University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1986

Factors Associated with Success of Resource Development Programs at California Community Colleges

Paula Jane Jenner EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Jenner, Paula Jane EdD, "Factors Associated with Success of Resource Development Programs at California Community Colleges" (1986). *Dissertations*. 500.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/500>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCCESS
OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AT CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by
Paula J. Jenner

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1986

Dissertation Committee

Wallace Cohen, Ed.D., Director
Robert Infantino, Ed.D.
Edward Kujawa, Ph.D.

© 1987

PAULA JANE JENNER

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to provide information concerning the extent to which California community colleges have incorporated a resource development function and which programs have been most successful in generating external voluntary support. Program features were examined to identify factors associated with success.

A survey research methodology was utilized to determine the extent to which resource development programs operate in all 70 community college districts in the state. There were 68 resource development programs reported from the survey. Of the respondent programs, 13 were identified as successful as judged by the success criteria of (a) the ratio of a three-year income average to the cost to operate, (b) depth of staffing for resource development, and (c) institutional commitment to the development program.

Interviews were conducted with directors of all 13 successful programs. This data produced a profile of the institution, the development function, and the development director, as well as responses to five questions designed to reveal directors' perceptions of what specific factors led to their success.

Some of the major findings and conclusions of the study were: (a) The individual responsible for resource development

is a primary factor associated with success; the expertise, character, and level of motivation of the director are related to the effectiveness of the program; (b) institutional support for development and integration of resource development with other major college functions is crucial to program success; (c) an operational foundation or other auxiliary contributes to the success of the development program; (d) institutional funds and staff must be allocated to adequately support the resource development effort.

The major recommendation was that public community colleges in California implement a resource development program which is adequately staffed and budgeted and which is fully integrated with other institutional functions. Additionally, where there are marginal programs, top administration should review its commitment to resource development and reevaluate the position of development within the organization. Programs operated on a limited basis without adequate resources and commitment will not achieve desired results.

In a time when traditional sources of income are limited, resource development programs are an excellent means of generating additional funds as well as local interest and support for the community college.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to those individuals who made the completion of this research possible.

Dr. Wallace Cohen, Director of the Dissertation Committee, who gave of his time, energy, and expertise in providing the guidance to complete this study. He typifies all the principles of leadership taught in this program.

Dr. Robert Infantino and Dr. Edward Kujawa, Committee members, who provided a fresh insight and invaluable expertise.

Dr. William Pickett for sharing his wealth of knowledge of the development field and for providing guidance in the design of this study.

Dr. Sharalee Jorgensen for many years of encouragement and support in completing this degree and for her skills in editing portions of this study.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Cook, my parents, for equipping me with the gift of appreciation for education and, thankfully, a sense of humor.

My colleagues who agreed to participate in this study.

To Roy Sims for his unfailing confidence and years of love and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Development	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Objectives	4
Need for the Study	4
Definition of Terms	7
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Historical Perspective	9
Organizational Perspective	18
Functions of Resource Development	18
Management of the Resource Development Program	20
Development Office Personnel	25
Program Effectiveness	28
Foundations	35
Legislation	39
Summary	42
3. METHODOLOGY	44
Population	45
Data Collection Procedures	45

CHAPTER	
Questionnaire	45
Interview	48
Limitations	50
4. RESEARCH FINDINGS	51
Questionnaire Data	51
Research Question One	51
Research Question Two	52
Research Question Three	58
Analysis of Questionnaire Findings	74
Interview Data	78
Research Question Four	78
Analysis of Interview Findings	146
Institutions and Districts	146
The Development Office	147
The Development Directors	148
Interview Questions	149
Summary	157
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	158
Factors Associated With Success	158
Implications	160
Recommendations	165
APPENDICES	168
REFERENCES	182

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Range of Annual Operating Budget, 1984-85	53
2. Activities Included in Resource Development . . .	55
3. Number of Years Resource Development Program Has Existed	56
4. Other Participants in Resource Development Activities	57
5. Marketing Strategy Used in Resource Development	59
6. Position Status of Chief Development Officer . . .	60
7. Title of Chief Development Officer	62
8. Previous Title of Chief Development Officer . . .	63
9. Number of Full- and Part-Time Staff	65
10. Years of Experience of Chief Development Officer	67
11. Organizational Reporting Line of Chief Development Officer	69
12. Profile of Professional Development	70
13. Median Program Income, 1982-85	73
14. Range of Average Annual Income 1982-1985	75
15. Range of Annual Operating Costs 1984-1985	76
16. Program Rankings on Three Success Criteria	77

