


Getting the Job Done: An
Examination of Offices of
Institutional Advancement at HBCUs
and the Resources Available to Them

Prepared By: Marcus H. Burgess
November 29, 2020



Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Problem of Practice	5
Focus Organization.....	5
Literature Review and Conceptual Framework.....	7
Who gives?	7
Individual Characteristics of Fundraisers	7
Project Characteristics	7
Fundraising Practices and Available Resources	8
Conceptual Framework	8
Organizational Analysis, Data, and Evidence.....	10
Data Sources	10
Analysis of Survey Data.....	11
Finding #1: Staff Size Has an Impact on Fundraising Success	11
Finding #2: Institutions that confer degrees beyond the bachelor’s level raise more money	11
Finding #3: Institution size correlates with the average total amount raised.	12
Finding #4: Schools actively involved in fundraising raised more than schools that were not.	12
Finding #5: Schools with larger alumni bases raised more than schools with smaller alumni	13
bases.	13
Finding #6: Advancement offices with larger operating budgets raised more than schools	13
with smaller budgets.....	13
Finding #7: The percent of the operating budget given to advancement offices did not	14
correlate to fundraising success.....	14
Analysis of Interview Data	15
Finding #8: Fundraiser experience did not impact fundraising success as determined by the	15
average amount raised.	15
Staff Characteristics	16
Finding #9: High rates of turnover among staff was a barrier to fundraising success.	16
Shared Responsibility for Fundraising.....	17
Finding #10: Institutions with presidents that actively fundraised raised more than	18
institutions where the president was not an active fundraiser.	18
Finding #11: The involvement of other university leaders did not correlate with fundraising	20
success.	20

Finding #12: Schools with high levels of alumni involvement raised more than those that did not have active alumni.....	22
Summary of All Data	22
Implications for Intervention.....	24
Annual Member Institution Assessment	24
Discrete Technical Assistance	24
Knowledge Management and Professional Development	24
Recommendation 1: Reimagine the UNCF’s Institute for Capacity Building (ICB)	24
Recommendation 2: Re-establishing the UNCF’s Capacity Building Grant Process	25
Recommendation 3: Provide Restricted Funding to Member Institutions	25
Examples of Successful Intervention.....	25
Impact of the Initiative	26
Directions for Future Research	28
Conclusion.....	29
References.....	30
Appendix A: IRB Notification	31
Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet	32
Appendix C: Recruitment Email.....	35
Appendix D: Survey Tool.....	36
Appendix E: Interview Protocol.....	39
Appendix F: Institutional Characteristics.....	41



Abstract

This mixed methods case study uses resource-based theory to examine which institutional investments factor into fundraising success at private historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs). The primary source of data was a survey that was adapted from Gunsalus' (2004) study. A secondary data source was the use of interviews that were conducted via phone with a select group of participants.

***Keywords:* institutional advancement, HBCUs, resource-based theory**



Problem of Practice

Gunsalus (2004) conducted a study that examined institutional factors that impacted giving participation rates. The study compared the effectiveness of fundraising work in higher education. This kind of study is important because it allows institutions to evaluate their effectiveness and adopt new institutional practices. It also sets a standard for best practices when it comes to advancement offices and their fundraising efforts.

In my capstone research, I examined the relationship between advancement offices' resources and their ability to achieve fundraising success. While Gunsalus' (2004) study focused on the top tiers of schools in U.S. News and World Report, my capstone research is focused on private historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) that are member institutions of the United Negro College Fund. HBCUs already face a number of institutional challenges when it comes to fundraising and the results of this research could possibly provide some insight as to how those institutions can strengthen their advancement offices.

Focus Organization

Because HBCUs are spread out across a significant portion of the nation, I decided to make the focus organization the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). The UNCF's mission is to provide opportunities for financial support to students who may not be able to attend school without it. The UNCF accomplishes that mission through its financial support of its 37 member institutions. These 37 schools are private HBCUs that are spread out across the nation.

The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) is the largest and oldest fundraising organization that supports the education of Black students. They are also an organization dedicated to supporting their member institutions from both a programming and financial aspect. The UNCF raises operating funds for 37 private, historically Black colleges and universities. They provide networking opportunities, fundraising support, and leadership development for the private HBCUs in its membership.

The UNCF has been investing considerable resources in the development of their member institutions in a variety of areas. Specific to leadership, the UNCF launched the Institute for Capacity Building (ICB) in 2006 with the intent of supporting and strengthening institutions' capacity for fundraising, improving enrollment and retention, academic programming and faculty development, and financial management. When member institutions launch their capital campaigns or other fundraising efforts, they are able to consult with the IBC in an effort to understand the best practices around how to realize the greatest levels of success.

Despite their commitment to providing such high levels of support for its member institutions, the UNCF is still experiencing a continued decrease in the funds raised by its schools. While member institutions have continued fundraising and experience fundraising success, many have faced challenges when it comes to sustaining that fundraising success. With a smaller pool of consistent alumni donors, limited human capital in advancement offices, and/or a lack of fundraising skill in senior leaders, many of these HBCUs have experienced inconsistent success with their fundraising efforts over time. That is why the UNCF is interested in understanding how its member institutions are allocating resources to support development, or fundraising efforts.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

The interest in the factors and practices of successful advancement offices is not new (Skinner, 2019). Advancement officers at every school are constantly considering the factors that encourage people to support the institution financially. This is mainly because colleges and universities have always relied on consistent private gifts to support programming and scholarships for students (Skinner, 2019). Colleges and universities also need to dedicate considerable resources to private fundraising because they are unable to depend on declining state funding allocations (Skinner, 2019).

Who gives?

A 1986 study of Wellesley College, Grant and Lindauer found that age was a significant indicator of a person's ability and willingness to donate to the institution. After examining the giving patterns across reunion years, Grant and Lindauer (1986) found that older people were more likely to give consistently and at higher levels than younger people. Now, it is important to acknowledge that the difference is not necessarily the result of apathy on younger people. The fact of the matter is that older people are often in better positions to give financially. These findings were also supported by Belfield and Beney (2000). There is also evidence that women give at slightly higher rates than men (Belfield & Beney, 2000), but they also tend to give smaller amounts (Okunade, Wunnava, & Walsh, 1994). People who were active on campus, specifically those who are members of fraternities and sororities, also give at higher rates than those who are not members (Harrison, Mitchell, & Peterson, 1995).

Understanding the profile of a giver is not enough to ensure that fundraising efforts are successful. Prior research has discovered that there are also other factors of the fundraising effort that influence the likelihood of fundraising success (Dahlin et al., 2019). Those factors include individual characteristics, project characteristics, and the availability of staff and resources.

Individual Characteristics of Fundraisers

There have been some studies that found differences in fundraising success that were rooted in gender differences. Women who lead fundraisers tend to experience success at higher rates than men who lead fundraisers (Greenberg & Mollick, 2017). Even having a single woman on the team can increase the chances of fundraising success. Another characteristic is the social network that each member of the fundraising team has access to (Bruton et al., 2015). Those who have broad social networks tend to experience greater success in when fundraising because they have a greater number of people to connect to the project (Bruton et al., 2015). Additionally, fundraisers with large social networks may experience greater success in fundraising because they can leverage large networks of people using social media (Bruton et al., 2015).

Project Characteristics

Another factor that influences the success of fundraising efforts is the reason that the money is being raised in the first place (Sauermaun et al., 2019). From the literature on crowdfunding and

fundraising, it has been discovered that fundraising efforts tend to be more successful when they have non-profit goals (Skirnevskiy et al., 2017). Fundraising campaigns that have for-profit goals tend to be less successful (Skirnevskiy et al., 2017).

Fundraising Practices and Available Resources

Another factor in fundraising success is the fundraising practices of the institution. While the literature focuses on many different types of fundraising practices, I focused specifically on staffing structures as a fundraising practice because that is the spirit of this capstone.

