, 2006). The proportion of state budget allocations going to higher education has declined steadily since fiscal year 1977-78 (Hossler et al., 1997). A shift in priorities has restricted state revenues and has

prevented funding higher education at previous levels. Likewise, there have been reductions in the percent of the average state budget allocation for higher education (Ehrenberg, 2006).

Traditionally, state governments have been the second largest source of revenue for public institutions. In fiscal year 1989-90 state support in all forms accounted for 42% of the revenue for public institutions (Hossler et al., 1997). As a result, the student is inheriting a greater portion of the expenses. Students and families are paying 142% more compared to what they paid in 1980. State appropriations per full-time-equivalent student in 2003-04 reached their lowest point in a 30-year timeframe (Hossler et al., 1997). When tuition dollars cannot be increased further, public higher education institutions will become especially reliant upon alternative sources of revenue. Private giving is one of the more promising possibilities (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008).

Tuition increases are different for public and private higher education institutions. Among private institutions, the increases are due to “the rising costs of technology, student services, and institutional financial aid; the unrelenting competition to be the best in every dimension” (Ehrenberg & Rizzo, 2004, p. 1). Public institutions experience all these demands, plus a reduction of state support. As a follow-up to “the unrelenting competition to be the best in every dimension of an institution’s activities” (p. 1), the authors quote cowboy humorist Will Rogers, “Even if you’re on the right track, you’ll get run over if you just sit there” (Ehrenberg & Rizzo, 2004, p. 3). The world continues to change, and higher education is no exception. A campus physical plant grows. Student enrollments increase. Budgets, curriculum, and technologies change. As the funding landscape changes, higher education must adapt.

The average college or university undergoes annual reviews and participates in strategic planning in response to societal change and student demands, in order to maintain its level of success. A leading institution strives for continuous improvement to develop new programs, take on new research and advance with technology (Alexander, 2000). Financial support from outside sources has become even more important as higher education looks to the future. “Private fund raising by both public and private institutions has, in recent times, increasingly become a mechanism for competitive advantage” (Cook & Lasher, 1996, p. 15).

Fundraising is a social exchange between donors and an institution. “Giving is visceral. Individuals will view your long list of details and specifics with pious and quiet admiration, but this will seldom move mega givers to audacious action” (Panas, 2005, p.129). It is a dynamic process built over time through relationships (Seymour, 1988). Quality is a big part of the fundraising mix. Commitment to achieve and maintain quality is a worthy goal, but also one that requires financial resources (Cook, 1994). Successful fundraising allows institutions to move more easily along the path of continuous improvement and excellence.

Mission of Public Institutions

In general, public higher education institutions have an obligation to serve the state’s entire population, not only the current students on campus. Through a state’s extension services, land grant colleges and universities have been major vehicles to supply knowledge to farmers, ranchers, consumers, and industry (Ehrenberg, 2006). Cutbacks in state funding for these services have forced state agencies serving the public

to become more entrepreneurial, and public colleges and universities are being forced to become more reliant on fundraising. When tuition and fees have been raised to their limits, public institutions must look elsewhere for revenue sources (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). “Research indicates there is a social return to higher education that includes increased income for non-college graduates, increased state tax revenues, increased intergenerational mobility, and lower welfare costs” (Ehrenberg, 2006, p. 52). A continued decrease in state appropriations could result in not only a lower percent of the population attending and completing college, but fewer benefits and services to the state’s entire population.

Public colleges and universities have become more accurately described as simply state-assisted, whereas previously the term was state-supported. Tuition and fees should be viewed as limited sources of revenue for public institutions and must be held at reasonable levels (Archibald & Feldman, 2006). Private support through aggressive fundraising efforts allows an institution to move from average academic programs to great academic programs. Private fundraising allows the opportunity for continued improvement at many institutions (Cook, 1997).

Research on Advancement Efforts

Fundraising has been neglected as a topic of extensive study and lacks historical perspective with most of the research on the subject having been conducted in recent years (Cook & Lasher, 1996). In a search for existing research on higher education fundraising relating to the CAO, some relevant studies were discovered (Dean, 2007; Lanning, 2007; Murray, 2008). Topics researched included the president’s involvement

and role in development work (Gentile, 2009; Goddard, 2009; Karns, 2008; Nehls, 2007), alumni participation in fundraising (Hurst, 2008; Leahy, 2009), and the more recent trend of development among community colleges (Ciampa, 2009; Garcia, 2009; Jones, 2008). Lanning (2007) pointed out the challenge of developing expertise in fundraising by major gift officers with minimal previous experience, most of whom were hired from other fields of employment.

Lanning (2007) found that the average female development officer tends to be Caucasian, from 41-60 years of age, and possesses a Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) credential. The Association of Fundraising Professionals is an international organization providing certification in fundraising and a practice-based credential for career professionals (Certified Fund Raising Executive International, 2009). The average male development officer tends to be older with more formal education. Due to the Lanning (2007) findings that most individuals in this study came to their fundraising positions by accident, with no experience and little preparation, the author developed a model for skill acquisition, including a recommended curriculum. Although a list of characteristics leading to expertise in the field of fundraising was identified, there was no reference or recommendation provided for a development officer to ascend to the role of CAO (Lanning, 2007).

Dean (2007) investigated perceptions of CAOs regarding major factors of influence that determined increased alumni giving. Dean (2007) determined that the factors can be divided into the following three categories: socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors. Of particular interest was a profile for an average CAO constructed from information obtained by respondents. The mean age was

just over fifty years, the CAO had been in his or her current position at least five years and had more than twenty years fundraising experience, eighteen of which were in higher education (Dean, 2007). Although the findings were beneficial, the study did not provide insight into factors determining the best role for a CAO nor their effectiveness.

More closely aligned to this research was a study to determine key management practices used by CAOs and variables that improved fundraising results (Murray, 2008). Murray (2008) found that the average CAO was generally a male holding the title of Vice President for Institutional Advancement. Most had been in his or her current position only four years, 90% of these individuals supervised the offices of development and alumni relations. However, most did not hold a terminal degree, nor did they have any official certification, such as CFRE. The CAO is responsible for managing other programs in addition to normal administrative duties and oversight of development, alumni, and public relations (Murray, 2008). The focus of this research was on management activities and programs, in addition to the descriptive statistics given for an average CAO.

The most common topic among research studies on fundraising in higher education focused on the president's role and involvement in the process. The focus of Nehls' (2007) research was on fundraising challenges as a result of a presidential change during a capital campaign. She found that the typical capital campaign has recently increased in duration while the length of stay of an average president has declined. Since campus leadership is one of the keys to successful fundraising, making a presidential change presents a challenge to fundraising. Nehls (2007) considered the effects of a presidential transition during a capital campaign from the perspective of the CAO.

Schlossberg's transition theory was used as a theoretical framework; however, each campus situation was different. One similar observation consistent at all nine institutions that were part of this study was that a presidential transition had a negative effect on fundraising success (Nehls, 2007).

Two case studies (Gentile, 2009, Goddard, 2009) compared the development programs among a similar group of institutions. Goddard (2009) considered the fundraising experiences of ten presidents at colleges and universities located within the same Midwestern state. Goddard (2009) discovered the following three major themes: preparation for successful fundraising is obtained from a variety of sources; fundraising is not the necessary evil it is often portrayed to be; and fundraising work presents a situation that a president can use to build a legacy. Overall, the responses of the presidents interviewed can be summarized as three opportunities--to tell their institution's story, to connect donors to meaningful projects, and to make an impact on the lives of students (Goddard, 2009). This case study provided relevant and supportive information. Fundraising is often seen as negative, mostly by those who do not understand the process and have not had fundraising experience. However, successful fundraising can easily be one of the most rewarding aspects of administrative work in higher education.

Another case study included a sampling of nine public community college presidents in New Jersey and their leadership views of fundraising as a revenue source (Gentile, 2009). The study is centered on preserving the American dream of pursuing a college degree while attempting to ensure access and affordability during difficult economic times. The intent of the research was to present the presidents' responses to the dilemma of declining public funding and to determine whether private fundraising was a

viable alternative source of funds. Discoveries made as a result of the study in New Jersey were not dissimilar to situations faced by institutions in other states. There were three overriding observations as a result of the research: public funding will continue to decline; the president's expanding role must include the fact that higher education is a public good; and there is growing pressure for additional sources of revenue (Gentile, 2009). Even though this study is from the perspective of only one state, it is consistent with other findings and supports the theory that an institution's future is dependent on its success in fundraising (Carlson, 2011; Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008; Hodson, 2010; Proper et al., 2009).

In Karns' (2008) research, the topic of fundraising was instrumental in the minds of community college vice presidents as they contemplated the possibility of becoming president. Ten individuals were interviewed in a study regarding their transitional considerations of taking on the role of president and in particular, their role in fundraising. Karns (2008) found that the process of securing private funds for the institution was seen as a necessary evil. However, while the vice presidents did not feel they would be successful at fundraising they did not regard it as an obstacle that would prevent them from becoming president (Karns, 2008). Even though this research was a qualitative study on the leadership at community colleges, the results reflected the consistent, negative reaction to fundraising. The interviews also reflect the lack of history, experience, and expectations in fundraising for two-year institutions.

These studies provided information supporting and confirming the fact that the endorsement and participation of campus leadership is essential and important for successful fundraising (Hodson, 2010). However, the focus is on the president and

therefore application for the CAO is an assumption made from observations upon the president. Some of the data is transferable to the CAO; however, any comparisons should be done with caution. The total focus of the CAO is development, whereas the president's attention is spread over many areas, therefore only partially on fundraising (Sturgis, 2006). One conclusion can be drawn based on the number of studies reviewed on the topic of the president and fundraising: the importance of having the top campus administrator involved in fundraising remains a high priority, if not a necessity. For the development operation to be successful the president must be a strong leader with a focus on teamwork, communication, and the ability to set goals and objectives (Satterwhite & Cjeda, 2005).

Among research relating to alumni involvement in fundraising, Hurst (2008) examined the giving preferences of nontraditional versus traditional alumni. Nontraditional alumni are defined as those who attended class off campus as students, compared to traditional alumni who attended on campus as students. A limitation of this quantitative study was that data was collected from alumni at only one institution in the Southwest. Hurst (2008) found that there were no significant differences among the two alumni groups in several categories, including giving frequency, level of involvement, and age at graduation. However, one significant difference among the two populations was their motivations for giving, which was lower among the nontraditional alumni (Hurst, 2008). In a general sense, the findings are transferable to other colleges and universities. Although there was no reference to the development office, the research does provide support for placing a priority for fundraising from traditional students.