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	Page
A. Questionnaire and Cover Letter	169
B. Post Card Survey	174
C. Criteria for Evaluating Fund Raising Programs (Heemann)	176
D. Colleges In Which Interviews Were Conducted . . .	180

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Historical Development

In California, in 1907, state law authorized high schools to offer post-graduate courses which would be roughly equivalent to the first two years of college, and in 1910, Fresno Junior College became the first California public junior college. By 1930, there were a total of 450 junior colleges nationally, with 33 of those being in California. In 1968, these colleges were separated from the secondary school system, a Board of Governors for California was established, and the college districts were formed. The term junior college was replaced by community college in order to more closely reflect the comprehensive, public-oriented, locally-based nature of the institution. The community colleges continued to be supported by tax dollars raised in their respective local districts plus enrollment-driven average daily attendance (A.D.A.) funds from the state. In California there are now 106 community colleges in 70 locally governed districts.

By the 1950s there had been an evolution in the California community colleges. These institutions had grown and matured in terms of both programs and services. Additionally, their essential role as providers of the first two years of a

baccalaureate degree was extended to include, in addition to transfer programs, vocational education as well as counseling and guidance and community service programs.

In the 1970s, as enrollments leveled off, costs increased, and Proposition 13 became effective, the California community colleges found themselves in difficult financial times. Community colleges traditionally have received their primary funding based on the numbers of students in attendance. As a result of enrollment and financial shifts, alternative means of funding began to be explored.

Proposition 13 limited property tax increases in California, thereby limiting a major source of revenue for community colleges and shifting the emphasis to state sources. According to Stats and Facts, a brochure produced by California Community College Chancellor's office, prior to 1978 the California community colleges received about 55% of their general operating revenue from local property taxes, 40% from the state, and 5% from federal monies. By 1982, the percentages shifted to 25% local, 70% state, and 5% federal. When Proposition 13 passed in 1978, California community colleges lost about \$450 million and had to draw on "bail out" funds from surplus money accumulated in the state treasury. Even with the surplus funds, most colleges were obliged to make significant budget cuts--both in programs and personnel (Cohen & Brawer, 1982).

Leslie Koltai, Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District, reported that in 1984-85 he faced a \$28

million shortfall in the operating budget (Elsner, 1983). This major community college district is now feeling the full effects of Proposition 13 legislation, reduction in enrollments, and ensuing reduced levels of funding.

To date there has been little change in the source of funds, except for increased fees or tuition. In the fall of 1984, California community college students were, for the first time, required to pay a fee to enroll in classes. The fee is, in reality, tuition, because the funds derived from the fee will go into the general apportionments which support the costs of instruction. New ways of increasing revenues are now being explored by community colleges, especially from private gifts, grants, or contracts. Efforts in generating additional revenue, presently referred to as resource development, will be the focus of this research.

Purpose of the Study

This study will investigate resource development programs at California community colleges for the academic year 1984-85. A determination will be made as to where resource development programs exist and which seem to be the most successful. The purpose is to identify a series of factors which are associated with success of these resource development programs. These factors can ultimately serve as a guideline for new or emerging resource development programs at public two-year colleges.

Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

1. To determine how many community colleges in California have a resource development function and whether they are being operated at the district level, individual college campuses, neither, or both.
2. To determine the present level of operations of existing resource development programs.
3. To determine which of the existing programs have been successful in their development efforts.
4. To identify specific factors which have led to success as perceived by each development officer.
5. To examine the implications of having a successful resource development program for community colleges.

Need for the Study

Research in the area of community college resource development is extremely limited. There is little information available about the growing effort at the community college level toward the cultivation of external support. The new interest in this effort is evidenced by the multitude of workshops and seminars offered by community college oriented organizations recently. The Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCA) has sponsored workshops this year on developing foundations, on contract education programs, and on fund raising. The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), at its January 1985 district

conference, provided for the first time a program addressing the needs of community colleges.