Of all the factors that impact an institution's ability to fundraise successfully, staffing and resources impacts are the most understudied. Kroll (2012) found that advancement offices with fewer staff raised significantly less in total and spent less on fundraising and advancement services than schools that had more advancement staff. This makes sense because the less staff an advancement office has, the higher the possibility that the staff will be overextended by the demands of the institution.

It is not just about a relationship between the number of people on staff and the number of dollars raised. Kroll (2012) also found that an institution with the median number of advancement staff and raised more, both in total and per staff member, than the other groups in the comparison. This would indicate that there has to be something more in place than having a bigger advancement staff. The institution maximized their efficiency which also maximized their ability to fundraise efficiently.

Conceptual Framework

The theoretical framework for this proposal is resource-based theory. The theory focuses on efficiency as a method for sustaining the highest levels of performance (Barney & Clark, 2007). In the case of the proposal, the performance is institutional fundraising efforts. Resource-based theory is used in this proposal to help the focus organization understand why some of the UNCF member institutions are outperforming the others when it comes to fundraising.

Resource-based view was introduced by Wernerfelt (1984). He attempted to develop of theory that shed light on the relationship between resources and outcomes. While other researchers were also examining why some organizations were outperforming others, Wernerfelt (1984) was doing so by examining the resources (human, financial, etc.) that an organization relied on to meet its objectives. As such, Wernerfelt was known for viewing performance issues as a competition for resources among organizations that had the ability to impact their chances of gaining advantages in their areas. This view was later supported by Barney (1986).

Barney (1986) added to Wernerfelt's initial view by suggesting that the view that Wernerfelt (1984) was promoting was actually better used to gauge performance across organizations. As such, Barney (1986) is credited with shifting the resource-based view into an actual research theory. Although Barney's (1986) theory provides more depth and has greater implications for organizational

success, this capstone proposal is grounded in the most basic part of the theory—the idea that variations in resources can lead to variations in outcomes.

To bring this back to the focus organization, the UNCF uses a formula to determine the allocations that are given to each of its member institutions. Thinking about this through the lens of resource-based theory, the member institutions that can leverage their resources to achieve higher fundraising outcomes are able to use that efficiency to their advantage (i.e. increased allocations from the UNCF). This is a large part of the reason that this is a topic of great importance for the UNCF.

Organizational Analysis, Data, and Evidence

In order to understand the relationship between advancement offices' resources and their ability to achieve high giving participation rates, this proposal is guided by an adapted version of the question that guided Gunsalus' (2004) study. The research question is, "Which institutional investments make the biggest impact on fundraising success in Private HBCUs?". There are two sub questions that are designed to help explore the larger research question. They are:

- What institutional characteristics are associated with the resources that they have for advancement?
- What relationship, if any, exists between development resources and fundraising outcomes?

It is also important to point out that I will be referring to the definition of advancement that is used by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). The organization defines advancement as "all of the functions charged with building relationships with an institution's constituents in order to benefit the institution" (Kroll, 2012, p. 10).

Data Sources

This was a mixed methods case study because it used qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data. For this study, the primary source of the data was a survey. The survey tool is an adapted version of the AIMS survey used by Kroll (2012) in a study written for CASE. The survey tool asks questions about staffing, budget allocations, services provided by, and the initiatives of offices of institutional advancement. However, the survey does not require information about specific fundraising practices because the goal is to determine other factors that impact fundraising efforts across HBCUs.

The survey was created in Survey Monkey and was shared with the gatekeeper at UNCF. From there, the survey tool was sent out to the vice presidents of institutional advancement at all 37 UNCF member institutions. The gatekeeper was a senior-level official at UNCF headquarters who had access to the target group. Of the 37 surveys that were sent, only 20 of the vice presidents responded to the survey. The survey was initially open for a three-week period but had to be extended twice to give potential respondents more time to participate. Overall, the survey was open for a 10-week period. Additional responses were also collected after the survey originally closed in an effort to increase the sample size for generalizability purposes.

The data collected via the survey was augmented by interviews with institutional advancement professionals at a select group of UNCF member institutions. The select group of advancement professionals were selected from schools with a wide variety of fundraising goal success. Some schools were among the highest fundraisers while others were among the lowest. This was intentional so that there would be a wide variety of experiences captured in the interview tool.

The interview tool was structured in a way that allowed clarifying questions to be asked. Prior to the COVID shutdown, interviews were supposed to be conducted in person. After the shutdown, however, interviews were conducted over the phone or via Zoom for the safety of myself and the participants. Interviews lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. Of the 37 vice presidents available, 10 of

them participated in the interviews. This sample included schools that have experienced consistent success in fundraising, those who have had more challenges than others, as well as those that have moderate fundraising success.

Analysis of Survey Data

The survey was shared via email with all 37 member institutions. Of that number, 20 schools responded, with two schools submitting responses twice. Six of the survey respondents were vice presidents of institutional advancement while one of them was the senior director of development. When it comes to the schools that participated in the study, they represent a wide range of fundraising success. Some of the schools had very little consistent success, others had moderate success, and others were consistently successful in their fundraising efforts. To protect the identities of those who participated in the study, each school has been renamed.

Finding #1: Staff Size Has an Impact on Fundraising Success

The primary purpose of this capstone was to explore the ways that investments in human capital impact an institution’s ability to successfully fundraise. One of the methods for doing so is to take the total staff available at each institution and compare it to the total amount that each institution raised by stakeholder groups. Doing so provides surface-level insight into how human capital can affect fundraising success.

Table 1

Human Capital and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Staff Size		Average amount raised in FY18-19
	<i>n</i>	
5 or less	6	\$2,223,000
6-10	9	\$3,935,188
11-15	1	\$6,445,000
16 or more	4	\$7,969,000

Immediately, it is evident that there is a correlation between the staff size at an institution and the average amount raised by each group. Institutions with larger total numbers of staff outraised those institutions with smaller staff sizes. This supports the idea that the number of fundraising staff matters to the success of a fundraising initiative at private HBCUs. The larger the staff, the more “hands on deck” are available to assist with fundraising initiatives. This includes frontline fundraisers, those directly responsible for securing gifts from prospective donors, as well as support staff and department leaders.

Finding #2: Institutions that confer degrees beyond the bachelor’s level raise more money

Table 2

Carnegie Degree Classification and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Carnegie Classification		Average amount raised in FY18-19
	<i>n</i>	
Bachelor's	11	\$4,192,063
Master's	8	\$4,302,500
Doctoral	1	\$6,546,000

Like staff size, the Carnegie degree classification also seems to correlate to increased levels of money raised on average. Most of the schools in the sample did not confer a degree beyond the bachelor's level and they were outraised by the single institution that conferred degrees at the doctoral level. One could assume that the single school that confers doctoral degrees could have outraised the other schools because graduates of doctoral programs make more on average than those who only hold a bachelor's degree. However, the reasons for the increase are not immediately clear based on the data collected from institutional advancement leaders.

Finding #3: Institution size correlates with the average total amount raised.

Table 3

Carnegie Size Classification and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Size Based on Carnegie Classification		Average amount raised in FY18-19
	<i>n</i>	
Very Small	9	\$3,974,111
Small	9	\$4,335,555
Medium	1	\$6,145,500

The size of an institution, based on student enrollment, also correlated with higher fundraising totals. Very small schools, on average, raised considerably less than larger schools. Again, it is difficult to drill down to exactly why the difference exists, but it could be related to the idea that schools with larger student bodies end up with larger alumni bases because they graduate more students. Whatever the reason, the correlation of school size to average amounts raised hold across all three school size classifications. None of the schools in the sample were classified as large by Carnegie's classification levels.

Finding #4: Schools actively involved in fundraising raised more than schools that were not.

Table 4

Fundraising Campaign Status and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Fundraiser in FY18-19		Total amount raised in FY18-19
	<i>n</i>	
Yes	8	\$4,684,625
No	12	\$4,133,475

When institutions are in an active fundraising campaign, there is a concerted effort to secure donors that are willing to provide financial gifts to the university. One would expect that those institutions that were engaged in an active fundraising campaign, whether it was a crisis fundraising or a different campaign, to outraise those schools that were not engaged in an active fundraising campaign. That expectation is true with this set of institutions. Schools that were in fundraising campaigns raised slightly more than those institutions that were not. Again, the reasons for this are not immediately clear from the data collected via the survey. What is clear, though, is that the argument can be made that fundraising status has an impact on total amounts raised by the institutions.