Leahy (2009) chronicled how an institution in the Northeast increased fundraising over a ten year period. The university selected for this study was chosen intentionally based on the Council for the Aid to Education's Voluntary Support of Education (VSE) rankings in 1997 compared to 2007. This particular institution displayed the highest percentage improvement in giving over the ten year period. The author noted that his research led him to believe that effective fundraising programs have become critical to the growth and survival of some institutions. Leahy's (2009) research questions targeted the reasons for this institution's success and how other institutions can improve based on this example. This qualitative study provided pertinent information suggesting that effective development offices are essential to the future of many institutions (Leahy, 2009). This research was conducted on a private institution which had achieved the highest increase in fundraising improvement in the nation over the ten year period. Fundraising at a private institution is not always comparable to that of a public college or university, and in this case the institution already possessed a highly efficient development operation.

Research on community college fundraising were also considered (Ciampa, 2009; Garcia, 2009; Jones, 2008). The first was specific to the fifty, two-year institutions in the State of Texas and was initiated due to the limited research available on fundraising efforts at community colleges. Garcia's (2009) research premise was based on decreased funding due to a weakened economy and the need for community colleges to expand their fundraising efforts, becoming more similar in their development programs to the traditional four-year institutions. Findings of this study related to the age, location, and size of the community college and the effects that those factors had on successful

fundraising. However the author makes it clear that all indications point toward a greater need for research on fundraising at community colleges (Garcia, 2009).

Also reviewed was a case study in search of the factors that determined successful fundraising among community colleges. This was a qualitative study that interviewed CAOs at twelve institutions with a track record of successful fundraising programs. Jones (2008) found that the most decisive factor was an overall commitment to institutional fundraising. This commitment was defined as a president who designated resources for development work, in addition to being personally involved in the fundraising process (Jones, 2008). This is confirmation of the importance of a president's time dedicated and devoted to the fundraising activities of an institution, also reinforcing the topic of the dissertations which inspired this study (Cook, 1994; Satterwhite, 2004).

Finally, Ciampa's (2009) study of community college fundraising work was reviewed. It was a qualitative study of institutions of the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The research focused on the community college CAO and their expectations, responsibilities, relationships, and commitments. Ciampa (2009) found that the development offices of two-year institutions should follow the model established in 1958 by the American College Public Relations Association, which recommended consolidation of an institution's externally-focused programs (alumni relations, development, and public relations) under one centralized unit. This is the same model and justification used at many four-year institutions under the title of Institutional Advancement for these same functions of external relations (Seymour, 1988). Results of Ciampa's (2009) interviews display the need for clear policies and procedures in order to

produce the best results in private fundraising. She also emphasized the benefit of the advancement offices in building strong relationships with alumni and the advantage in beginning this process while they are students (Ciampa, 2009). Fundraising among community colleges is new and therefore lacks historical perspective. However these studies (Ciampa, 2009; Garcia, 2009; Jones, 2008) offer information confirming the benefit of including the local community in the development process, as well as the importance of outside financial support.

The President's Role in Fundraising

When considering general fundraising research, one clear message was constant: successful fundraising begins with leadership (Brakeley, 1980; Panas, 1988; Seymour, 1988). The same message is consistent in professional journals outlining the importance and involvement of campus leadership as prerequisite for successful fundraising in higher education.

Administration in higher education has traditionally been selected from among the ranks of the faculty, often with academic qualifications outweighing administrative skills (Waugh, 2003). However, due to pressure for greater efficiency, performance and productivity, there has been added emphasis on executive-centered management, in addition to economic constraints forcing institutions to focus on accountability and fundraising (Lederman & Jaschik, 2011). The pressure to perform often originates from governing boards, which are largely comprised of business people and therefore bring a business model approach. Even though research exists and the argument can be supported that a college is not like a business (Winston, 1998), the demands are such that

many institutions and leadership are being evaluated and judged according to business principles. More often than not, the measurement standard for higher education is the same measurement being used in business, the comparison of revenues to expenses (Ehrenberg & Rizzo, 2004). In addition to a clear understanding of the academic arena, in uncertain economic times, the characteristics most highly valued in a president are fundraising skills and leadership (Dorich, 1991). Fundraising is a team effort and the president is the key player on that team.

Presidents should focus their effort and attention on fundraising in two areas, major gifts and leadership (Cook, 1997). The challenge is finding time for fundraising in a president's demanding schedule. Constraints dictated by campus activities, events, and meetings often produce an inflexible schedule that is a requirement and the responsibility of being a college president (Satterwhite & Cedja, 2005). Because of that fact, many presidents and deans cannot afford to spend 20 to 50% of their time on fundraising, which is the standard often recommended by consultants (Hodson, 2010). Therefore, it is crucial that the president set aside time each week, or at least several times a month, in order to be actively involved in fundraising and to achieve successful results. In economic terms, there are opportunity costs associated with fundraising for the president. Development work requires time outside the office to thank contributors and meet with prospective donors, which takes away from other responsibilities (Sturgis, 2006). An effective president accepts fundraising as part of the job, sees it as a great way make a lasting impression, and embraces the opportunity to leave the institution in better financial shape than before their arrival (Cook, 1997). By necessity, college and university presidents are becoming more responsive to outside constituencies and less

sensitive to faculty and staff (Waugh, 2003). A president is now judged on whether the institution raised more funds under his or her watch than under the previous administration (Cook, 1997). Academic credentials and a clear understanding of how higher education works will continue to be important to a college president. However, in a challenging economic environment, a president will be evaluated based on their experience and leadership skills in the fundraising arena (Dorich, 1991).

A Dean's Role in Fundraising

College and university deans have primarily served in an academic capacity and have traditionally performed an administrative role. Their responsibility has been to ensure the consistent quality of academic programs in their particular area (Waugh, 2003). However, an academic dean's role has shifted from an almost exclusively student-centered mission to a focus on quality demanded by donors who often want excellence across programs (Wolverton, Gmelch, & Montez, 2003). The changing role of an academic dean is linked to the transition of how higher education is funded. As an institution deals with increasing expenses, declining state support and limited tuition increases, academic deans have inherited the additional responsibility of fundraising (Randall, 2001). The rising costs of maintaining current technology, improving research, in addition to recruiting and retaining quality faculty can be overwhelming, if not impossible, on a typical university budget (Ehrenberg, 2006). It is becoming necessary that the academic dean must be involved in the process of securing private funding (Hodson, 2010). An academic unit within an institution wishes to improve instruction, strengthen the research infrastructure, provide more financial assistance to faculty, and

spend more money on countless other activities (Wolverton, et al., 2003). Given this appetite for additional resources, a dean must be involved in fundraising (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). In today's higher education environment, a dean cannot be judged truly successful if he/she does not secure philanthropic support (Randall, 2001).

Historical Evolution of the CAO

The participation and involvement of campus leadership is one of the requirements for effective fundraising. In order to be successful, the president must be a strong leader, focused on teamwork, promote productive communication, and be willing to work with the development team (Sturgis, 2006). Historically, presidents of public institutions delegated the daily fundraising responsibilities to a professional development staff in order to pay more attention to academic concerns, public relations, budgets, and other matters (Cook, 1994). As the job and responsibility of attracting contributions grew, a new position of one individual responsible for all fundraising operations began to emerge. The CAO became the manager of development activities, the lead fundraiser, the executive director of the volunteer board, and the person responsible for investment of the endowment (Seymour, 1988). The position evolved into a campus leader because the function became essential to the financial success of an institution (Sturgis, 2006). Changes eventually led to the most common title of Vice President of Institutional Advancement which incorporates all external relations of a college or university, including the offices of alumni, development, and public affairs (Cook & Lasher, 1996). Often the CAO is a member of the president's cabinet, along with the other vice

presidents. The CAO is the operational officer over fundraising under the direction and supervision of president (Satterwhite & Cedja, 2005).

Crawford (1976) researched the role of the CAO, and the purpose of the study was to outline the duties, characteristics and scope of the CAO. The results were demographic statistics such as age, sex, level of education, and experience. Other data gathered included fundraising experience of presidents, the time devoted to fundraising by the president, and an attempt to determine areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the role of the CAO. This quantitative study collected data from a sample of presidents and CAOs at both public and private institutions (Crawford, 1976) and was among the earliest research involving the CAO.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to examine and recommend the appropriate role for the CAO in a public institution of higher education in the State of Texas. It is built on the groundwork laid in a study titled, *University Presidents in Fundraising: A Study of Public Universities with Campaigns less than \$100 million* (Satterwhite, 2004). Satterwhite (2004) focused on the president and the specific role in the fundraising process, and is an extension of an earlier study, *Courting Philanthropy: The Role of University Presidents and Chancellors in Fund Raising* (Cook, 1994). Cook's (1994) focus was on a president's role in a fundraising campaign of more than \$100 million. These studies provide beneficial information, but have limited application to the CAO. Some variety of opinion exists among professionals on the appropriate role for the CAO, whether manager, researcher, fundraiser, or campus leader (Sturgis, 2006). While there is

extensive research on the president's role in fundraising (Cook, 1997; Dorich, 1991; Gentile, 2009; Goddard, 2009; Hodson, 2010; Karns, 2008; Nehls, 2007; Satterwhite & Cedja, 2005; Sturgis, 2006; Waugh, 2003) and some on a dean's role (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008; Randall, 2001; Wolverton et al., 2003), the need exists to research current practices and recommendations for the most appropriate role for a CAO at public institution of higher education.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to discover significant correlations between the CAO and his or her effect and impact on fundraising at the institution. As a result, recommendations will be made to identify significant variables that influence a CAO's fundraising success. Satterwhite (2004) states, "it is apparent that the chief development officer (CDO) is the constant driving force behind university fundraising. Additional studies should address the significance of the CDO" (Satterwhite, 2004, p. 174). Using this statement as a benchmark and based on the lack of specific research in this area, a statistical exploration of information directly relating to the CAO was conducted. The intent of this research is to identify the appropriate role for the CAO that leads to fundraising success. Data was collected using a newly developed and piloted survey from current CAOs regarding education and experience (independent variables) and regarding their institution's current fundraising results, prior to arrival through current standing (dependent variable). Regression analyses, bivariate correlations, and descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data.

Research Design

The justification of this study is a result of the research presented in Chapter II. Based on the current funding model of public higher education, combined with the current trend of the reduction of state funding, there is an increased need, even a sense of

urgency, to increase private financial support. Since there is minimal research on the CAO, the person directly charged with the mission of fundraising for an institution, there is a need for data specific to the CAO and their effect on fundraising results of the institution.

Population and Sample

There are more than 4000 institutions of higher education in the United States. CASE has over 3400 member organizations, including colleges and universities, primary and secondary independent and international schools, as well as non-profit organizations in 68 countries (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2011). The organization serves more than 60,000 advancement professionals, which encompass various positions within the advancement division. The population is the entire group of advancement professionals in higher education. Many individuals working in advancement (alumni, communications, marketing, development) could provide recommendations for the most appropriate role for the CAO. However, respondents were limited to those currently serving in the capacity of CAO. Private institutions have participated in external fundraising throughout their history but only recently have public institutions been forced to depend more heavily on private support. Therefore, the survey will be limited to CAOs at public, four-year colleges and universities. There are 630 public, four-year institutions in the United States (Eckel & King, 2004) and it is from this group the sample of CAOs was selected. Specifically, the entire sample is CAOs of public, four-year institutions who are also members of CASE. At present there are 512

public, four-year colleges and universities which are members of CASE. Of these 512 institutions, 292 identify their head of fundraising using the title of CAO.