In order to receive significant external support, community college resource development personnel will need to be very effective in order to compete with the variety of established and historically successful organizations also actively seeking private voluntary support. Paul Schneider, Director of Communications for the Development Office of the Mormon church, points out that to succeed in development one must gain an understanding of what motivates philanthropy. "Fund raising is like house painting; most of the work and some of the greatest challenges are in preparing to do the job, rather than doing the job itself" (Schneider, 1978).

There is a growing concern for the need to train people in the resource development area. Organizations such as the National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) have emerged not only as vehicles for sharing information on sources of funds and optimal ways of soliciting them, but also as a means of providing intensive training programs for resource development specialists at the community college level. As an affiliate organization of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, NCRD is primarily concerned with the advancement of community college resource development programs across the country. Many community college development personnel currently lack the necessary expertise and sophistication to obtain voluntary funds from external sources. This can create significant problems for those who

are expected to perform this duty. Formal academic courses and professional texts are few. Many educators "acquire" the task of resource development as a secondary duty so there is little time to learn on the job.

Don DeNevi, Assistant to the President at Merritt College in Oakland, California, wrote of his experiences as an NCRD Intern in a 1983 AdCom article. He verified the fact that money for community colleges is available for those who know how to obtain it. He also discussed the comprehensive nature of the training received by the interns. Unfortunately, only about a dozen people annually are selected for this national training program. As a participant in the 1984 Internship program, this researcher was most impressed with the quality and scope of the training experience. All individuals responsible for resource development at community colleges should have the benefit of this type of training.

Within the academic community, the idea of marketing education traditionally has not been well received. Using strategies associated with the world of business has been viewed by many faculty and staff members as being too "Madison Avenue." Within college service areas, citizens may have difficulty understanding why they should give additional money to a public institution already supported by a portion of their tax dollars. The future of the community college in California could depend on the broadening of the financial base through private support, so it will become important for resource development professionals to show the public, as

well as colleagues within the institution, that fund raising to support community colleges is appropriate and necessary, and that it can be done productively, skillfully, and with a high degree of professionalism.

Definition of Terms

Resource development and institutional advancement are terms most frequently used in the literature to describe means of obtaining external voluntary support. Resource development generally refers to the use of planned giving, annual campaigns, and capital drives as a means of generating funds for support of the institution. Institutional advancement refers to a broader scope of development which includes government relations, public relations and communications, which, in turn, includes public information.

Smith (1979) noted that voluntary support must be clarified and defined because it often means different things to different people. He stressed the importance of such a definition in new development programs such as those at the community college level. Voluntary support included:

1. all cash gifts;
2. gifts in the form of tangible and intangible property (i.e., securities, real estate, structures, art objects, or merchandise produced by the donor);
3. the cash value of life insurance contracts;
4. any transaction designated as a "contribution" for tax purposes;

5. funds received through intermediaries originating as current contribution or income from prior contributions (i.e, distributions from state or national fund raising organizations, grants from private foundations, church support, income from trade associations, chambers of commerce, service clubs where funds are obtained from contributions, not from dues).

According to Muller (1977), Friend raising refers to the process of creating alliances with individuals in order to cultivate their interest, friendship, and, ultimately, their financial support. This is a significant term since resource development activity must be continuous. One encounter, action, or single conversation rarely generates support. Results come from a continuous effort in both the structured fund raising projects and the friend raising activities of fostering new loyalties while nurturing the old.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

This review of the literature is divided into four sections. The first section deals with a historical perspective of resource development, from early educational fund raising activities through more contemporary college resource development programs. The second section examines organizational structures, including functions and management of typical resource development programs. This section also deals with issues related to resource development personnel and the organizational effectiveness of resource development programs. The third section reviews the use of foundations as vehicles for resource development. Lastly, the review describes legislation related to resource development programs.

Historical Perspective

From the mid-1960s to the 1980s, community colleges in the United States underwent significant change. During those years, the number of community colleges doubled and their enrollments quadrupled, multi-campus districts formed, and collective bargaining became common. Nationally, the number of students transferring to four-year institutions dropped from 1 in 3 to 1 in 10. Community college financing was

influenced by tax limitations and, in some, by a shift toward state-level funding. Career and community education grew tremendously during those years, and community colleges had to face the issue of teaching the functionally illiterate (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

Community colleges have been versatile and friendly institutions. Over the decades, they have met the diverse educational needs of their constituency. "The two-year college enrolls a great mixture of students--in terms of age, race, economic and social background, and the level of ability and interest. Its programming is generally wide-ranging and certainly different from that of more conventional post-secondary educational institutions" (Wise & Camper, 1985, p. 131).