Finding #5: Schools with larger alumni bases raised more than schools with smaller alumni bases.

Table 5

Solicitable Alumni and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Number of Solicitable Alumni		Average amount raised in FY18-19
	<i>n</i>	
0 – 5,000	10	\$3,460,000
6,000 – 11,000	7	\$5,198,000
12,000 – 18,000	1	\$3,800,000
19,000 or more	2	\$6,145,000

When looking at the total number of solicitable alumni at each institution compared to the average amount that they were able to raise, there seems to be a correlation between alumni base size and total amount raised. However, the correlation is not consistent across all of the subgroups in this classification. When we look at the one institution that had a considerable alumni base, they raised less than the institutions with next smallest alumni bases. The reason for that is likely due to the inclusion of small institutions that were engaged in crisis fundraising. Those institutions raised considerably more than typical because of they were working to avoid institutional shutdowns that garnered the attention of large, one-time donors. Another factor could be that there is only a single institution in the 12,000 to 18,000 category. The small *n* may not be a true indicator of the average amount raised by schools with alumni bases this size.

Finding #6: Advancement offices with larger operating budgets raised more than schools with smaller budgets.

Table 6

Advancement Operating Budget and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Total advancement operating budget	<i>n</i>	Average amount raised in FY18-19
\$2,000,000 or less	15	\$3,166,800
\$2,000,001- \$4,000,000	3	\$5,915,000
\$400,000,001- \$6,000,000	1	\$6,546,000
\$6,000,001-\$8,000,000	1	\$15,285,000

The advancement operating budget determines how much an advancement office has to spend on human capital and other resources needed to do the work of fundraising for the institution. One would expect that schools that have experienced fundraising success—as demonstrated by the total amount raised by the institution—would receive a higher operating budget allocation than those schools that raise smaller amounts of money. That expectation holds true with the current sample of schools. The larger the advancement operating budget, the more schools in that group raised on average compared to schools with smaller budgets. This enforces the argument for increased allocations for advancement departments that they can then use to increase human capital as well as the reach of their frontline fundraisers.

Finding #7: The percent of the operating budget given to advancement offices did not correlate to fundraising success.

Table 7

Percent of Total Operating Budget and Average Amount Raised by Institution

Percent of total operating budget	<i>n</i>	Average amount raised in FY18-19
2% or less	8	\$2,216,875
<2% - 5%	6	\$4,986,283
<5% - 8%	4	\$7,526,500
<8% - 11%	2	\$4,660,000

The percent of the institution’s operating budget that is allocated to advancement offices is representative of the institution’s commitment to fundraising success. One would expect that the greater the percentage, the more fundraising success an institution would experience. For the schools in this sample, that is mostly true. However, we can see that four schools in the third category raised significantly more on average than the other three groups. Again, this is likely due to the inclusion of those institutions that experienced unprecedented large donations due to crisis fundraising efforts. It could also be due to the way that schools allocate funding to the advancement department. For one school in particular, their advancement office’s operating budget comes from the school’s endowment. This means that they have access to a larger percentage of the institution’s budget than a school whose budget does not come from the endowment.

Analysis of Interview Data

As with the quantitative data, the data taken from the interviews with advancement staff were intended to answer the research question, “Which institutional investments make the biggest impact on fundraising success in Private HBCUs?”. The data from the interviews was coded using an open coding method where the researcher reviewed each transcript for common themes that related to the research question. The analysis is organized into two major themes or institutional characteristics that seemed to come up the most when it came to fundraising success—fundraiser and staff experience and a shared responsibility for fundraising. The second theme is split into three subthemes that focus on the involvement of the institution’s president, other institutional leaders, and the institution’s alumni base.

Finding #8: Fundraiser experience did not impact fundraising success as determined by the average amount raised.

Table 8 shows the advancement experience of the 10 interviewees that participated in this study.

Table 8

Advancement Experience of Interviewees by Total Amount Raised

Years of Experience		Average Amount Raised
	<i>N</i>	
10 years or less	4	\$4,300,000
11-20 years	4	\$15,285,000
21 years or more	2	\$2,675,000

The literature on fundraising success suggests that there are fundraiser characteristics that position a fundraiser for success. For instance, we know that women tend to be more successful fundraisers than men (Greenberg & Mollick, 2017). Another characteristic that emerged from the research was the social network that each member of the fundraising team has access to (Bruton et al., 2015). An operating assumption is that those who have extensive experience in the advancement field are likely to have broad social networks, increasing the likelihood of their success when it comes to fundraising efforts.

Of the 10 interviewees, six of them had more than 15 years of experience in advancement work. With this group, it seemed like participants were either a veteran fundraiser or they were at the beginning of a fundraising career—there was no middle ground. A group of advancement professionals this experienced were still experiencing varying levels of fundraising success.

When compared to the quantitative data provided by the schools (see Table 8), there is still no correlation between the advancement officer’s years of experience and the total amount raised at the

institution. This is where the findings for this particular theme do not support the findings of previous literature. A closer look at staff characteristics may shed some light on why that may be the case.

Staff Characteristics

Like survey respondents, interviewees were asked to identify the number of staff members working in their advancement offices. In an effort to understand the level of autonomy each advancement officer had when it came to selecting their staff members, each interviewee was asked to describe how decisions about staffing were made. John Q explained that he “hired all directors and the directors hire their staffs. However, I interview the people they select before an employment offer is made”. The same was true for Bob Jones. For Fundraiser 6 and Kennedy, the decisions were made by the vice president of the institutional advancement. Advancement Executive said that hiring decisions were made “based on institutional priorities and peer institutional staffing models aligned with aspirational goals and objectives”. So, for their school, hiring decisions seemed to be controlled by someone outside of their office.

Most of the interviewees had some say in the hiring process when it came to their advancement staff. This allowed those advancement leaders to create a team that would be built of varying levels of experience and/or genders, potentially maximizing their potential for fundraising success.

When comparing the number of advancement staff to the total amount raised at each institution, we see that there is initially a strong correlation between staff sizes and the total amount raised. Advancement officers that had larger staffs also seemed to have greater success in fundraising. However, the correlation becomes weaker when we look at Advancement Executive’s staff. Even with 11 staff members, the institution raised \$650,000 and, based on the other schools with larger staff sizes, the expectation would be that Advancement Executive’s total amount raised would be higher.

Finding #9: High rates of turnover among staff was a barrier to fundraising success.

When asked to explain why larger numbers of staff do not always translate to increased fundraising amounts, many of the interviewees cited turnover among their staffs as a primary reason. When asked to describe the rates of turnover among their staff, Bob Jones explained:

In Development, turnover for fundraisers is quite high. On average, the frontline fundraisers stay about a year and a half. The accounting and database positions, however, are very stable. In all the other areas of Development, the average tenure is 5 years.

John Q. also expressed that turnover in his department was “extremely high”. On average, his department lost a gifts officer every 1.5 years. The same was true for Camille. For Barbara and Fundraiser 6, department turnover was average. For Kennedy, Lisa, and Monica, department turnover was low.

Staff turnover is an important consideration because talent and knowledge leave when an advancement department loses a staff member. If an advancement department is regularly losing

talent, then it adversely impacts the department's ability to fundraise successfully. Instead of focusing the majority of their efforts on fundraising, high rates of turnover mean that a department's focus has to be on training and development instead of fundraising. They often have to grow their own.

Shared Responsibility for Fundraising

Each advancement officer was asked to identify the role of their president, other leaders, and alumni when it comes to fundraising. The roles of each group are presented first, followed by an analysis of the impact on fundraising. Each subsection also includes the ways that the advancement offices support each stakeholder group.