Instrumentation

The CAO oversees fundraising at the institution, carrying out the mission of the advancement office in securing financial contributions. However, existing research on the CAO is minimal, in particular, studies on the most appropriate role for the CAO that result in successful fundraising for an institution. Constructs and items used to develop this survey were influenced by previous research.

The survey was designed based on the variables that are present in the role of the CAO: level of education, level of experience, and change in fundraising results while in the role of CAO. The survey was specifically designed to identify levels of education and experience of CAOs at public, four-year colleges and universities across the nation, that are also members of CASE. Constructs were developed to describe the CAO through his or her education and experience in order to establish an individual identity for each CAO. Another construct was developed in order to measure each CAO's fundraising effectiveness at the institution. Items measuring fundraising success are intended to compare results at the institution prior to the CAO's arrival to current fundraising results under the CAO's direction. Survey items are both open-ended and ordinal, using a four point Likert scale consisting of strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and no change. The open-ended items were treated as qualitative responses and analyzed through content analysis and sorted into themes.

One previous study constructed a profile of chief advancement officers from respondents' demographic data. This research began with a population of CAOs from 283 Carnegie Doctoral Research Universities and resulted in 250 surveys being distributed (Dean, 2007). Another study generated a model for skill acquisition in higher education fundraising (Lanning, 2007). A third study surveyed 136 CAOs from private institutions in search of key management practices (Murray, 2008). These three surveys provided information used in developing the instrument for this study.

Pilot Test

The purpose of the pilot test is to evaluate the reliability and validity of the instrument (Bryant, 2004) through analyses and feedback from a representative panel of CAOs, not to be included in the final survey. The drafted instrument was sent to twelve CAOs and requested feedback concerning the construct validity of the items. The exercise was originally intended to be a survey review by an expert panel of CAOs, prior to distribution of a pilot test. The expert panel consisted of six individuals from private institutions, four from public institutions, and two from health science centers. The draft was sent to the panel with a one week deadline for participation in the survey, as well as individual evaluation of each survey item. Ten of the twelve CAOs responded favorably with minor recommendations and expressed interest in obtaining final survey results. Based on the high response rate with minimal revisions, it was decided that the expert panel would also serve as the pilot test. Final adjustments to the instrument were made based on the results of the pilot. The final edition was distributed to the target sample through Survey Monkey.

Survey Procedure

The finalized instrument was sent via email to the sample population: CAOs at four-year public institutions in the United States who are members of CASE. A request was made to CASE for its membership list of CAOs that fit the criteria of this survey and permission to survey the individuals from this list of members. A complete summary and explanation of this research project was provided to CASE as justification. Upon approval of the request by CASE, initial contact was made to the CAO sample via email. The initial contact consisted of an introduction, a condensed summary of the research and notification of the online instrument within one week. The second notice included an invitation to participate in the study and link to the online survey. The instructions within the email stated that the survey would be available for two weeks, with three reminders, and a follow-up email informing the participants that the survey was closed.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Demographics

The survey was distributed electronically to a sample of 292 CAOs at four-year public institutions in the U.S. who were members of CASE. There were a total of 111 CAOs who responded to the survey and 100 of those completed the survey representing a return rate of 34.2%.

The first three items corresponded to the independent variable, CAO Education. As shown in Table 4.1 roughly half of the CAOs had a master's degree.

Table 4.1

Highest Degree Earned by CAO

Degree	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's	22	21.0
Master's	57	54.3
Doctoral	26	24.8
Total	105	100.0

The second item asked for the CAO's major field of study. There were 107 respondents. In order to facilitate statistical analysis of this open-ended item, researchers recoded responses into one of three main categories: Business, Education, or Communications. Any additional field of study was categorized as "Other." Responses are shown in Table 4.2

Table 4.2

CAO Major Field of Study

Degree	Frequency	Percent
Business	34	31.8
Education	26	24.3
Communications	21	19.6
Other	26	24.3
Total	107	100.0

The final item relating to a CAO's education was CFRE status. As shown in Table 4.3, the majority of CAOs surveyed (89.7%) were not Certified Fundraising Executives.

Table 4.3

CAO Certified Fund Raising Executive Status

CFRE Status	Frequency	Percent
Yes	11	10.3
No	96	89.7
Total	107	100.0

The predictor variable addressed in survey items 4 through 7 was CAO work experience. Item 4 was open-ended and respondents were asked to provide their current job title. In order to facilitate statistical analysis of this open-ended item, researchers grouped responses into the following four categories: Vice President, Vice Chancellor,

Director, and Other. Table 4.4 illustrates responses for current position title. The most common CAO title among respondents was Vice President, with a variety of complete titles, such as Vice President for Institutional Advancement, University Advancement, and Development. Another title identified was President/CEO of the Foundation, which is included in the “Other” category.

Table 4.4

CAO Job Title

Job Title	Frequency	Percent
Vice President	34	31.8
Vice Chancellor	26	24.3
Director	21	19.6
Other	26	24.3
Total	107	100.0

In survey items 5 through 7, CAOs were asked to respond to the following items: Years in Current Position (Item 5), Years of Experience in Higher Education (Item 6), and Total Number of Colleges and Universities Employed (Item 7). Researchers grouped the data into categories as shown in the following tables. Results for Item 5 are show in Table 4.5, results for Item 6 in Table 4.6, and results for Item 7 in Table 4.7.

Table 4.5

CAO's Number of Years in Current Position

Years	Frequency	Percent
2 or fewer	28	27.7
3 to 5	37	36.6
6 to 9	20	19.8
10 or more	16	15.8
Total	101	100.0

Table 4.6

CAO's Number of Years of Experience in Higher Education

Years	Frequency	Percent
9 or fewer	21	20.6
10 to 19	33	32.4
20 to 29	33	32.4
30 or more	15	14.7
Total	102	100.0

Table 4.7

CAO's Total Number of Colleges and Universities Employed

Number of Institutions	Frequency	Percent
1	18	17.5
2	19	18.4
3	25	24.3
4	41	39.8
Total	103	100.0

The number of years in a CAO's current position ranged from less than one to 19. The total number of years in higher education fundraising ranged from less than one year to 41 years. Total number of institutions ranged from one to 17. Results are shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8.

CAO Years of Professional Experience

Item	<i>N</i>	Min-Max	<i>M</i>	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>SD</i>
How many years have you been in your current position?	105	.50 - 19.00	5.40	4.00	4.28
How many years of experience do you have in higher education fundraising?	105	.50 - 41.00	17.76	18.00	9.94
What is the total number of colleges and universities for which you have worked?	104	.00 - 17.00	3.36	3.00	2.24

Survey items 8 through 15 were answered using a Likert scale. CAOs were asked to respond to indicators of their effect on fundraising, comparing results after their arrival to results prior to their arrival at the institution. Respondents were given the following options: 0 = no change, 1 = significantly worse, 2 = declining, 3 = improving, 4 = significantly better. Results for items 8 through 15 are displayed in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10.

Table 4.9

Summarized Effects of a CAO's Fundraising Efforts Before and After Arrival at an Institution

Item	<i>N</i>	<i>Min-Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
President Involvement	99	0-4	2.94	1.35
Dean Involvement	99	0-4	2.80	1.27
Athletic and Advancement Relationship	97	0-4	2.86	1.43
Internal Reputation	98	0-4	3.12	1.15
External Reputation	99	0-4	3.08	1.16
Alumni Giving Per Year	99	0-4	2.39	1.27
Annual Gift Totals Per Year	99	0-4	2.78	1.21
Total Giving Per Year	97	0-4	3.24	.99

Note. 0 = no change, 1 = significantly worse, 2 = declining, 3 = improving, 4 = significantly better

Table 4.10

Effects of a CAO's Fundraising Efforts Before and After Arrival at an Institution

	<u>No Change</u>		<u>Sig. Worse</u>		<u>Declining</u>		<u>Improving</u>		<u>Sig. Better</u>	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
President Involvement	14	14.14	2	2.02	3	3.03	37	37.37	43	43.43
Dean Involvement	14	14.14	2	2.02	1	1.01	55	55.56	27	27.27
Athletic and Advancement Relationship	17	17.53	1	1.03	1	1.03	38	39.18	40	41.24
Internal Reputation	9	9.18	1	1.02	2	2.04	44	44.90	42	42.86
External Reputation	10	10.10	0	0.00	2	2.02	47	47.47	40	40.40
Alumni Giving Per Year	18	18.18	2	2.02	13	13.13	55	55.56	11	11.11
Annual Gift Totals Per Year	12	12.12	1	1.01	10	10.10	50	50.51	26	26.26
Total Giving Per Year	5	5.15	1	1.03	5	5.15	41	42.27	45	46.39

Note Regarding Research Questions

When analysis of the survey results began, it was evident that some adjustments of the research questions were necessary. The four previous research questions were not as fluid with the survey results as had been planned. The straight forward answer to the four questions was that no statistical significance was found, but some trends did emerge from the data. However, the decision was made that it was more beneficial to make slight adjustments to the research questions in order to produce a more meaningful study.

Research Question 1a

Is there a difference between a CAO's education level and his or her self-report of overall fundraising results at the institution?

Researchers completed a 3x4x2 between subjects ANOVA on the three survey items measuring education (highest degree, major field of study, and CFRE status) and a composite variable from the eight measurements of fundraising outcomes. The main effect of degree on fundraising results, $F(2, 59) = .277, p = .759$; field of study on fundraising results, $F(3, 59) = 1.479, p = .229$; and CFRE status on fundraising results, $F(1, 59) = 1.200, p = .278$; demonstrated there were no statistically significant differences in fundraising success based on the independent variables. Stated alternatively, no statistically significant difference was found in the composite score for the eight measures fundraising results based on CAO's level and type of education.

Research Question 1b

Is there a difference between a CAO's experiences and his or her self-report of overall fundraising results at the institution?

The three survey items measuring experience (years in current position, years of higher education fundraising experience, and total number of institutions) were analyzed by comparing them to the composite variable using regression and Pearson Product Moment correlations. The regression model was not statistically significant ($F = 1.98$, $p = .122$) and as such was not able to predict success of a CAO based on level of experience. Pearson Product Moment correlations are shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11

Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Measures of Experience and Composite Measure of Fundraising Effects

	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. How many years have you been in your current position?	1	.449*	.041	.206*
2. How many years of experience do you have in higher education fundraising?	.449*	1	.389*	.133
3. What is the total number of colleges and universities for which you have worked?	.041	.389*	1	-.036
4. Composite variable, effects of fundraising.	.206*	.133	-.036	1

Note. * $p < .05$.