Cohen and Brawer (1982) noted that community colleges may be best characterized as nontraditional. They have not followed the pattern of higher education which began in the colonial era. They did not follow the tradition of the residential liberal arts colleges, nor are they frontiers of knowledge like the research institutions. In fact, community colleges do not even follow their own traditions. They frequently change. Never satisfied with the traditional ways, the community college seeks new ways to solve old problems. Community colleges " . . . maintain open channels for individuals, enhancing the social mobility that has so characterized America. And they accept the idea that society can be better, just as individuals can better their lot within

it" (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 28).

Fund raising in private education dates back to the establishment of educational institutions in this country. College presidents or clergymen were often the fund raisers. Capital and annual campaigns began in the colonial times. Wealthy benefactors were sought for capital gifts, and annual or "sustaining" gifts came in the form of produce, labor, or money from community members (Pray, 1981). In 1880, leaders at Tufts University considered hiring a fundraiser with the title of "Professor of Ethics," but the university trustees rejected the idea as being too elaborate and expensive (Luck, 1978). Luck (1978) also described an ingenious idea at Kenyon College, in Ohio, to raise money. The local citizens began the "Kenyon Circles of Industry" in which local sewing circles worked to make items to sell to raise funds for the college. It was not until the mid-twentieth century that someone within a college was given a development-related title.

In 1949, the American College Public Relations Association reported that, for the first time, the ACPRA roster listed two members having the title of director of development (Pray, 1981). In 1958, representatives of ACPRA established that because fund raising, public relations, and alumni associations were all part of the institutional program to generate understanding and support, they should be organized so that the president of the institution acted as coordinating officer. The adoption of this pattern ushered in the new era of resource development in education that we know today

(Porter, 1958).

Degerstedt, in The Community College Foundation (1982), contended that the present struggle to achieve adequate funding for community colleges has not come without warning. He reported that as early as 1965, community college leaders sensed the gradual closing of the "open door" to enrollment unless new funding sources were found. In 1973, the Council for Financial Aid to Education issued a report which warned that the public lacked adequate awareness of the community college and its mission (Degerstedt, 1982). Degerstedt pointed out that public awareness is a prerequisite for any kind of voluntary support.

In 1976, William Harper, then Vice President of Communications for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), prophetically noted, "There is not enough money forthcoming from the state and local tax sources and the situation may get worse before it gets better" (Harper, 1976, p. 49). Nine years later, Wise and Camper noted the continuance of the problem in California. "The financial tax base of county and state governments has been eroded by inflation, and the ability to generate state and local tax dollars has been limited with the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978" (Wise & Camper, 1985, p. 132).

Historically, larger private prestige universities, those which predominate in graduate and research programs, have received nearly two thirds of all voluntary support. Two-year colleges, which represent about one third of all

institutions and half the total enrollment, have received no more than 2% of the voluntary support for all of higher education. Even though private colleges outnumber public ones, private colleges receive in excess of ten times as much voluntary support (Smith, 1979). According to Smith, voluntary support of education will increase, and part of the increase will be attributed to growing professionalism and skill in the development field.

Wise and Camper (1985) reported that the 1984 statistics on fund raising in higher education show that only 1.4% of the total dollars raised that year went to two-year colleges. They felt the two-year college could raise " . . . more significant levels of private dollars" (p. 134) if adequate staff and resources were devoted to resource development and institutional advancement. The old axiom, "It takes money to make money," is equally true if one says, "It takes money to raise money" (Fisher, 1985, p. 53). This idea was substantiated by Perrote's 1974 study in which he reported a positive correlation between amount of institutional support for development programs (i.e., budget and staff) and productivity in terms of money raised.

James Fisher, former President of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), wrote,

Those who believe that the prosperity of the 1960s and the 1970s, when Federal and state appropriations for higher education grew more rapidly than the number of prospective students, will return, are

playing a dangerous game of "ostrich." To cling to the hope that public colleges and universities will somehow be immune from the financial difficulties that assail our private institutions is a denial of reality. Such thinking will cause public institutions to be unprepared for the next decade. (Fisher, 1985, p. 49).