Role of the President

The majority of interviewees reported that their institution's president was active in the institution's fundraising efforts. When asked how involved his president was in fundraising, John Q. responded, "Very involved. He proactively seeks prospects and works with me to develop cultivation strategies and execution". To support the president in his fundraising work, John's office "provides intelligence on all his prospects. The president and the vice president of advancement work closely together on solicitations".

Fundraiser 6 also had a president that was involved "at all levels" and was "intimately involved" in the fundraising for the institution. The same was true for Bob Jones. He explained:

The president is quite involved. He frequently participates in prospect visits as assigned by the VP for IA. He is also involved in developing solicitation strategies; however, he doesn't do many cultivation meetings. Most of his meetings are at the solicitation stage.

To support his president in the fundraising efforts, Bob's office "provides 100% of the information needed for the president's fundraising efforts. The office provides research, updates on cultivation efforts, schedules meetings, and attends them with the president".

Advancement Executive and Kennedy also reported that their presidents were very active in fundraising efforts as well. The former described their president's role by saying, "Our President is highly engaged in our Fundraising efforts. We are now building depth amongst our other senior leaders - academic and administrative". Advancement Executive was the only interviewee to mention that the advancement office was training other senior leaders to engage in fundraising. Kennedy said that her president was "the chief fundraising officer. He is engaged with major donors and donor prospects". To support that work, Kennedy's department "[kept] him abreast of potential major donors and set up time for him to engage them. We also assist in scheduling meetings while in the donor's city".

When asked to consider the way that their department supported the fundraising efforts of the president, Advancement Executive responded:

This question puzzles me - a fully functioning office of institutional advancement should be the engine that not only supports the President but the entire campus community in regards to fundraising. With that said and at a minimum, we should set all fundraising expectations, priorities, etc.

When asked to clarify whether their office was providing these services to the president as he was engaged in fundraising, Advancement Executive reported that their department was not currently supporting the president in that way.

For Lisa, Monica, and Camille, their presidents were also very active in fundraising efforts. Camille reported, “The president is deep in the trenches with fundraising. I am her worst nightmare if she does not follow up with potential donors”. Camille and her staff supported those fundraising efforts by researching and providing notes on potential donors, scheduling meetings, and shadowing the president when it came to meeting with potential donors. The same was true for Lisa and her office as they primarily supported the president’s fundraising efforts by setting meetings, discussing strategies for securing gifts, and writing proposals based on the meetings they had with the president. Monica did not offer anything different than Camille and Lisa.

Mark K. was the only interviewee that described his president’s fundraising involvement as “low to moderate”. The president often left the securing of major gifts to the advancement department and only became involved once the gift had been secured. The advancement office’s primary role, then, was simply to provide the president with actionable information concerning major gifts.

Finding #10: Institutions with presidents that actively fundraised raised more than institutions where the president was not an active fundraiser.

Table 9

Presidential Involvement by Advancement Officer Compared to Total Amount Raised

President Active in Fundraising?	<i>n</i>	Total Amount Raised
Yes	9	\$4,371,375
No	1	\$3,975,000

Overall, institutional presidents were considered to be very active in the fundraising process. That can be considered an asset to small advancement offices as presidents tend to have broad social networks as the most visible institutional leaders. When we look at presidential involvement compared to fundraising, there is a clear correlation between presidential involvement and the total amount raised (see Table 9). Therefore, it is safe to conclude that presidential involvement leads to increased success in fundraising looking at the total raised alone.

Role of Other Leaders

There was a lot more variation in responses when interviewees were asked to describe the involvement of other senior leaders when it came to fundraising efforts. These leaders were other vice-presidents and deans. Again, the roles of other leaders are presented accompanied by a description of how the advancement department supports other leaders. The end of the section provides a comparison of the involvement of other leaders to the total amount raised.

Ms. C and Mark K. reported that their other leaders are “not as involved” as they would like them to be. Barbara’s department provided support “as needed or requested without hesitation, but the relationships between academic affairs and institutional advancement is not close or ideal”. In Mark’s case, the advancement office simply asks other leaders for their priorities and then tries to help the other leaders by providing what the leaders need in order to realize their goals.

John Q., Bob Jones, Monica, and Fundraiser 6 all worked at institutions where there was some level of involvement from other leaders. John Q. reported that some of the other institutional leaders were helpful. He added, “They will do what they are asked. Others are not involved at all and do not see it as their responsibility unless they or their area benefit directly. Most of them are not proactive in fundraising”. When describing his department’s role in supporting the fundraising efforts of other leaders, John Q. explained:

We constantly ask them to work with us. We make recommendations on prospects who may be supportive of their areas. We also develop cultivation and solicitation strategies. In most cases, a Development Officer makes the ask. IA also assists leaders in developing grant proposals.

Bob Jones also said that other leaders were “very engaged and proactive in fundraising. I’d put this at a third of the population. Another 10% of them will participate when asked. The rest participate minimally or not at all”. When it comes to supporting those efforts, Bob’s department “provides prospect research and helps to develop solicitation strategies. in most cases, someone from Development accompanies them on cultivation meetings and almost always does for solicitation meetings. The office also ensures the faculty members remain in contact with donors”. For Fundraiser 6, only two of the senior leaders were involved in fundraising—the provost and the chief of staff. At Monica’s institution, only those who were involved in STEM fields actively participated in fundraising efforts.

Advancement Executive and Kennedy worked at institutions where other leaders were actively involved in fundraising efforts. Advancement Executive described the involvement of other leaders in the following way:

Our fundraising team is organized by units and subject matter experts. My team drives short- and long-term strategies, including helping academic leaders think beyond budget relief needs. My ultimate desire is that we build sustainable revenue (current use/endowed) based on institutional priorities.

To support that work, Advancement’s department offers support to other leaders through “strategic thinking and planning for the future of the institution”. At Kennedy’s institution, the other leaders were “very involved”, especially when it came to grant making and special appeals. Her department provides assistance with by increasing other leaders’ awareness of fundraisers and disseminating information.

It is important to note that Camille and Lisa’s institutions were in the beginning stages implementing fundraising trainings for other leaders. At Camille’s institution, her department was beginning to work with other leaders on fundraising for their specific areas. For Lisa, the work of engaging other leaders had also just begun. Her department was holding regular meetings with other leaders to “engage them in the fundraising process”.

Finding #11: The involvement of other university leaders did not correlate with fundraising success.

Table 10

Other Leaders’ Involvement by Advancement Officer Compared to Total Amount Raised

Other Leaders Active in Fundraising?	<i>n</i>	Total Amount Raised
No	2	\$4,137,500
Some	4	\$6,290,500
Beginning Stages	2	\$2,119,500
Very	2	\$635,000

Overall, other leaders had varying levels of involvement with the fundraising process. Like the involvement of institution presidents, the involvement of other senior leaders can also be considered an asset to small advancement offices because it helps lift the work of fundraising. However, when we look at the involvement of other leaders compared to fundraising, there is no clear correlation between their involvement and the total amount raised (see Table 10). Again, that makes it difficult to say that the involvement of other institution leaders leads to increased success in fundraising when looking at the total raised alone.

Role of Alumni

Alumni involvement across the participating institutions varied. Four interviewees reported that their alumni were very active, four reported that their alumni were somewhat active, and two reported that their alumni were not active at all. The descriptions of alumni involvement are presented along with how the advancement departments support their fundraising efforts. The end of the section provides a comparison of the involvement of alumni to the total amount raised.

Ms. C was one of the interviewees that reported having a very active alumni base. She said, “Alumni are the backbone of much of the work of Institutional Advancement. [The] alumni are amazingly supportive and resilient”. To support the institution’s alumni, Barbara’s office “nurtured and

maintain strong, personal, authentic relationships with alumni”. While the alumni at John Q.’s institution were also considered “very involved”, he also expressed a desire for additional involvement. He explained:

I would like to see even more. The national alumni association has a fundraising committee that collaborates with the Development team. They are particularly active on the university's giving day and during alumni reunion. I would like to see them become more active with other fundraising efforts as well.