Research Question 2

The original question asked if there is a significant difference in fundraising results at an institution, prior to and after a CAO's arrival. As researchers had incomplete measurements for fundraising results, this research question was removed. The new Research Question 2 states the following: Is there a relationship within the eight sub-items of a CAO's fundraising results, specifically, President's Involvement, Deans' Involvement, Athletics v. Advancement, Internal Reputation, External Reputation, Alumni Giving (unrestricted) per year, Annual Gift Totals per year, and Total Giving (all sources) per year? Researchers addressed this research question by using Pearson Product Moment Correlations to compare the variables. The results are discussed below and are shown in Table 4.12.

Observations of positive correlations:

1. President's involvement and the institution's reputation
Internal ($r = 0.528, p = 0.00$), External ($r = 0.536, p = 0.00$)
2. President's involvement and giving levels
Annual gifts ($r = 0.275, p = 0.01$), Total giving ($r = 0.397, p = 0.00$)
3. Deans' involvement and the institution's reputation
Internal ($r = 0.410, p = 0.00$), External ($r = 0.323, p = 0.00$)
4. Deans' involvement and total giving per year from all sources
($r = 0.215, p = 0.03$)
5. Advancement's internal reputation and giving levels
Annual gifts ($r = 0.293, p = 0.00$), Total giving ($r = 0.297, p = 0.00$)

6. Advancement's external reputation and giving levels

Annual gifts ($r = 0.249$, $p = 0.01$), Total giving ($r = 0.433$, $p = 0.00$)

Table 4.12

Pearson Product Moment Correlations for Measures of a CAO's Fundraising Efforts

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. President Involvement	1	.380*	.408*	.528*	.536*	.202*	.275*	.397*
2. Dean Involvement	.380*	1	.401*	.410*	.323*	.101	.115	.215*
3. Athletics vs. Advancement	.408*	.401*	1	.420*	.448*	.212*	.108	.330*
4. Internal Reputation	.528*	.410*	.420*	1	.495*	.312*	.293*	.297*
5. External Reputation	.536*	.323*	.448*	.495*	1	.307*	.249*	.433*
6. Percent Alumni	.202*	.101	.212*	.312*	.307*	1	.423*	.244*
7. Annual Gifts	.275*	.115	.108	.293*	.249*	.423*	1	.467*
8. Total Giving per Year All Sources	.397*	.215*	.330*	.297*	.433*	.244*	.467*	1

Note. * $p < .05$.

Research Question 3a

Similarly to Research Question 1, this question was divided into two parts, one addressing CAO education and the other addressing CAO experience. The first amended sub question asked if there is a distribution difference in education level and the self-reported fundraising improvements based on each fundraising sub-item. This difference was evaluated using cross tabs. “Cross tabulations (cross tabs for short) are also called contingency tables because they are used to test hypotheses about how some variables are contingent upon others, or how increases in one affects increases, decreases or curvilinear changes in others” (White & Korotayev, Jan 2004, p. 13). The sub-items of the CAO Survey Item 8 concern an institution’s fundraising success, prior to versus after a CAO’s arrival. The sub-items were crossed tabulated with the distribution of a CAO’s education as shown in Tables 4.13 through 4.20.

Table 4.13 contains the cross tabs between the distribution of a CAO’s highest level of degree completed and the President’s involvement in fundraising. The comparison was not statistically significant.

Table 4.13

Comparison of CAO Degree and President Involvement in Fundraising

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	4	2.3	0	.9	13	13.8
Master's	8	7.5	4	2.9	44	45.6
Doctorate	1	3.2	1	1.2	22	19.5
Total	13	13.0	5	5.0	79	79.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 97) = 4.63, p = .328$)

The distribution of a CAO's highest degree completed is compared to Academic Deans' Involvement in Table 4.14. There were no statistically significant differences.

Table 4.14

Comparison of CAO Degree and Dean's Involvement in Fundraising

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	3	2.5	1	0.5	13	14.0
Master's	6	8.1	2	1.7	48	46.2
Doctorate	5	3.5	0	0.7	19	19.8
Total	14	14.0	3	3.0	80	80.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 97) = 2.73, p = .604$)

Table 4.15 shows the relationship between Athletics and Advancement compared to the distribution of CAO degrees. As shown in Table 4.15, there was not a statistically significant difference in the two variables.

Table 4.15

Comparison of CAO Degree and Relationship between Athletics & Advancement

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	4	2.9	0	0.4	13	13.8
Master's	8	9.1	2	1.1	44	43.8
Doctorate	4	4.0	0	0.5	20	19.5
Total	16	16.0	2	2.0	77	77.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 95) = 2.16, p = .706$)

The distribution between a CAO’s highest degree and the internal reputation of the Advancement Office is shown in Table 4.16. There was no statistically significant difference.

Table 4.16

Comparison of CAO Degree and Internal Reputation of Advancement Office

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor’s	3	1.6	1	0.5	13	14.9
Master’s	6	5.2	2	1.7	47	48.1
Doctorate	0	2.2	0	0.8	24	21.0
Total	9	9.0	3	3.0	84	84.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 96) = 5.53, p = .237$)

The external reputation of the Advancement Office crossed with the distribution of CAO’s highest degree completed is shown in Table 4.17, the difference was not statistically significant.

Table 4.17

Comparison of CAO Degree and External Reputation of Advancement Office

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	1	1.8	0	0.4	16	14.9
Master's	7	5.8	2	1.2	47	49.1
Doctorate	2	2.5	0	0.5	22	21.0
Total	10	10.0	2	2.0	85	85.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 97) = 2.35, p = .671$)

Table 4.18 shows a CAO's highest degree distributions and annual alumni giving percent, the difference was not statistically significant.

Table 4.18

Comparison of CAO Degree and Alumni Giving Percent per Year

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	2	3.0	1	2.5	14	11.6
Master's	11	9.8	10	8.1	35	38.1
Doctorate	4	4.2	3	3.5	17	16.3
Total	17	17.0	14	14.0	66	66.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 97) = 2.65, p = .619$)

The distribution of a CAO's highest degree compared to unrestricted annual gifts per year is shown in Table 4.19. There was no statistically significant difference.

Table 4.19

Comparison of CAO Degree and Unrestricted Annual Gifts per Year

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	2	1.9	1	1.9	14	13.1
Master's	7	6.4	8	6.4	41	43.3
Doctorate	2	2.7	2	2.7	20	18.6
Total	11	11.0	11	11.0	75	75.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 97) = 1.62, p = .806$)

Finally, Table 4.20 shows total giving per year from all sources crossed with the distribution of a CAO's highest degree completed. There was no statistically significant difference.

Table 4.20

Comparison of CAO Degree and Total Giving per Year

Degree	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Bachelor's	1	0.9	1	1.1	15	15.0
Master's	1	2.8	5	3.4	48	47.7
Doctorate	3	1.3	0	1.5	21	21.2
Total	5	5.0	6	6.0	84	84.0

Note. ($\chi^2(4, n = 95) = 5.86, p = .210$)

Researchers used cross tab comparisons to analyze the distribution of a CAO's major field of study and the indicators of fundraising success. The fields of study were grouped into four categories: business, education, communications, and other.

Table 4.21 shows the distribution of a CAO's field of study compared to President's involvement. This relationship was not statistically significant.

Table 4.21

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and President's Involvement in Fundraising

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	4	4.4	1	1.6	26	25.1
Education	3	3.5	1	1.3	21	20.2
Communication	4	2.7	1	1.0	14	15.4
Other	3	3.4	2	1.2	19	19.4
Total	14	14.0	5	5.0	80	80.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 1.77, p = .940$)

Academic Deans' involvement crossed with the distribution of the CAO's major field of study is shown in Table 4.22. The findings were not statistically significant.

Table 4.22

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Deans' Involvement in Fundraising

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	5	4.4	1	0.9	25	25.7
Education	2	3.5	2	0.8	21	20.7
Communication	3	2.7	0	0.6	16	15.7
Other	4	3.4	0	0.7	20	19.9
Total	14	14.0	3	3.0	82	82.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 4.27, p = .640$)

Table 4.23 shows the distribution of a CAO's major field of study crossed with the relationship between Athletics and Advancement. The distribution is statistically significant based on the fact that the p-value is less than 0.05 ($p = 0.029$). Of note, only two CAOs responded that the relationship between the Advancement Office and Athletics had deteriorated after their arrival. Based on field of study, only five in business or education responded no change, while only 1 responded worse.

Table 4.23

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Relationship with Athletics

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	2	5.4	0	0.6	29	24.9
Education	3	4.2	1	0.5	20	19.3
Communication	8	3.2	0	0.4	10	14.5
Other	4	4.2	1	0.5	19	19.3
Total	17	17.0	2	2.0	78	78.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 14.09, p = .029$)

Table 4.24 compares the distribution of a CAO's major field of study and the internal reputation of the Advancement Office. There were no statistically significant differences found.

Table 4.24

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Internal Reputation of Advancement

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	3	2.8	0	0.9	28	27.2
Education	1	2.2	1	0.7	22	21.1
Communication	3	1.7	1	0.6	15	16.7
Other	2	2.2	1	0.7	21	21.1
Total	9	9.0	3	3.0	86	86.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 98) = 3.26, p = .775$)

The distribution of a CAO's field of study and the external reputation of the Advancement Office is shown in Table 4.25, which is not statistically significant.

Table 4.25

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and External Reputation of Advancement

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	2	3.1	0	0.6	29	27.2
Education	1	2.5	2	0.5	22	22.0
Communication	4	1.9	0	0.4	15	16.7
Other	3	2.4	0	0.5	21	21.1
Total	10	10.0	2	2.0	87	87.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 9.93, p = .128$)

The distribution of a CAO's major field of study and the percent of alumni giving per year is shown in Table 4.26. There was no statistical significance.

Table 4.26

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Annual Alumni Giving Percent

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	7	5.6	6	4.7	18	20.7
Education	3	4.5	4	3.8	18	16.7
Communication	2	3.5	3	2.9	14	12.7
Other	6	4.4	2	3.6	16	16.0
Total	18	18.0	15	15.0	66	66.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 3.79, p = .705$)

Table 4.27 shows the distribution of a CAO's major field of study compared to unrestricted annual gifts, which indicates no statistical significance.

Table 4.27

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Unrestricted Annual Gifts

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	3	3.8	5	3.4	23	23.8
Education	4	3.0	3	2.8	18	19.2
Communication	2	2.3	1	2.1	16	14.6
Other	3	2.9	2	2.7	19	18.4
Total	12	12.0	11	11.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 2.23, p = .897$)

Table 4.28 compares total giving per year from all sources to the distribution of a CAO's major field of study. There was no statistical significance.

Table 4.28

Comparison of CAO Field of Study and Annual Total Giving

Field	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Business	0	1.5	2	1.9	28	26.6
Education	3	1.2	1	1.5	20	21.3
Communication	1	1.0	0	1.2	18	16.8
Other	1	1.2	3	1.5	20	21.3
Total	5	5.0	6	6.0	86	86.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 79) = 7.30, p = .294$)

The comparison of the CFRE distributions across each sub-item of the dependent variable did not yield any relationships that were statistically significant. As shown in Table 4.39, the distributions were similar to the comparisons of the previous items.