In Fisher's opinion, the future of most institutions, regardless of whether they are public or private, is going to depend on the success and effectiveness of their resource development programs and, thereby, their ability to raise private dollars (Fisher, 1985).

Carpenter and Walker noted the need for all members of the academic community to be more familiar with financial resource development. "In the 1980s and 1990s, the academician who is not involved in many phases of fund raising from private sources is likely to be regarded as an anachronism" (Carpenter & Walker, 1985, p. 14).

Generally, money is raised for educational program quality rather than for the operation of public colleges and universities. "Philanthropy is used to water the green spots, not just to keep down the dust" (Leslie, 1985, p. 13). Leslie also maintained that the state is still responsible for basic support of public colleges, and private gift dollars should not be used to relieve this responsibility. Underlying all fund raising for public colleges should be the concept of public interest and public service and the degree to which development programs reflect this will determine their success. Smith (1979) noted other factors associated with

voluntary support of education are image of education in the public eye, current tax laws, and present economic climate.

Grants are a viable source of income for educational institutions. Grants are available from the government, private philanthropic foundations, and corporations. As Bailey (1985) indicated, most educators view grants as "gateways to research, the answers to budget cutbacks, and the symbol of prestige" (p. 40). Operating on "soft money" from grants can be tenuous because funding is often for one year or less, and there is no guarantee of continued funding beyond that time, even if the project is ongoing.

Many philanthropic foundations exist and are potential sources of income for educational institutions. Funds are often difficult to obtain because, as Marchese (1985) noted, the number, range, and sophistication of claimants has grown, and higher education has lost its "competitive edge" to programs of different social significance, such as sheltering the homeless. According to Sleeper (1985), "Private foundations contribute barely 1% of the income of universities and colleges in the United States. Out of a total of 22,000 philanthropic organizations, only 40 grant anything more than a million or two a year to higher education" (p. 12). Sleeper also notes that "community colleges seldom get an institution-specific grant from a foundation" (p. 14).

Corporate philanthropy has also become known as a means of generating external funds for education. As Payton (1985)

noted, "Corporate philanthropy under United States law makes it possible to invest in efforts to improve the quality of general education" (p. 28). Payton went on to indicate that "grants to improve and strengthen the humanities and social sciences represents, then, a defensible and rational program of support for a corporation" (p. 30). According to Smith (1983), more than 90% of corporations with assets over one billion dollars reported charitable contributions, and that in 1970 the major industry from which came the largest percent of total contributions was manufacturing with 49.5%, followed by finance, insurance, and real estate with 17.2% of the total corporate contributions.

As Robert Payton, President of the Exxon Education Foundation wrote,

Philanthropy--in the limited sense of fund raising and grant making--is after all, the means we use to call our priorities to wider attention, and to marshal the means to effect change within the confines of the campus as well as in the broader intellectual community. (Payton, 1985, p. 30)

Charles Polk, President of Daytona Beach Community College in 1979, noted that regardless of how effectively public funds are managed in community colleges, there is a constant and growing need for more money. Polk reported,

Seeking federal dollars and private donations is the key to progress, innovation, and survival for colleges in the future. Those looking to legislators for additional support are looking the wrong way. There is a backlash among the public against funding education, community, and municipal services. That backlash is going to reach crisis proportions in the next three to five years. Inflation, union demands, energy costs and the

simple inability to carry more financial burdens are stirring a taxpayer rebellion such as the successful Proposition 13 movement in California. . . . Private funding seems to be the only resource left for public institutions. (Polk, 1979, p. 4)

Stetson, in her 1984 research, investigated the history of private financial support nationwide to public two-year colleges. Among her findings was the fact that California community colleges experience less support than other similar institutions nationwide. This was so, she felt, partially because historical funding patterns gave them little motivation to seek private support. Another of her conclusions echoed the idea of many other researchers that alumni programs were not a major source of gifts as they have been for the four-year institutions, and where alumni programs did exist, they were not effective in fund raising. Stetson's documented historical perspective yielded the following conclusions:

1. The history of private giving to public two-year colleges was less than 80 years old.

2. As a percent of total revenue, private gifts and grants accounted for no more than 3% of public two-year college revenue.