From a support standpoint, John’s office “provided complete support to alumni fundraising efforts. We provide reports to them and help them draft their appeals. We provide budget support to their efforts as well”. Kennedy also had alumni who were “very involved” but that involvement was limited to Homecoming fundraising. The institution’s advancement department provided support by “offering assistance in bringing awareness and disseminating their efforts to the community”. At Lisa’s institution, the alumni association was “very active” and was “fully supported by the university and advancement staff”.

An equal number of interviewees reported that their alumni were somewhat active. Bob Jones explained alumni involvement by saying, “The alumni chapters are fairly involved. They mostly solicit each other for annual fund gifts. They are not very involved in major gift fundraising”. To support alumni participation, Bob’s department provided them with campaign materials and facilitated class and chapter meetings. Mark K. reported that the alumni of his institution would “occasionally spearhead a campaign for giving”. Outside of that, their involvement was limited. Camille also noted that alumni at her institution were “somewhat active”.

Advancement Executive noted that alumni at their institution were active, but that it was something the advancement department had been intentional about improving. They explained:

For us, this is a work in progress. However, in the couple of years, our engagement with alumni is exponential because we are building greater trust amongst the ranks. Alumni giving moved give percentage points in one year. This is unheard in our industry.

To support that work, the office of advancement supported alumni fundraising efforts through “our Alumni Giving Team which is now growing by two additional professionals this year. We are building capacity by our demonstrated success”.

Fundraiser 6 and Monica worked for institutions where the alumni were not as active. Specifically, the alumni at Fundraiser 6’s institution displayed “little to no engagement”. However, when they did engage, the “full cycle of development” was available to them, depending on the initiative. At Monica’s institution, the alumni association had their own separate 501c3 so they did not collaborate with the university on fundraising efforts.

Finding #12: Schools with high levels of alumni involvement raised more than those that did not have active alumni.

Table 11

Alumni Involvement by Advancement Officer Compared to Total Amount Raised

Alumni Active in Fundraising?		Total Amount Raised
	<i>n</i>	
No	2	\$1,665,500
Some	4	\$3,706,925
Very	4	\$5,219,250

Similar to the involvement of other leaders, alumni were involved in fundraising efforts at varying levels. Like the involvement of other leaders, the involvement of alumni can also be helpful to advancement offices because it widens their network of potential donors. However, the same thing is true here that is true for institution presidents; when we look at the involvement of alumni compared to fundraising, there is a clear correlation between their involvement and the total amount raised (see Table 11). Once again, that demonstrates that, for these institutions, the involvement of alumni leads to increased success in fundraising when looking at the total raised alone. More context regarding the success of various initiatives would be needed in order to determine the impact of each stakeholder group on the institution’s fundraising success.

Summary of All Data

The research question guiding this study was, “Which institutional investments make the biggest impact on fundraising success in Private HBCUs?”. Based on the data collected, it was clear that the number of full-time fundraising/development officers had a clear impact on an advancement offices’ ability to fundraise successfully. While the correlations between resources and average amount raised were not always consistent, it is safe to say that the provision of institutional resources has a significant impact on an advancement office’s ability to fundraise successfully. With that in mind, institutions should work to ensure that their advancement offices have the resources necessary in order to realize increased fundraising success. To help shed light on additional areas of study, the interviewees were asked to describe the strengths and weaknesses of their departments.

One of the common strengths reported by interviewees was resilience. Even when their advancement teams did not have all of the resources they wanted or needed, their staff members always put their best foot forward when it came to fundraising, securing gifts, and maintaining meaningful relationships with their donors. Another strength was that the available advancement staff typically worked well together and were innovative in coming up with new methods for engaging past and potential donors.

When it came to the challenges, the most common among all ten interviewees were the allocation of limited resources and staffing needs. Overwhelmingly, there was a need for additional staff members to help do the work of fundraising. Many of the interviewees cited employee turnover and limited numbers of staff members as another common set of challenges. Over and over again, advancement officers communicated that they had staffing challenges that impacted their ability to consistently experience fundraising success. With small numbers of staff member and high turnover, institutions' ability to fundraise can be severely compromised. After reflecting on their strengths and challenges, interviewees were also asked to describe what resources, if any, they needed to improve their fundraising success.

A common theme among the requested resources was either an increase in staff or an increase in the advancement operating budget. There were also requests for additional training or software that would make the job of coordinating fundraising easier. The recommendations for the intervention, then, are rooted in the requests from the interviewees.

Implications for Intervention

The recommended intervention is that the UNCF develop and implement a capacity-building program to support the development efforts of its member institutions. The program has three primary components: reimagining the UNCF's Institute for Capacity Building, reestablishing the UNCF's Capacity Building Grant Process, and providing restricted funding to member institutions to help provide additional support.

The UNCF's current ICB framework is to provide institutional support services to participating member institutions. The support provided by the ICB occurs both on and off site. There are three components to the institutional support provided by the ICB—the annual member institution assessment, discrete technical assistance, and knowledge management and professional development.

Annual Member Institution Assessment

As part of their move to support member institutions, the ICB conducts an annual institutional assessment that is designed to assess the institution's needs, threats, and opportunities. The findings of the assessment are then used to provide support tailored to the institutions' needs. The ICB then steps in to provide support on addressing threats before they become problematic and begin to risk the sustainability of the institution. The assessment typically focuses on three areas—student achievement financial resources, and institutional effectiveness.

Discrete Technical Assistance

The technical assistance provided here is also intended to be specific to the opportunities and threats that were identified in the annual member institution assessment. The interventions implemented are based on the three areas of the assessment instead of focusing on a single area. Participating institutions have to compete for a grant in order to receive the support that begins with a two-day site visit from a consultant.

Knowledge Management and Professional Development

ICB also provides training opportunities for UNCF member institutions both virtually and in-person. The training programs are designed to encourage information sharing, networking, and the exchange of best practices across member institutions. This component is one of the more popular among advancement officers.

Recommendation 1: Reimagine the UNCF's Institute for Capacity Building (ICB)

In order to better meet the needs of its member institutions, the UNCF should consider providing increased levels of professional development for advancement officers. The professional development should include best practices for making the most of fundraising with small advancement departments and/or providing training to new hires for in advancement departments. The professional development for new hires would provide participants with basic information concerning the

fundraising process and would alleviate advancement offices' burden of providing entry training to new hires.

The UNCF, through ICB, should also work to provide direct support to the advancement leaders through quarterly vice president round tables and staff peer-to-peer sessions. The key here is to allow member institutions to learn from each other more frequently during the year instead of only having an annual opportunity through the ICB. These conversations are more apples to apples versus the training or conferences offered by CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education), AFP (Association of Fundraising Professionals), etc. Through the ICB, schools could save the costs of paying for outside trainings on best practices by utilizing the skills and expertise of advancement professionals within the UNCF member institutions.

Recommendation 2: Re-establishing the UNCF's Capacity Building Grant Process

As part of the intervention to address the specific needs of advancement offices in order to increase the likelihood of fundraising success, the UNCF should allow institutions the opportunity to compete for grants that help grow their advancement staffs and provide much-needed dollars for programming. The UNCF should also partner with existing donors and foundations to provide \$1 to \$2 million in funding that is specifically earmarked for capacity building in advancement at member institutions. This capacity building should be centered around the staffing needs, technology enhancement, training, and presidential and college/university commitment to continue funding the advancement office after the grant funding runs out.

Recommendation 3: Provide Restricted Funding to Member Institutions

Providing restricted funding to member institutions will help provide additional support to hire, develop, and retain development staff. By designating a portion of the allocations for the exclusive use of capacity building and training for advancement staff this will allow smaller institutions to not only reach fundraising goals but possibly exceed them. These funds will also allow larger institutions to retain key staff while continuing to build upon their current advancement infrastructure.

Examples of Successful Intervention

The Kresge HBCU initiative is one of the foremost examples of success in developing advancement officers. The initiative was a 5-year program, \$18 million programs that was dedicated to helping five HBCUs develop comprehensive advancement programs. The Kresge initiative provided each participating institution with specialized funding, training, and technical assistance with the aim of creating sustainable advancement departments.