Table 4.29

Summarized Results for Chi-Squared Analysis of CFRE Status and Eight Measures of CAO Fundraising Success

	<i>n</i>	χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
President Involvement	99	3.114 ^a	2	.211
Dean Involvement	99	.618 ^a	2	.734
Athletics vs. Advancement	97	.718 ^a	2	.698
Internal Reputation	98	1.554 ^a	2	.460
External Reputation	99	1.534 ^a	2	.464
Percent Alumni	99	2.102 ^a	2	.350
Annual Gifts	99	1.531 ^a	2	.465
Total Giving per Year All Sources	97	.901 ^a	2	.637

Note. ^aAnalysis contained cells with expected counts fewer than 5.

Research Question 3b

The first item on the survey concerning the independent variable for a CAO's experience was current position title. Responses were grouped into four categories: Vice President, Vice Chancellor, Director, and Other. Table 4.30 shows these distributions crossed with the CAO responses regarding their President's involvement in fundraising. The comparison was statistically significant due to a p-value less than 0.05 ($p = 0.013$).

Table 4.30

Comparison of CAO Title and President's Involvement in Fundraising

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	7	9.2	2	3.3	56	52.5
Vice Chancellor	1	2.3	0	0.8	15	12.9
Director	4	1.4	2	0.5	4	8.1
Other	2	1.1	1	0.4	5	6.5
Total	14	14.0	5	5.0	80	80.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 16.19, p = .013$)

The distribution of a CAO's current title and the deans' involvement in fundraising at their institution is shown in Table 4.31. There was no statistical significance.

Table 4.31

Comparison of CAO Title and Deans' Involvement in Fundraising

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	9	9.2	2	2.0	54	53.8
Vice Chancellor	2	2.3	0	0.5	14	13.3
Director	3	1.4	1	0.3	6	8.3
Other	0	1.1	0	0.2	8	6.6
Total	14	14.0	3	3.0	82	82.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 6.23, p = .398$)

The distribution of CAO current position title crossed with the relationship between Athletics and Advancement is shown in Table 4.32, and not statistically significant.

Table 4.32

Comparison of CAO Title and Relationship with Athletics

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	12	11.2	2	1.3	50	51.5
Vice Chancellor	1	2.8	0	0.3	15	12.9
Director	3	1.8	0	0.2	7	8.0
Other	1	1.2	0	0.1	6	5.6
Total	17	17.0	2	2.0	78	78.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 3.73, p = .713$)

Table 4.33 shows the distribution of a CAO's current position title compared to the internal reputation of the Advancement Office, which is not statistically significant.

Table 4.33

Comparison of CAO Title and Internal Reputation of Advancement Office

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	5	6.0	2	2.0	58	57.0
Vice Chancellor	1	1.5	0	0.5	15	14.0
Director	2	0.8	0	0.3	7	7.9
Other	1	0.7	1	0.2	6	7.0
Total	9	9.0	3	3.0	86	86.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 98) = 5.50, p = .482$)

Table 4.34 provides the distribution of a CAO's current title compared to the external reputation of the Advancement Office and was not statistically significant.

Table 4.34

Comparison of CAO Title and External Reputation of Advancement

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	6	6.6	1	1.3	58	57.1
Vice Chancellor	0	1.6	0	0.3	16	14.1
Director	2	1.0	1	0.2	7	8.8
Other	2	0.8	0	0.2	6	7.0
Total	10	10.0	2	2.0	87	87.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 8.90, p = .179$)

Table 4.35 compares the distribution of CAO current titles to the percent of alumni giving per year, which was not statistically significant.

Table 4.35

Comparison of CAO Title and Alumni Giving Percent per Year

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	10	11.8	11	9.8	44	43.3
Vice Chancellor	3	2.9	1	2.4	12	10.7
Director	3	1.8	2	1.5	5	6.7
Other	2	1.5	1	1.2	5	5.3
Total	18	18.0	15	15.0	66	66.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 3.03, p = .805$)

The distribution of CAO current position titles compared to unrestricted annual gifts is shown in Table 4.36. The relationship is statistically significant due to the p-value less than 0.05 ($p = 0.04$).

Table 4.36

Comparison of CAO Title and Unrestricted Annual Gifts

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	6	7.9	7	7.2	52	49.9
Vice Chancellor	1	1.9	2	1.8	13	12.3
Director	5	1.2	2	1.1	3	7.7
Other	0	1.0	0	0.9	8	6.1
Total	12	12.0	11	11.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 99) = 18.89, p = .004$)

When the CAO's position titles were crossed with total giving per year from all sources at the institution (Table 4.37), the relationship was not statistically significant.

Table 4.37

Comparison of CAO Title and Annual Total Giving

Title	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
Vice Pres	4	3.4	4	4.0	57	57.6
Vice Chancellor	0	0.8	0	1.0	16	14.2
Director	1	0.5	1	0.6	7	8.0
Other	0	0.4	1	0.4	6	6.2
Total	5	5.0	6	6.0	86	86.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 4.38, p = .625$)

The next section includes crosstabs of the second measurement of a CAO's experience, which is the number of years a CAO has been in his or her current position. The variable was divided into the following four categories of years: two or fewer, three to five, six to nine, and ten or more. When the distribution across these categories was compared to the president's involvement in fundraising (Table 4.38), the results were not statistically significant.

Table 4.38

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and President's Involvement

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	5	3.8	2	1.4	19	20.8
3 to 5	6	5.0	1	1.8	27	27.2
6 to 9	2	2.9	1	1.1	17	16.0
10 or more	1	2.2	1	0.8	13	12.0
Total	14	14.0	5	5.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 2.52, p = .866$)

Results of the distribution of a CAO's years in current position crossed with the deans' involvement is shown in Table 4.39, which was not statistically significant.

Table 4.39

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Deans' Involvement

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	5	3.8	0	0.8	21	21.3
3 to 5	5	5.0	1	1.1	28	27.9
6 to 9	2	2.9	0	0.6	18	16.4
10 or more	2	2.2	2	0.5	11	12.3
Total	14	14.0	3	3.0	78	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 7.36, p = .289$)

Table 4.40 shows the results of crosstabs between the distribution of a CAO's years in current position and the Advancement Office's relationship with Athletics, which was not statistically significant.

Table 4.40

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Relationship between Athletics & Advancement

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	5	4.8	0	0.6	21	20.7
3 to 5	8	5.8	0	0.7	24	25.5
6 to 9	3	3.7	1	0.4	16	15.9
10 or more	1	2.7	1	0.3	13	11.9
Total	17	17.0	2	2.0	74	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 93) = 5.64, p = .465$)

Results of a CAO's years in current position crossed with the internal reputation of the Advancement Office is shown in Table 4.41. The relationship was statistically significant based on the fact that the p-value was less than 0.05 ($p = 0.015$).

Table 4.41

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Internal Reputation of Advancement

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	7	2.5	0	0.8	19	22.7
3 to 5	0	3.2	2	1.1	31	28.8
6 to 9	1	1.9	0	0.6	19	17.4
10 or more	1	1.4	1	0.5	13	13.1
Total	9	9.0	3	3.0	82	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 94) = 15.70, p = .015$)

Table 4.42 shows the distribution of a CAO's number of years in current position and the external reputation of the Advancement Office. The distribution which was statistically significant because the p-value was less than 0.05 ($p = 0.015$).

Table 4.42

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and External Reputation

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	7	2.5	0	0.5	19	23.0
3 to 5	2	3.2	1	0.7	31	30.1
6 to 9	0	1.9	0	0.4	20	17.7
10 or more	0	1.4	1	0.3	14	13.3
Total	9	9.0	2	2.0	84	84.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 15.76, p = .015$)

The distribution of a CAO's years in current position compared to percent of alumni giving, as shown in Table 4.43, was not statistically significant.

Table 4.43

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Alumni Giving Percent

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	9	4.4	4	4.1	13	17.5
3 to 5	5	5.7	3	5.4	26	22.9
6 to 9	1	3.4	4	3.2	15	13.5
10 or more	1	2.5	4	2.4	10	10.1
Total	16	16.0	15	15.0	64	64.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 11.71, p = .069$)

The distribution of a CAO's years in current position and unrestricted annual gifts is shown in Table 4.44 and there was no statistical significance.

Table 4.44

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Unrestricted Annual Gifts

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	5	3.3	3	2.7	18	20.0
3 to 5	3	4.3	3	3.6	28	26.1
6 to 9	1	2.5	3	2.1	16	15.4
10 or more	3	1.9	1	1.6	11	11.5
Total	12	12.0	10	10.0	73	73.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 3.95, p = .684$)

Table 4.45 shows the distribution of a CAO's years in current position and total giving per year, which was not statistically significant.

Table 4.45

Comparison of CAO's Years in Position and Annual Total Giving

Years in Current Pos	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
2 or less	4	1.4	2	1.4	20	23.2
3 to 5	0	1.8	1	1.8	33	30.3
6 to 9	0	1.0	2	1.0	16	16.1
10 or more	1	0.8	0	0.8	14	13.4
Total	5	5.0	5	5.0	83	83.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 93) = 10.93, p = .091$)

The next section includes crosstabs of the third measurement of a CAO's experience, which is the total number of years a CAO has been in higher education (HE) fundraising. The variable was divided into four categories of years: nine or less, 10-19, 20-29, and 30 or more. Table 4.46 compares the distribution of these categories to the president's involvement in fundraising. The results were not statistically significant.

Table 4.46

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and President's Involvement

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	3	2.7	0	0.6	17	16.7
10 to 19	4	4.3	1	1.0	27	26.7
20 to 29	6	4.1	1	0.9	23	25.0
30 or more	0	1.9	1	0.4	13	11.7
Total	13	13.0	3	3.0	80	80.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 96) = 4.55, p = .602$)

The distribution of a CAO's total years in HE fundraising crossed with the academic deans' involvement, as shown in Table 4.47, was not statistically significant.

Table 4.47

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Deans' Involvement

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	5	2.5	0	0.6	15	16.9
10 to 19	5	4.0	1	1.0	26	27.0
20 to 29	2	3.8	2	0.9	26	25.3
30 or more	0	1.8	0	0.4	14	11.8
Total	12	12.0	3	3.0	81	81.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 96) = 8.25, p = .220$)

Table 4.48 shows the distribution of a CAO's total years in HE fundraising compared to the relationship between athletics and advancement, which is not statistically significant.

Table 4.48

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Relationship with Athletics

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	1	3.0	0	0.4	18	15.6
10 to 19	3	4.9	1	0.7	27	25.4
20 to 29	9	4.8	1	0.6	20	24.6
30 or more	2	2.2	0	0.3	12	11.5
Total	15	15.0	2	2.0	77	77.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 94) = 8.30, p = .217$)

Table 4.49 shows the distribution of total years in HE fundraising crossed with the internal reputation of the Advancement Office, and no statistical significance.