3. Individual public two-year colleges nationwide received an average of \$85,450 each year from private gifts and grants during the years 1968-1971.

4. Non-alumni were the largest source of private gifts during those years.

5. California community colleges tended to receive

about one third of the average dollar amount that other two-year colleges around the nation received. (Stetson, 1984)

Organizational Perspective

Much of the literature on resource development has focused on the organization and management of resource development programs and personnel. Recent research has dealt with organizational strategies, training and development of personnel, and effectiveness of resource development programs. This section will be organized into four areas: functions, management, personnel, and effectiveness of resource development programs.

Functions of Resource Development

As Webb (1982) noted in his research, private sector gifts have become an indispensable element in the continued development and preservation of an educational institution, whether public or private. Pray (1981) also stressed the importance of the resource development function in colleges when he notes, " . . . the changing patterns of integration of advancement and development functions into the institution's general administrative structure in accord with what might be called the philosophy of total resource development" (p. 389). This suggests that resource development should become an integral function of the community college along

with instructional services, business services, and student services.

In his 1980 research, Wilmer verified that the whole development function is relatively new and has not produced standards for evaluation or comparison. His study reiterated that small college development programs have produced few, if any, published norms from which comparisons can be made and sound management decisions reached, Wilmer's research was a comprehensive nationwide study of 109 small colleges (fewer than 2,000 students) and specifically their advancement programs. His findings included:

1. There is a need for institutional commitment for advancement programs.

2. Only about 4-8% of total budget is allocated to development.

3. There is a minimal staffing commitment.

4. Advancement officers were largely experienced professionals in their field.

5. Volunteers were used effectively.

6. There were structured fund raising activities (annual campaign, alumni, deferred giving, capital gifts).

7. Development offices mailed out quarterly publications to constituency.

8. Development programs underwent regular complete evaluation.

Management of the Resource
Development Program

Management has been defined as " . . . the process undertaken by one or more persons to coordinate the activities of other persons to achieve results not attainable by any one person alone" (Schermerhorn, 1986, p. 187). There are four management functions for which any manager is responsible. These are identified by Schermerhorn as planning, organizing, controlling, and leading. Planning determines what results the organization will achieve, organizing specifies how it will achieve the results, and controlling determines whether or not the results are achieved. Throughout all three activities, managers must exercise leadership (Schermerhorn, 1986). Leslie (1985), commenting on management, has said,

Fund raising management and organization should fit both the institution and the personnel available. From a pure management perspective, placing the four principal functions under one person is quite sound, assuming the person is qualified. But the efficiencies of a centralized system will not compensate for the inexperience and unpreparedness of a person thrust into the position before he or she is ready. There should be just enough management to provide direction and to sustain movement. (p. 22)

Centralization versus decentralization does not seem to matter as long as there is good institution-wide coordination of fund raising efforts which are consistent with overall institutional goals. Leslie (1985) indicated that the following factors should be considered important regardless of the organizational approach:

1. academic goals exist for the total institution;
2. high professional standards for resource development exist;
3. there is quality control in fund raising programs;
4. creativity is encouraged in obtaining private dollars;
5. there is an orderly way of identifying, cultivating, and soliciting prospects.

Leslie noted that, while emphases and cases differ between public and private colleges, there are few professional differences among well-run resource development programs. He stated that fundamentals of fund raising and management of the program are similar. There are some differences between public and private college fund raising programs, however. In terms of emphasis, most private colleges feature their alumni ventures and lack this major source of support. This is especially true of community colleges. Another difference is that public colleges usually put more emphasis on seeking support from local business and industry (Leslie, 1985). It has been noted that community colleges are different and that traditional ways of raising money used by the four-year universities will not work for the community college. While, according to Wise and Camper (1985), this is not entirely accurate, community colleges must be very selective about the fund raising techniques they borrow from the university programs.

A variety of authors have set forth basic principles of fund raising. Broce (1979) listed nine basic principles related to methods of fund raising. Broce's principles included establishment of objectives, involvement of key people, thorough prospect research, and preparation of an adequate case statement. Brakeley's fund raising fundamentals included sound planning, adequate goals and objectives, effective research, adequate operating budget, solid public relations, and good communication (Brakeley, 1980). These features largely relate to the management of the development effort.