Each of the five grantee institutions received a \$2 million grant from the foundation that was dispersed over a five-year period. Those funds were to be used for staffing, technology, and programming. Grant winners also received extensive training, technical assistance, and access to consultants. If institutions met their annual benchmarks, they were awarded an additional grant of up to \$25,000 per year. If they achieved a special, major milestone, then they were eligible to receive a one-time \$100,000 grant.

Impact of the Initiative

Prior to the start of the HBCU Initiative, advancement at the five grant institutions was severely underfunded. Few staff members were dedicated to direct fundraising and/or solicitation activity. The initiative was successful in its goal of improving the staffing and operational budgets of the grant institutions (see Table 12 and Table 13).

Table 12

Operations and Staffing Comparison of Grant Institutions Before the HBCU Initiative

Grantee	A	B	C	D	E
Advancement Budget	\$717,958	\$1.1 million	\$743,808	\$1.6 million	\$853,645
Institutional Budget	\$26 million	\$49 million	\$43 million	\$82 million	\$30 million
# of advancement staff	11	9	14	22	15
Percent of institutional budget spent for advancement	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%

Table 13

Operations and Staffing Comparison of Grant Institutions After the HBCU Initiative

Grantee	A	B	C	D	E
Advancement Budget	\$1.6 million	\$2 million	\$1.7 million	\$3.5 million	\$2 million
Institutional Budget	\$31.5 million	\$62 million	\$40.4 million	\$115 million	\$51.3 million
# of advancement staff	14	28	20		26
Percent of institutional	6%	4%	5%	4%	4%

budget spent for
advancement

Participation in the HBCU Initiative also led to increased private giving for each of the participating institutions (see Table 14). This is because, prior to participating in the initiative, the chief advancement officers functioned primarily as a grant writer. This meant that the institutions were over-reliant on federal grants in their operations budgets. Over time, technical assistance was provided to the chief advancement officers in order to build their capacity as the chief fundraisers in their departments. This also meant establishing major gift programs at each institution.

Table 14

Private Giving Compared to Federal Grants During Participation

Grantee	Year Before Grant	Year 4	Year 5
A	Private: \$3.7 million	Private: \$5.3 million	Private: \$8.3 million
	Federal: \$5.7 million	Federal: \$5.2 million	Federal: \$5.0 million
B	Private: \$5.9 million	Private: \$10.3 million	Private: \$10.8 million
	Federal: \$5.6 million	Federal: \$15.9 million	Federal: \$16 million
C	Private: \$5.7 million	Private: \$6.0 million	Private: \$6.0 million
	Federal: \$1.2 million	Federal: \$.26 million	Federal: \$.27 million
D	Private: \$6.8 million	Private: \$7.4 million	Private: \$8.6 million
	Federal: \$1.5 million	Federal: \$7.2 million	Federal: \$4.5 million
E	Private: \$5.5 million	Private: \$8.4 million	Private: \$4.6 million
	Federal: \$4.3 million	Federal: \$7.2 million	Federal: \$5.6 million

Not only did participation in the HBCU Initiative increase private giving, it also increased the percentage of alumni giving at each of the institutions (see Table 15). In order to do this, consultants encouraged advancement officers to include all alumni in their solicitation efforts instead of solely focusing on those that belonged to the alumni association. Under the guidance of their consultants, institutions created new ways of reaching out to alumni. It is important to note that increased giving did not always translate to increased percentages of alumni giving.

Table 15*Private Giving Compared to Federal Grants During Participation*

Grantee		Alumni Giving	% of Alumni Giving
A	Before grant	\$286,004	24%
	Last year of grant	\$621,394	13%
B	Before grant	\$602, 483	16%
	Last year of grant	\$1,874,121	24%
C	Before grant	\$271,812	10%
	Last year of grant	\$916,127	17%
D	Before grant	\$1,213,015	16%
	Last year of grant	\$1,266,193	15%
E	Before grant	\$98,676	6%
	Last year of grant	\$464,928	17%

As evidenced in the tables above, it is clear that the Kresge HBCU Initiative had a positive impact on the grant institutions. It is reasonable, then, to expect that UNCF member institutions could potentially experience similar positive effects through the reimagining of the UNCF's ICB programs.

Directions for Future Research

There were a number of institutional characteristics that were not explored in the course of this project, which makes it seem as though institutional characteristics do not have a substantial impact on the office of advancement's ability to fundraise successfully. As an advancement professional of more than 20 years, I know that this is not the case. Therefore, it is my belief that further research in this area is needed. Subsequent studies should consider how a school's location and reputation impact their ability to fundraise successfully. Additional information is also needed regarding how advancement operating budgets are broken down. Are advancement offices spending more on marketing materials or on people? On advancement services staff or on those front-line fundraisers? The collection of this information provides a more comprehensive picture of how we understand the impact of resources and other external factors on the ability to fundraise successfully.

Conclusion

This study was intended to answer the research question, “Which institutional investments make the biggest impact on fundraising success in Private HBCUs” and used resource-based theory to understand why this is a critical issue for the UNCF’s member institutions. From the quantitative data, it was difficult to draw a correlation between staffing and successful fundraising efforts. The same was true for the qualitative data, but it did shed considerable light on the roles of institution presidents, other senior leaders, and alumni. Study participants also had the opportunity to share their areas of strength and challenges with the researcher and, from there, they were able to create a wish list of sorts regarding the types of resources that they wanted to have.

Those resources, along with the other commentary of the interview participants, served as the foundation of the recommendations made at the end of this study. In order to fully address their concerns and desires, the UNCF must position itself to provide intensive capacity-building interventions to the advancement officers at those institutions. Doing so will allow the UNCF to address the challenges that each advancement department faces while also building something sustainable which creates a mutually beneficial financial picture for the both the institutions and the UNCF.

After analyzing the framework and impact of the Kresge HBCU Initiative, I feel confident that the recommendations outlined in this study will address the issue of fundraising success for UNCF member institutions. When implemented, the program will provide both financial resources—eliminating the member institutions’ dependence on tuition and student fees—and technical assistance to work in each institution’s specific context. The UNCF will need to ensure that it tracks the progress of each institution closely in order to gauge the success of the program over time.

References

- Barney, J. B. (1986). Organizational culture: Can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage?. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, pp. 656-665.
- Barney, J.B. & Clark, D.N. (2007). *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Belfield, C.R. & Beney, A.P. (2000). What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economic Journal*, 8(1), 65-81.
- Bruton G., Khavul S., Siegel D., & Wright M. (2015). New financial alternatives in seeding entrepreneurship: Microfinance, crowdfunding, and peer-to-peer innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12143>
- Dahlin, L., Rhue, L., & Clark, J. (2019). Crowdfunding community formation: Fundraiser race and gender homophily. http://www.laurendahlin.com/pdfs/dahlin_rhue_clark_crowdfunding_community_march_2019.pdf
- Grant, J.H. & Lindauer, D.L. (1986). The economics of charity: Life cycle patterns of alumnae contributions. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 2(April-June), 129-141.
- Greenberg, J., & Mollick, E. (2017). Activist choice homophily and the crowdfunding of female founders. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62(2), 341-374. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839216678847>
- Gunsalus, R. (2004). The relationship of institutional characteristics and giving participation rates of alumni. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(2), 162-170. ISSN 1744-6511.
- Harrison, W.B., Mitchell, S.K., & Peterson, S.P. (1995). Alumni donations and college's development expenditures—does spending matter? *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 54, 397-412.
- Kroll, J.A. (2012). Benchmarking investments in advancement: Results of the inaugural CASE advancement investment metrics study (AIMS) [white paper]. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED571309.pdf>
- Okunade, A.A., Wunnava, P.V., & Walsh, R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53(1), 73-84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1994.tb02674.x>
- Skinner, N.A. (2019). The rise and professionalization of the American fundraising model in higher education. *Philanthropy & Education*, 31(2), 23-46. <https://doi.org/10.2979/phileduc.3.1.02>
- Skirnevskiy, V., Bendig, D., & Brettel, M. (2017). The influence of internal social capital on serial creators' success in crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(2), 209-236.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171-180.