Table 4.49

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Internal Reputation

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	2	1.5	0	0.6	18	17.9
10 to 19	2	2.4	0	1.0	30	28.6
20 to 29	2	2.1	2	0.9	25	25.9
30 or more	1	1.0	1	0.4	12	12.5
Total	7	7.0	3	3.0	85	85.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 4.00, p = .676$)

When comparing the distribution of a CAO's years in HE fundraising to the external reputation of the Advancement Office, as shown in Table 4.50, the relationship was not statistically significant.

Table 4.50

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and External Relationship

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	1	1.9	0	0.4	19	17.7
10 to 19	3	3.0	0	0.7	29	28.3
20 to 29	4	2.8	2	0.6	24	26.6
30 or more	1	1.3	0	0.3	13	12.4
Total	9	9.0	2	2.0	85	85.0

Note. ($\chi^2 (6, n = 96) = 5.77, p = .449$)

Table 4.51 shows the crosstab of a CAO's years in HE fundraising and percent of alumni giving per year. There was no statistical significance.

Table 4.51

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Annual Alumni Giving Percent

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	2	3.5	3	2.9	15	13.5
10 to 19	7	5.7	5	4.7	20	21.7
20 to 29	7	5.3	4	4.4	19	20.3
30 or more	1	2.5	2	2.0	11	9.5
Total	17	17.0	14	14.0	65	65.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 96) = 3.08, p = .799$)

When the relationship between a CAO's total years in HE fundraising is crossed with unrestricted annual gifts, as shown in Table 4.52, there was no statistical significance.

Table 4.52

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Unrestricted Annual Gifts

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	3	2.1	2	2.1	15	15.8
10 to 19	4	3.3	3	3.3	25	25.3
20 to 29	2	3.1	5	3.1	23	23.8
30 or more	1	1.5	0	1.5	13	11.1
Total	10	10.0	10	10.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 96) = 4.11, p = .662$)

The distribution of years in HE fundraising compared to total giving per year from all sources is shown in Table 4.53 and shows no statistical significance.

Table 4.53

Comparison of CAO's Years in HE Fundraising and Annual Total Giving

Years in HE	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
9 or less	0	1.0	1	1.2	18	16.8
10 to 19	2	1.6	2	2.0	27	27.4
20 to 29	2	1.6	2	1.9	26	26.5
30 or more	1	0.7	1	0.9	12	12.4
Total	5	5.0	6	6.0	83	83.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 94) = 1.44, p = .963$)

The next section includes crosstabs of the final measurement of a CAO's experience, which is the number of higher education institutions (HEI) for which a CAO has worked. The variable was divided into the following four categories, representing the number of institutions: one, two, three, or four or more. The distribution of these categories compared to the president's involvement in fundraising is shown in Table 4.54, which shows no statistical significance.

Table 4.54

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and President's Involvement

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	5	2.1	1	0.8	10	13.0
Two	2	2.4	1	0.9	15	14.7
Three	0	3.1	1	1.2	22	18.7
Four or more	6	5.4	2	2.1	32	32.6
Total	13	13.0	5	5.0	79	79.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 8.40, p = .210$)

Table 4.55 shows the distribution of the number of CAO's institutions crossed with the deans' involvement in fundraising, which is not statistically significant.

Table 4.55

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Deans' Involvement

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	3	2.1	0	0.5	13	13.4
Two	3	2.4	2	0.6	13	15.0
Three	4	3.1	0	0.7	19	19.2
Four or more	3	5.4	1	1.2	36	33.4
Total	13	13.0	3	3.0	81	81.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 7.28, p = .296$)

The distribution of a CAO's total number of institutions crossed with the relationship between Advancement and Athletics is shown in Table 4.56, and there is no statistical significance

Table 4.56

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Relationship with Athletics

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	3	2.7	0	0.3	12	12.0
Two	2	3.2	1	0.4	15	14.4
Three	2	4.1	0	0.5	21	18.4
Four or more	10	7.0	1	0.8	28	31.2
Total	17	17.0	2	2.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 5.47, p = .485$)

The crosstab results of the number of institutions for which a CAO has worked and the internal reputation of the Advancement Office are shown in Table 4.57. The comparison is not statistically significant.

Table 4.57

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Internal Reputation

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	3	1.3	0	0.5	13	14.2
Two	1	1.5	1	0.6	16	15.9
Three	1	1.9	0	0.7	22	20.4
Four or more	3	3.2	2	1.2	34	34.5
Total	8	8.0	3	3.0	85	85.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 96) = 5.00, p = .543$)

Table 4.58 shows the distribution of the number of CAO's institutions crossed with the external relationship of the Advancement Office, and no statistical significance.

Table 4.58

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and External Relationship

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	2	1.6	0	0.3	14	14.0
Two	1	1.9	1	0.4	16	15.8
Three	1	2.4	0	0.5	22	20.2
Four or more	6	4.1	1	0.8	33	35.1
Total	10	10.0	2	2.0	85	85.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 4.32, p = .634$)

The distribution of a CAO's number of HE institutions and percent of alumni giving are shown in Table 4.59. The distribution was not statistically significant.

Table 4.59

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Annual Alumni Giving Percent

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	1	3.0	3	2.5	12	10.6
Two	5	3.3	3	2.8	10	11.9
Three	1	4.3	6	3.6	16	15.2
Four or more	11	7.4	3	6.2	26	26.4
Total	18	18.0	15	15.0	64	64.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 10.35, p = .111$)

Results of the distribution of a CAO's number of institutions crossed with unrestricted annual giving are shown in Table 4.60. There was no statistical significance.

Table 4.60

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Unrestricted Annual Gifts

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	2	1.6	2	1.8	12	12.5
Two	3	1.9	1	2.0	14	14.1
Three	1	2.4	4	2.6	18	18.0
Four or more	4	4.1	4	4.5	32	31.3
Total	10	10.0	11	11.0	76	76.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 97) = 2.97, p = .813$)

The crosstabs for the distribution of the total number of institutions for which a CAO has worked and total giving per year is shown in Table 4.61. The distribution was not statistically significant.

Table 4.61

Comparison of CAO's Number of HEIs and Annual Total Gifts

No. of HEIs	No change		Worse		Better	
	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.	Observed Freq.	Expected Freq.
One	0	0.8	2	0.9	13	13.3
Two	1	0.9	0	1.1	16	15.0
Three	1	1.2	0	1.5	22	20.3
Four or more	3	2.1	4	2.5	33	35.4
Total	5	5.0	6	6.0	84	84.0

Note. ($\chi^2(6, n = 95) = 6.14, p = .408$)

Research Question 4

This question requires revision for the same reason that Research Question 2 was removed. As researchers had no measurements to quantify the differences in fundraising prior to and after a CAO's arrival, Research Question 4 was amended to address the most appropriate role for the CAO as head of fundraising for a four-year public institution in the U.S. The final two open-ended survey items were used to answer this question.

There were 88 CAOs who responded to the item asking for other factors that contribute to fundraising success. The most common responses included the following: quality staff, good management, presidential leadership and vision, reputation of the institution, quality academic programs, fundraising campaign, communication and marketing, and strategic planning.

In contrast, the final survey item asked CAOs what barriers exist that reduce fundraising. There were 93 responses and the most popular barriers listed were the following: lack of adequate staff, reduced budget or lack of resources, the economy, lack of a fundraising culture, lack of leadership or vision, and challenges from silo mentality on campus.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose

The objective of this research was to identify the most appropriate role of a Chief Advancement Officer in fundraising at a public four-year college or university in the United States. This objective was accomplished by the analysis of the predictor variables of a CAO's education and experience, and the outcome variable of fundraising success at the CAO's institution. As a result of this work, researchers were able to identify and predict the role for the CAO that led to the most successful fundraising for the institution.

External financial support is critical to the future of public higher education. Funding from the state continues to erode as the costs of higher education continue to climb. Much of the funding burden is placed on the students through increased tuition and fees. As public institutions search for additional sources of revenue, there is a greater need and urgency for institutions to increase contributions and donations of all types through the Advancement Office. Therefore, the role played by the CAO in leading the institution's fundraising efforts is an important one. A CAO's role should be well-defined in order to be effective and maximize private financial support from a college or university's constituents.

Findings

Demographics

The first set of results centered on a CAO's education, measured by highest degree earned, field of study, and CFRE status. Over 50% of CAOs in the sample had earned a masters degree and an additional 25% had obtained a doctorate. Since over 75% of the CAOs sampled had earned an advanced degree, education seems to be a valuable trait of the CAO's position at public institutions across the nation.

A CAO's major field of study varied widely. Researchers grouped responses for this variable into one of the following three areas: business, education, or communication. There is no specific degree or recommended area of concentration for individuals interested in a career in fundraising and many enter the profession from another line of work. The most common field of study among the CAOs sample was business, which is a popular major and includes a variety of disciplines. An education degree is consistent in the fact that a CAO's employer is an educational institution. In addition, the CAO position is among the top-tier at the institution. Therefore, an advanced degree in educational administration, educational leadership, or higher education is common. Also, a degree in communication is compatible with a CAO's work.

The final survey item of a CAO's education was status as a Certified Fund Raising Executive. As the number of non-profit organizations has grown and more people are employed in the fundraising profession, the CFRE accreditation has grown in popularity. But what is its status in higher education and, in particular, among CAOs?

Prior to this study it was unknown if the CFRE accreditation was common among CAOs. The survey results showed that only 10% of the sample had obtained CFRE status.

The second independent variable, CAO experience, was measured using current job title, number of years in current position, number of years in higher education, and total number of institutions for which a CAO has worked. The most common title among respondents was Vice President (32%), with Vice Chancellor (24%) and Director (20%) as second and third places respectively. A CAO's number of years in their current position (Table 4.5) indicated that 64% of the respondents had been in their current jobs five years or fewer. One interpretation is that an individual serving as CAO, with higher education fundraising experience, is in demand. At the same time, a CAO is under pressure to increase private support to produce immediate results. Therefore, some CAOs consider opportunities at other institutions and are open to being recruited by other colleges and universities, due to the demand for immediate fundraising results.

The survey responses showed that, in general, CAOs are content in higher education fundraising, that the profession is steady and dependable, and that CAOs are satisfied with the profession. More than 75% have been in the business for 10 years or more, with one individual in his or her 41st year. However, to reinforce the claim that job mobility is high, the sample response showed that 64% of respondents have worked at three or more institutions.

Table 4.8 provides more insight of the CAO respondents' years of experience. Upon first examination it could be assumed that an outlier exists in each category and therefore the data is not representative of the population. Specifically, are "19 years in current position, 41 years of experience in higher education, and 17 different institutions"

outliers or representative of the data? Further analysis using the mean and median provides more information. The first category, years in current position, the mean is 5.40 and the median is 4.00. Therefore, it is likely that the response of 19 years is an outlier since the mean is larger than the median. However, in the second category, years of experience in higher education, the mean (17.76) and median (18.00) are much closer, therefore the high response of 41 is less likely to be an outlier. In the last category, number of institutions, the mean (3.36) and median (3.0) are close, indicating tighter data. Therefore the high value of 17 institutions is likely an outlier because it is larger than two standard deviations from either the mean or the median.