Appendix A: IRB Notification

Human Research Protections Program – HRPP

Supporting the work of the IRB and Providing HRPP Oversight



RE: IRB #192410 "Getting the Job Done: An Examination of Offices of Institutional Advancement at HBCUs and the Resources Available to Them" Dear Marcus H Burgess:

A designee of the Institutional Review Board reviewed the Request for Exemption application identified above. It was determined the study poses minimal risk to participants. This study meets 45 CFR 46.104 (d) category (2) for Exempt Review.

Any changes to this proposal that may alter its exempt status should be presented to the IRB for approval prior to implementation of the changes.

DATE OF IRB APPROVAL: 1/20/2020

Sincerely,

Alexander R Bologa BS

Institutional Review Board

Behavioral Sciences Committee

Electronic Signature: Alexander R Bologa/VUMC/Vanderbilt : (dedd9276b822f7769a3af4654fde332e)

Signed On: 01/20/2020 1:03:12 PM CST

Appendix B: Participant Information Sheet

Institutional Review Board

Participant Information Sheet

Principal Investigator: Marcus H. Burgess

Revision Date: January 8, 2020

Study Title: Getting the Job Done: An Examination of Offices of Institutional Advancement at HBCUs and the Resources Available to Them

Institution/Hospital: Vanderbilt University

This information sheet applies to Institutional Advancement officer volunteers.

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project and your participation in it. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have about this study and the information given below. You will be given an opportunity to ask questions, and your questions will be answered. Also, you will be given a copy of this consent form.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You are also free to withdraw from this study at any time. In the event new information becomes available that may affect the risks or benefits associated with this research study or your willingness to participate in it, you will be notified so that you can make an informed decision whether or not to continue your participation in this study.

1. Purpose of the study:

The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between advancement offices' resources and their ability to achieve fundraising success.

You are being asked to participate in a research study because of your experience as Institutional Advancement officer.

2. Procedures to be followed and approximate duration of the study:

The study will take 12 months from start to finish, but data collection will take place over a 3-month period.

Participants will:

- Receive an email that contains the survey link

-
- Complete the survey (30-45 minutes)

Participants who choose to continue with the interview will:

- Participate in the interview face-to-face or via phone, which will take 30-60 minutes.
- Receive an executive summary of the most relevant findings

3. Expected costs: N/A

4. Description of the discomforts, inconveniences, and/or risks that can be reasonably expected as a result of participation in this study:

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study.

5. Unforeseeable risks: N/A

6. Compensation in case of study-related injury: N/A

7. Good effects that might result from this study:

a) The study may produce findings that could result in improved staffing and allocation of resources for offices

of Institutional Advancement.

8. Alternative treatments available:

N/A

9. Purpose of the study:

The purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between advancement offices' resources and their ability to achieve fundraising success.

You are being asked to participate in a research study because of your experience as Institutional Advancement officer.

10. Procedures to be followed and approximate duration of the study:

The study will take 12 months from start to finish, but data collection will take place over a 3-month period.

Participants will:

- Receive an email that contains the survey link
- Complete the survey (30-45 minutes)

Participants who choose to continue with the interview will:

- Participate in the interview face-to-face or via phone, which will take 30-60 minutes.
- Receive an executive summary of the most relevant findings

11. Expected costs: N/A

12. Description of the discomforts, inconveniences, and/or risks that can be reasonably expected as a result of participation in this study:

There are minimal risks associated with participation in this study.

13. Unforeseeable risks: N/A

14. Compensation in case of study-related injury: N/A

15. Good effects that might result from this study:

a) The study may produce findings that could result in improved staffing and allocation of resources for offices

of Institutional Advancement.

16. Alternative treatments available: N/A

Appendix C: Recruitment Email

Greetings,

My name is Marcus Burgess. I am the Associate Vice President of Major and Planned Gifts at Claflin University and a doctoral student at Vanderbilt University.

For my doctoral research, I am partnering with the United Negro College Fund (UNCF) to study the relationship between advancement offices' resources and their ability to achieve fundraising success. In short, I am attempting to understand and describe the resources (both human and fiscal) that contribute to the success of offices of institutional advancement in HBCUs. You were selected to participate in this study because you are an institutional advancement director who is currently working at a UNCF member institution. As part of this study, your institution will receive an executive summary of the study that outlines the most relevant study findings.

Would you mind participating in the study by completing the online survey between now and March 8, 2019? It should take 30-45 minutes to complete. The survey link is below:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/7YBSB95>

If you are interested in participating in the interview portion of this study, please respond to this email. If you are not interested or do not meet the study criteria, no response is necessary. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me directly with questions.

Thank you for your time!

Date of IRB Approval: 01/20/2020

Institutional Review Board

Appendix D: Survey Tool

This survey will ask you questions about the way your department is staffed and the way the departmental budget is allocated. To complete this survey, you will need to provide dollar amounts (rounded numbers are acceptable).

By clicking here, you provide your consent.

First, tell us about your institution . . .

A1. What is the full legal name of your educational institution?

A2. Is your institution public (i.e., taxpayer-funded) or private?

A3. What is the total annual operating budget, in dollars, of your educational institution for the most recently completed fiscal year?

A4. How many “alumni of record” does your institution have?

A5. Was your institution in a fundraising campaign at any time during the most recently completed fiscal year?

Next, tell us about your advancement budget . . .

B1. Does the advancement program at your institution have information technology staff who are fully dedicated to supporting advancement operations and are not part of a centralized campus IT office?

B2. Does the advancement program at your institution have human resources staff who are fully dedicated to supporting advancement operations and are not part of a centralized campus HR office?

B3. What were total annual OPERATING expenditures, including salaries and benefits, of all your FUNDRAISING/DEVELOPMENT offices (including foundation, if applicable and available) for the most recently completed fiscal year?

About your staffing . . .

C1. How many full-time equivalent paid staff are there in all your FUNDRAISING/DEVELOPMENT offices (including foundation, if available) for the most recently completed fiscal year?

C2. How many full-time equivalent paid staff are there in your ALUMNI RELATIONS/ AFFAIRS office and INDEPENDENT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION (if applicable and available) for the most recently completed fiscal year?

C3. How many full-time equivalent paid staff are in your COMMUNICATIONS AND MARKETING office for the most recently completed fiscal year?

C4. How many full-time equivalent paid staff are there in your ADVANCEMENT SERVICES office for the most recently completed fiscal year?

C5. How many full-time equivalent paid staff are there in your ADVANCEMENT LEADERSHIP/ADVANCEMENT MANAGEMENT office for the most recently completed fiscal year?

About your fundraising

D1. What was the TOTAL VOLUNTARY SUPPORT raised by your institution for the period in the most recently completed fiscal year, from all sources?

In the following table, please indicate the amount (in dollars) that was received from each subgroup:

a.	Alumni	
b.	Parents of students	
c.	Other individuals	
d.	Foundations	
e.	Corporations	
f.	Religious Organizations	
g.	Other	

Finally, your contact info

E1. Please give us your job title. (This will only be used to keep track of what types of staff complete the survey; it will not be given out to third parties or appear in reports.)

E2. Please give us your department. (This will only be used to keep track of what types of staff complete the survey; it will not be given out to third parties or appear in reports.)

E3. Please give us your phone number. (This will be used only to contact you about the survey; it will not be shown in reports or given out to third parties.)

Appendix E: Interview Protocol

Interview Protocol

Say: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. I would like to record this interview so that I can focus on what you are saying. I'll be recording the interview with this audio device. Is that okay with you? Do you have any questions before we begin? Great. I'd like to remind you that your real name will not be used at all during the data collection or reporting process. I'll be using the pseudonym that you chose before we met today.

Background:

1. How long have you working in Institutional Affairs?
2. How many Institutional Affairs offices have you worked at throughout your career?

Staffing:

3. Which departments are integrated within your current Office of Institutional Advancement?
4. How many staff members work in Institutional Affairs?
5. How are decisions about staffing made?
6. How would describe the rate of turnover in your department?

Philanthropy Activities:

7. Please describe the involvement of your institution's president in fundraising.
8. How does the Office of Institutional Advancement support the President in his/her fundraising efforts?
9. How involved are other institution leaders when it comes to fundraising? (Deans, Associate Deans, Academic Department Leaders, etc.)
10. How does the Office of Institutional Advancement support those leaders in their fundraising efforts?
11. How involved are alumni when it comes to fundraising?

-
12. **How does the Office of Institutional Advancement support alumni in their fundraising efforts?**

Performance:

13. **What was your alumni annual fund participation rate for FY 18-19?**
14. **What are some of the strengths of your Office of Institutional Advancement?**
15. **What are some of the challenges that the Office of Institutional Advancement faces?**
16. **What resources would you need to overcome those challenges?**

Appendix F: Institutional Characteristics

To provide a full context for the area of study, each responding school was asked to describe their operating budget, the size of their alumni base, and recent fundraising campaigns. I provided their Carnegie classifications to help round out the data analysis. That demographic data is available in the tables that follow.

Table 16

Carnegie Classification by Institution

Institution	Carnegie Classification
School 1	Master's
School 2	Bachelor's
School 3	Bachelor's
School 4	Bachelor's
School 5	Bachelor's
School 6	Master's
School 7	Master's
School 8	Master's
School 9	Doctoral
School 10	Master's
School 11	Master's
School 12	Master's
School 13	Bachelor's
School 14	Bachelor's
School 15	Bachelor's
School 16	Bachelor's
School 17	Master's
School 18	Bachelor's
School 19	Bachelor's
School 20	Bachelor's

Table 17*Total Operating Budget of Institutions*

Institution	Total institutional operating budget (rounded to the nearest 100,000)	Total advancement operating budget (rounded to the nearest 100,000)	Percent of total operating budget
School 1	\$46,436,000	\$700,000	1.51%
School 2	\$12,000,000	\$1,000,000	8.00%
School 3	\$22,000,000	\$400,000	1.82%
School 4	\$16,102,000	\$360,000	2.24%
School 5	\$25,000,000	\$451,000	1.80%
School 6	\$50,000,000	\$3,000,000	6.00%
School 7	\$25,000,000	\$400,000	1.60%
School 8	\$96,000,000	\$3,200,000	3.33%
School 9	\$100,000,000	\$5,200,000	5.20%
School 10	\$28,000,000	\$2,500,000	8.93%
School 11	\$42,000,000	\$950,000	2.26%
School 12	\$12,000,000	\$1,200,000	10.00%
School 13	\$24,000,000	\$300,000	1.25%
School 14	\$104,000,000	\$7,500,000	7.21%
School 15	\$15,000,000	\$275,000	1.83%
School 16	\$22,000,000	\$500,000	2.27%
School 17	\$35,000,000	\$1,200,000	3.43%
School 18	\$28,000,000	\$460,000	1.64%
School 19	\$36,000,000	\$300,000	.83%

Table 18*Total Number of Students and Alumni by Institution*

Institution	Total Number of Students (in thousands)	Size Based on Carnegie Classification	Total Number of Solicitable Alumni (in thousands)
School 1	2,000	Small	13,000
School 2	<1,000	Very small	4,000
School 3	<1,000	Very small	5,000
School 4	<1,000	Very small	7,000
School 5	3,000	Small	< 8,000
School 6	2,000	Small	8,000
School 7	1,000	Very small	6,000
School 8	4,000	Medium	25,000
School 9	4,000	Medium	48,000
School 10	<1,000	Very small	9,000
School 11	1,000	Small	6,000
School 12	1,000	Small	5,000
School 13	1,000	Small	5,000
School 14	2,000	Small	4,000
School 15	<1,000	Very small	4,000
School 16	<1,000	Very small	5,000
School 17	2,000	Small	8,000
School 18	1,000	Small	5,000
School 19	<1,000	Very small	4,000
School 20	<1,000	Very small	6,000

Table 19

Was the Institution in a Fundraising Campaign during FY18-19?

Institution	Fundraiser in FY18-19
School 1	Yes
School 2	Yes
School 3	Yes
School 4	Yes
School 5	No
School 6	Yes
School 7	Yes
School 8	No
School 9	Yes
School 10	No
School 11	No
School 12	No
School 13	No
School 14	No
School 15	Yes
School 16	No
School 17	No
School 18	No
School 19	No
School 20	No

Table 20*Human Capital in Institutional Advancement by Institution*

Institution	Full-time fundraising/development staff	Full-time alumni affairs staff	Full-time communications and marketing staff	Full-time advancement services staff	Full-time advancement leadership staff	Total Staff
School 1	2	4	0	0	2	8
School 2	3	0	0	2	1	6
School 3	1	1	1	0	2	10
School 4	3	1	2	1	1	8
School 5	3	0	1	0	2	6
School 6	3	4	5	2	2	16
School 7	3	0	1	0	1	5
School 8	4	2	8	3	1	18
School 9	4	3	5	5	3	20
School 10	2	1	2	2	1	8
School 11	1	1	0	1	1	4
School 12	1	1	0	1	1	4
School 13	2	2	0	1	1	6
School 14	17	6	0	6	2	31
School 15	0	0	0	1	1	2
School 16	0	1	3	2	1	7
School 17	4	2	6	2	1	15
School 18	0	1	0	1	1	3
School 19	1	1	0	1	1	4
School 20	3	2	2	1	1	9

Table 21*Total Voluntary Support Raised by Stakeholder Group*

Institution	Alumni	Parents of Students	Other Individuals	Foundations	Corporations	Religious	Other
School 1	\$1,151,000	\$0	\$71,000	\$1,462,000	\$2,027,000	\$337,000	\$97,000
School 2*	\$2,254,000	\$0	\$182,000	\$34,508	\$130,000	\$817,000	\$557,000
School 3	\$100,000	\$0	\$0	\$250,000	--	\$300,000	--
School 4*	\$3,100,000	\$8,000	\$1,516,000	\$2,021,000	\$487,000	\$750,000	\$2,552,000
School 5	\$14,000	--	\$413,000	--	--	--	\$245,000
School 6	\$1,000,000	--	--	\$600,000	\$400,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,300,000
School 7	\$300,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$133,000	\$234,000	\$115,000	\$1,253,000
School 8	\$900,000	\$45,000	\$600,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,700,000	\$1,300,000	--
School 9	\$1,700,000	\$68,000	\$450,000	\$1,500,000	\$450,000	\$2,300,000	\$78,000
School 10	\$1,300,000	\$300,000	\$2,300,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,700,000	\$350,000	\$250,000
School 11	\$75,000	--	\$300,000	\$600,000	\$1,500,000	\$200,000	--
School 12	\$105,000	\$25,000	\$75,000	\$150,000	\$1,200,000	\$65,000	--
School 13	\$780,000	\$12,000	\$75,000	\$250,000	\$950,000	\$1,500,000	--
School 14	\$7,000,000	\$195,000	--	\$2,300,000	\$5,200,000	\$350,000	\$240,000
School 15*	\$500,000	\$5,000	\$1,500,000	\$7,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,700,000	\$25,000
School 16	\$800,000	\$1,700	\$300,000	\$100,000	\$80,000	\$40,000	\$600,000
School 17	\$1,800,000		\$95,000	\$2,500,000	\$1,800,000	\$250,000	--
School 18	\$120,000	--	\$175,000	\$120,000	\$150,000	\$35,000	\$56,000
School 19	\$120,000	\$35,000	\$135,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$75,000	\$78,000
School 20	\$157,000	\$23,000	\$67,000	\$800,000	\$350,000	--	\$1,300,000

Note: Schools 2, 4, and 15 were involved in crisis fundraising campaigns that inflate their total amounts raised by subgroup.