Results of the sample's success in fundraising due to their presence on campus are summarized in Table 4.9. These success indicators were self-reported by the CAO; therefore, are likely biased and most often reported as "improving" or "significantly better." Rarely did a CAO respond in the fundraising results section as "declining," "significantly worse," or "no change." Results of this section are discussed in greater detail under each research question. The final two survey items were open-ended and asked for factors that contributed to fundraising success and barriers that reduce fundraising success. These will be addressed when evaluating Research Question 4.

Analysis of Data

The original intent of the research questions was to help design survey items that would obtain data from CAO respondents regarding their education, experience and fundraising results. Interest, response, and feedback from the CAO sample was beneficial, with more than 34% (111 out of 292) responding. However, when results

were examined using statistical analyses, it became apparent that some revision of the research questions was necessary. This was not a case of doctoring the data for desired results, but can be more accurately described as adjusting the research questions in order to answer in a fluid manner that matched the analyses.

Research Question 1a

In Research Question 1a, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare a CAO's education level to a self-report of fundraising results at their institution. The main effects of the ANOVA, the three indicators of CAO education (degree, field of study, CFRE) on a composite variable of fundraising success, were not statistically significant. However, it cannot be said that these indicators are unrelated to a CAO's fundraising success. In many cases a master's degree and often a doctorate is a prerequisite for the position of vice president or vice chancellor. These two titles were given by 82% of the CAO respondents. Although a master's degree or doctorate does not indicate or predict fundraising success, an advanced degree allows an individual the opportunity to be considered as a candidate for the CAO position.

Research Question 1b

Research Question 1b compares a CAO's experience to the self-reported fundraising results by considering current position title, years in current position, years in higher education fundraising, and number of institutions for which a CAO has worked. The first indicator of CAO experience, current position title, was analyzed using an ANOVA, in a procedure similar to the education variables. Although not statistically significant, a CAO's title can indicate the size of the fundraising operation, which often determines its level of success. The CAO at a larger institution likely carries the title of

vice president or vice chancellor. A larger operation has a larger budget, a larger staff, including more full-time fundraisers and as a result may have more contributions, and is therefore considered more successful.

The other three variables used to predict CAO experience were compared to a composite variable of the eight dependent sub-items used for fundraising success in Table 4.11. There was no statistical significance but some observations can be made regarding these indicators. Successful fundraising is a product of building relationships and it takes time to develop relationships. The longer a CAO has been in place at one institution, the more likely fundraising will be successful. Similarly, the number of years in higher education fundraising should be consistent with a CAO's success. Conversely, the more experience a CAO has at more institutions does not necessarily indicate success. The longer a CAO remains at an institution, stronger relationships can be built as the CAO becomes more comfortable and familiar with alumni and friends. In contrast, the shorter the length of time a CAO remains with an institution, the less time the CAO has to develop a successful Advancement Office.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 seeks to find a relationship between any of the eight sub-items of the outcome variable, CAO fundraising success. Table 4.12 displays a positive correlation between the president's involvement in fundraising and internal reputation, external reputation, and total giving from all sources. Several sources have been cited that confirm the importance of a president's involvement in fundraising. By having the campus leader involved, the Advancement Office is endorsed on campus, which influences the internal reputation, as well as the external reputation. Also, previous

research confirms the president's participation in Advancement as having a positive effect on fundraising.

There were also positive correlations between the deans' involvement in advancement and the institution's reputation, internal and external, as well as total giving. An academic dean's influence in fundraising can be an asset. For example if a prospective donor is interested in a specific academic program, the dean can provide details of the program, share the vision, and speak on behalf of faculty and students. Therefore a dean's involvement can enhance a college's or university's reputation, in addition to making a positive impact on total giving.

The reputation of the Advancement Office also has a direct influence on annual giving and total giving from all sources. A positive reputation on campus can be interpreted as a beneficial relationship between the Advancement Office and the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Not only are these groups potential donors, they also have contact and communication with alumni, friends, and other prospective donors. A positive reputation off campus can be directly connected to an increase in gifts. If external constituent donor groups, such as alumni, parents, corporations, and foundations, hold the Advancement Office in a positive light, this may eventually have a positive impact on contributions.

Research Question 3a

Cross tabulations were used to answer Research Question 3a in search of a distribution difference in a CAO's education and the eight self-reported fundraising factors. The crosstabs are located in Tables 4.13 through 4.20. Even though none of the distributions of a CAO's highest completed degree were statistically significant, a few

observations can be drawn. The higher a CAO's degree, the more respect will be shown by faculty, especially the deans. Since an academic dean has earned a doctorate, the CAO with a doctorate is often considered a peer. The Advancement Office led by a CAO with a doctorate likely enjoys a positive internal reputation and, to a lesser extent, a positive external reputation.

The distribution of a CAO's major field of study and the sub-items of the dependent variable yielded one instance of statistical significance, that being the relationship between Athletics and Advancement. The three largest categories of a CAO's major field of study were business, education and communication. A CAO with a business degree understands that Athletics must be run like a business. CAOs with a degree in education realize that through the athletic programs an institution is able to provide an education to students who otherwise might not attend college. Those who studied communications are able to promote a good working relationship between the two divisions. None of the CFRE distributions were statistically significant, which stands to reason given that only 10% of the CAO respondent sample has the CFRE accreditation.

Research Question 3b

Crosstabs were used to answer Research Question 3b in search of a distribution difference in a CAO's experience and the eight self-reported fundraising improvements. First, considering a CAO's title, two of the distributions were statistically significant; the president's involvement in advancement and total giving per year from all sources. As previously discussed, the president is the top administrator on campus and his or her involvement lends credibility to any activity or program on campus. Eighty-two percent

of CAOs responding were vice presidents or vice chancellors and therefore were likely hired by and report directly to the president or chancellor. Fundraising enjoys more success with the president's involvement.

Research Question 4

Research Question 4 incorporates the title of this study, in search of a CAO's most appropriate role as head of fundraising for a public four-year college or university. Responses to the final two open-ended survey items from the CAO sample provided insight for answering this question. Factors contributing to successful fundraising will be considered first. As leader of the Advancement Office, the CAO should build a committed and cohesive staff, in addition to providing a management style that fits the team. Second, the CAO should do whatever is necessary to involve the president, to the greatest extent possible in fundraising. In addition, the majority of the factors identified by CAOs are tied to the president's leadership and vision. It is the president's decision to have a capital campaign, to engage in the strategic planning process, to shape the academic reputation of the institution, and to emphasize communication and marketing. Most factors contributing to successful fundraising originate from leadership.

Based on the final survey item, barriers that reduce fundraising success should be avoided, limited, or corrected. The factors mentioned most frequently by CAOs that limit fundraising effectiveness were a reduced budget or lack of resources. As state funding declines, the CAO and the president should do whatever possible to ensure an adequate operating budget for the Advancement Office. If financial support from outside sources is important, then it would be unwise to reduce the budget for the Advancement Office. Another barrier that is directly tied to funding was inadequate staffing. Increased funding

can lead to an improved staff, but this is not always the case. It is a CAO's job to build and manage the Advancement Office staff, which will require more effort and energy with a reduced budget. The most difficult barrier to overcome is an institution's lack of fundraising culture. Successful fundraising requires time and building a culture of giving requires a substantial investment of time.

Assessment

The ultimate goal of this study was to identify the most appropriate role for a CAO that produced successful fundraising. It was originally thought that a model could be developed to predict a CAO profile containing the qualities of a successful CAO. Targeted qualities were the independent variables of education and experience. If the proper mix of each could be identified, the profile could be used as a model by institutions hiring a CAO. Even with minimal statistical significance on the research questions, progress was made to identify the appropriate mix of education and experience that lead to fundraising success. Although no model or profile was developed, the CAO Success Survey provided useful data. Factors contributing to successful fundraising were identified from current CAOs: president's leadership and vision, quality staff, good management, involvement in a capital campaign, communication and marketing, strategic planning, academic reputation of the institution and quality academic programs. Barriers limiting success included lack of fundraising staff, decreasing budget, lack of resources, difficult economic conditions, silo mentality, lack of fundraising culture, and lack of leadership. In addition, the survey provided demographic statistics for over 100 current CAOs.

Recommendations for Future Practice

A CAO should have obtained or be pursuing a doctoral degree. Even though a doctorate is not a prerequisite for the CAO at most institutions, a CAO with a doctorate is preferred and builds the reputation of the Advancement Office, especially the internal reputation. In those cases where a CAO's highest degree is a bachelor's, it is recommended that the CAO pursue a master's degree. Most public four-year institutions offer a variety of graduate degrees; therefore, a CAO should take advantage of the opportunity to obtain a master's degree. Completion of a doctorate presents a larger challenge, but can be accomplished and should be pursued. The CFRE certification is recommended as an educational tool for a CAO new to fundraising or with minimal experience. CASE is now a partner in CFRE accreditation and continued education (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2011).

The survey showed a large majority of CAO respondents with the title of vice president or vice chancellor. In the reality of fundraising results, a CAO's title matters little. The true measurement of successful fundraising is the amount of total funds raised by an institution on an annual basis. The title has more internal meaning through identification as a campus administrator, which leads to increased responsibility and respect. In fact, it could make fundraising more challenging for the CAO because the title of vice president or vice chancellor often means a heavier workload, in addition to leading the Advancement Office.

The remaining indicators of CAO experience can be influential in determining a CAO's role for successful fundraising. The number of years a CAO has in their current

position is important for continuity in the Advancement Office, which has a direct effect in building relationships and therefore, fundraising success. The number of years in higher education fundraising reveals a CAO's experience, but must be considered on an individual basis. Many years of service at the same institution can be extremely beneficial; however it is also possible that a CAO could overstay and become stagnant. Therefore, total years in higher education combined with the number of institutions for which a CAO has worked, can be interpreted as a strength or a weakness. A CAO could bring a variety of experience from several institutions or might have a track record of moving too frequently.

The most important factor affecting the outcome variable of fundraising success is the president's involvement. Near the top of a CAO's priority list should be insisting that the president be as active as possible with the Advancement Office. The president provides leadership, vision, communication, and can enhance the institution's reputation. All these qualities contribute to successful fundraising. The deans' involvement, a good working relationship between Advancement and Athletics, as well as a positive reputation of the Advancement Office, are also important factors contributing to success.

Three indicators of giving were considered because fundraising success is easily quantified (the amount of donations received each year). Percent of alumni giving indicates involvement. Improvement on an annual basis in this category should be a goal of any Advancement Office. Unrestricted annual gifts are a building block of a strong fundraising program. Total giving per year from all sources is the bottom line barometer for the success of an Advancement Office. Therefore, experience and success in these three areas of giving help identify the most appropriate role for CAO success.

Recommendations for Future Research

A profile to predict CAO success should continue to be developed. This study discovered characteristics of a CAO's education and experience that are influential, in addition to some relationships that enhance fundraising. Additional studies in search of a CAO's success would supply attributes and qualities leading to successful fundraising. The goal is to obtain data and research gathered from CAOs in order to produce a CAO profile for success. This profile, or CAO matrix, could be used as a tool in the hiring process by institutions in search of a CAO.

Funding the Advancement Office is done in a variety of ways. The most common method is directly through the university budget, similar to any department or division. However, as state funding continues to erode and institutional budgets are further reduced, there will be added pressure to direct as much revenue as possible to the core academic units. As mentioned previously, there should be resistance to reducing the budget of an office that is charged to increase outside funding. Therefore, a future study about funding methods for an advancement office operating budget is recommended.

Summary

Securing and increasing private financial support is the job of an advancement office in higher education and the CAO is the leader of that endeavor. Funding from state appropriations are decreasing, costs of higher education are increasing, and there is a limit to the burden that can be shifted to the students. Therefore, the mission of the Advancement Office is urgent. It is important to identify the exact role for a CAO to

have the most effect in leading a successful Advancement Office. A successful CAO will ensure the president of the institution is involved in fundraising. The president is the top ranking official on campus and the president's involvement is a seal of approval, which would endorse the work of the Advancement Office. A successful CAO will also involve the academic deans and develop a good working relationship with Athletics. Cooperation with the president, the deans, and Athletics promotes a positive reputation of the Advancement Office, both internally and externally.

The ultimate goal of the CAO is to increase financial support from sources external to the institution. To be successful, a CAO must assemble a productive staff and be a good manager. A successful CAO should stay involved in fundraising, providing leadership by example. A successful CAO prepares the president and deans for successful fundraising. Several characteristics of a successful CAO have been discussed, as well as indicators of success. However, the ultimate measurement of a CAO and the Advancement Office is the total amount of funds raised on an annual basis. For a CAO to be considered successful, that amount should increase each year.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, F. K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 411-431.
- Archibald, R. B. & Feldman, D. H. (2004, October). Funding students instead of institutions. *NACUBO Business Officer Magazine*, 38(4)no pp. Retrieved from http://www.nacubo.org/Business_Officer_Magazine/
- Archibald, R. B. & Feldman, D. H. (2006). State Higher Education Spending and the Tax Revolt. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 618-644.
- Brakeley, G.A., Jr. (1980). *Tested ways to successful fund raising*. New York, NY: AMACOM, A division of American Management Associations.
- Bryant, M. T. (2004). *The Portable Dissertation Advisor*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Carlson, S. (2011). Budget standoff frays nerves at a regional public university. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, LVII(34), A1-A9.
- Council for Advancement and Support of Education. (2011). About CASE. Retrieved from http://www.case.org/About_CASE.html
- Certified Fundraising Executive International (2009). Retrieved from <http://www.cfre.org>
- Cheslock, J. J. & Gianneschi, M. (2008). Replacing state appropriations with alternative revenue sources: The case for voluntary support. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(2), 208-229.
- Ciampa, D.L. (2009). Community college vice presidents for institutional advancement: Role expectations, fundraising responsibilities, professional relationships, and commitment to the institution. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(70A), 2407.
- Cook, W. B. (1994). *Courting philanthropy: The role of university presidents and chancellors in fund raising* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin, TX.
- Cook, W. B. (1997). Fund raising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty: From 1975 to the present. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 53-86.

- Cook, W. B., & Lasher, W.F. (1996). Toward a theory of fund raising in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(1), 33-51.
- Crawford, T. R. (1976). *The role of the chief development officer as perceived by presidents and chief development officers at selected institutions of higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Dean, M. S. (2007). Perceptions of chief development officers about factors that influence major alumni giving. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(01A), 132.
- Dorich, D. (1991). The making of a president. *CASE Currents*. 17(4), 6-11.
- Eckel, P.D., & King, J.D. (2004). An overview of higher education in the United States: Diversity, access and the role of the marketplace. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Eduventures (2009). *Economic impact on fundraising: February 2009 member polls*. Boston, MA. Catalog No. 139.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2006). The perfect storm and the privatization of public higher education. *Change*, 38(1), 46-53.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. & Rizzo, M. J. (2004). Financial forces and the future of American higher education. *Academe*. July-August 2004, 25-31.
- Garcia, E. (2009). Texas community college fundraising: Strategies for meeting future financial needs. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(07A), 2394.
- Goddard, C. (2009). Presidential fundraising at independent colleges in the Midwest: A case study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(03A), 813.
- Gentile, P. A. (2009). Ensuring the American dream: Perceptions of New Jersey community college presidents on fundraising as an alternative revenue source to preserve access and affordability. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(03A), 780.
- Hodson, J. B. (2010). Leading the way: The role of presidents and academic deans in fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 149, 39-49.
- Holmes, Jr., R.J (2010). The challenge of funding fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 149, 27-37.

- Hossler, D., Lund, J. P., Ramin, J., Westfall, S. & Irish, S. (1997). State funding for higher education; The Sisyphean task. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(2), 160-190.
- Hurst, F. M. (2008). Philanthropic giving preference differences: Nontraditional and traditional alumni at Northern Arizona University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(06A), 2170.
- Jones, P. M. (2008). Exploring factors that impact success in community college fundraising. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(01A), 68.
- Karns, W. V. (2008). The transitional considerations of traditional potential community college presidents: Fundraising and other concerns. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(09A), 3409.
- Lanning, P. I., Jr. (2007). Developing expertise in higher education fundraising: A conceptual framework. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(05A), 1677.
- Leahy, P. F. (2009). To the next level: How Drexel University improved its fundraising performance from 1997 to 2007. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70(04A), 1194.
- Lederman, D. & Jaschik, S. (2011). Perspectives on the downturn: A survey of presidents. Inside *Higher Ed*, March 4, 2011. Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com
- Lingenfelter, P. E., Wright, D. L. & Bisel, T. M. (2005). *State Higher Education Finance, FY2004. Executive Overview. State Higher Education Executive Officers*. Boulder, CO. Retrieved from www.sheeo.org
- Mumper, M. (1996). *Removing college price barriers: What government has done and why it hasn't worked*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Murray, L. E. (2008). The managerial practices of chief advancement officers: Practices that promote or inhibit fundraising in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(11A), 4266.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2009) *Digest of Education Statistics*, 2009. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_244.asp
- Nehls, K. (2007). Presidential transitions during capital campaigns: Perspectives of chief development officers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(02A), 531.
- Panas, J. (1988). *Born to raise: What makes a great fundraiser; what makes a fundraiser great*. Chicago, IL: Pluribus Press, Inc.

- Panas, J. (2005). *Mega Gifts: Who gives them, who gets them*. Medfield, MA: Emerson & Church Publishers.
- Potter, W. (2003). Texas legislature gives public colleges the power to set tuition. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(40), A25.
- Proper, E., Caboni, T. C., Hartley, H. V. III, & Willmer, W. K. (2009). More bang for the buck: Examining influencers of fundraising efficiency and total dollars raised. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9, 35-41.
- Randall, K. C. (2001). The dean as fundraiser. *The University of Toledo Law Review*, 33(1).
- Rhodes, F.T. (1997). *Successful fund raising for higher education: The advancement of learning*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Rosser, V.J, Johnsrud, L.K., & Heck, R.H. (2003). Academic deans and directors: Assessing their effectiveness from individual and institutional perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74, 1-24.
- Satterwhite, C. R. (2004). *The function of university presidents and CEO's in fundraising: A study of public universities with capital campaigns less than \$100 million*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX.
- Satterwhite, C. R. & Cedja, B. (2005). Higher education fundraising: What is a president to do?" *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(4), 333-342.
- Seymour, H.J. (1988). *Designs for fund-raising: Principles, patterns, techniques* (2nd ed.). Rockville, MD: The Fund Raising Institute, A Division of the Taft Group.
- Sturgis, R. (2006). Presidential leadership in institutional advancement: From the perspective of the president and the vice president of institutional advancement. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(3), 221-231.
- Thompson, J. D., Katz, S. & Briechele, P. (2010). A high level annual fund without the annual ask. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9, 273-279.
- Waugh, W. L. (2003). Issues in university governance: More professional and less academic. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 585, 84-96.
- White, D. and Korotayev, A. (2003), Chapter 5 – Statistical Analysis of Cross-Tabs. Retrieved from <http://eclectic.ss.uci.edu/~drwhite/courses/StatGuide.pdf>

Winston, G. (1998). Economic research now shows that higher education is not just another business. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3(17), B6.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H. & Montez, J. M. (2003). The roles and challenges of deans. *The Review of Higher Education*, 26(2),241-266.

Appendix

CAO Fundraising Success Survey Instrument

CAO Fundraising Success Survey

The CAO Fundraising Success Survey takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. This survey administration software, Survey Monkey, allows participant responses to remain anonymous, therefore your name will not be associated with your answers.

Your participation to the following survey is greatly appreciated. Results of the survey will be available to you at your request.

If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at sid.walker@ttu.edu or 936-585-3115.

CAO Fundraising Success Survey
Education
1. Highest level of degree completed:
<input type="radio"/> Bachelors
<input type="radio"/> Masters
<input type="radio"/> Doctorate
Other (please specify)
<input type="text"/>
2. Your major field of study (psychology, Higher Ed, etc.):
<input type="text"/>
3. Are you a Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE)?
<input type="radio"/> Yes
<input type="radio"/> No
<input type="radio"/> Not Applicable

CAO Fundraising Success Survey	
<i>Institution Experience</i>	
4. Current Position Title:	<input type="text"/>
5. How many years have you been in your current position?	<input type="text"/>
6. How many years of experience do you have in higher education fundraising?	<input type="text"/>
7. What is the total number of colleges and universities for which you have worked? (total should include 2-year, 4-year, public, private, etc.)	<input type="text"/>

CAO Fundraising Success Survey					
Fundraising Success					
<p>8. This section contains items regarding the institution where the CAO is currently employed , comparing CURRENT results to the results PRIOR TO the CAO's arrival.</p> <p>Please provide responses to the best of your knowledge and experience as a CAO.</p>					
	No Change	Significantly Worse	Declining	Improving	Significantly Better
President's involvement in fundraising	<input type="radio"/>				
Academic Deans' involvement in fundraising	<input type="radio"/>				
Relationship between Athletics & Advancement	<input type="radio"/>				
Internal Reputation (on campus or within the system) of the Advancement Office	<input type="radio"/>				
External Reputation (alumni, community, partners) of the Advancement Office	<input type="radio"/>				
Percent of Alumni Giving per year	<input type="radio"/>				
Annual Gift Totals per year, unrestricted	<input type="radio"/>				
Total Giving per year, all sources	<input type="radio"/>				
<p>9. What other factors contribute to the fundraising success of your institution?</p> <div style="border: 1px solid gray; height: 80px; width: 100%;"></div>					

CAO Fundraising Success Survey

10. What barriers (special circumstances, individuals, limitations, budgets, etc.) currently exist at your institution that reduce the CAO's impact on fundraising success?