Pray (1981) also focused on the concept that management of the development effort is the key. "While much creative thinking is being applied and most programs are becoming increasingly effective, the thrust of present change seems to be toward better evaluation and refined management techniques" (p. 389). In Handbook for Institutional Advancement (1977), Rowland noted that " . . . the success of an institutional advancement program in colleges and universities rests largely on effective management" (p. 531).

In studying the organization and management of development programs in 26 state colleges and regional universities, McGinnis (1980) found that in the institutions identified as leaders in fund raising, no one best organizational structure emerged. Leslie (1969) indicated that good management of the

resource development function involves proper planning. Objectives must be established and specific activities or programs initiated in order for institutions to advance toward realization of their potential. Planning and evaluation must be consistent in order to keep the overall development program dynamic and focused. An institutional profile of data accumulated over several years is the most important management tool the institution's development program can have. According to Leslie (1979), "One of the most important things is for colleges and universities to maintain good records and have an information retrieval system that provides adequate data for planning and management purposes" (p. 63).

A series of criteria for evaluating advancement programs for the purpose of guiding planning and budgeting has been established by Heemann. Among the functions listed for evaluation are alumni relations, fund raising, government relations, institutional relations, periodicals, publications, and management. The criteria for evaluating fund raising programs are divided into the following categories: objectives, management, organizational structure, responsibilities, and budgeting and evaluation (see Appendix C for criteria). There are a total of 23 items or questions to be addressed, almost in the form of a quiz. Items answered in the affirmative suggest the program is healthy and well managed (Heemann, 1985).

The development of basic policies and procedures,

combined with an effective, efficient, central services component, can make any university fund raising organizational structure more productive (Leslie, 1985). While Leslie did not advocate an overly regimented fund raising program, he indicated that splintering resources--both human and financial--and proliferating appeals to the same or overlapping audiences reduces effectiveness.

Leslie, a pioneer in the field of cost-effectiveness analysis in college and university fund raising, repeatedly pointed out that analysis of this type is a critical management tool for development officers. It is often difficult to measure efficiency. Leslie defined efficiency as dollars spent versus dollars raised. Simply assessing what the institution is getting for the resources spent still leaves, according to Leslie, the question of realizing potential. Leslie's study in 1969 was an analysis of development costs and revenues. His analysis led to several generalizations, among them:

1. There is a high correlation between development program costs and gift dollars.
2. The cost of raising money was about \$.20 per dollar.
3. As amount raised increases, costs (program expenditures) decrease.

Factors that influence realization of potential and that lend themselves to relatively easy measurement are:

1. The resources directly allocated to the advancement program.
2. The percentage that the program commands of the institution's E and G budget (education and general expenditure).
3. Gift income information by source and purpose.
(Leslie, 1969)

The literature indicated that to start up operation of the resource development function and to realize potential requires financial commitment on the part of the institution.

To launch a development office, the college must fund salaries, current expenses, capital outlay items, and contract services. Contract services would cover such items as hiring a consultant to conduct feasibility studies and developing and printing a case document and brochures. Capital outlay would include office equipment such as typewriters, word processing units and computerized record-keeping systems. These are the tools of the trade. (Wise & Camper, 1985, p. 134)

Development Office Personnel

A review of the literature revealed that few people prepare themselves for a career in resource development. Heemann has suggested that,

Most of us tend to slide into it from the side. We are practitioners, not professionals. We brought no common body of knowledge on development with us when we assumed our jobs. We each do our work primarily in our own way, putting our organization together as best we can; crediting gifts as we understand others are doing it or, when we do not understand, crediting them in whatever way seems logical; figuring costs in whatever way best serves our purpose. (Heemann, 1979, p. xii)

Bornheimer (1967) found that typical development officers in private liberal arts colleges came from diverse educational backgrounds, with a preponderance in the humanities and social sciences. A wide variety of backgrounds of previous employment was found, with the largest single group having experience solely in education. Myer (1971) also noted a need for more qualified personnel in fund raising programs in order to be more effective.

"Few two-year colleges have the fund raising staffs, measured either by size or experience of four year institutions" (Wise & Camper, 1985, p. 134). Wise and Camper also indicated that it is not unusual for a two-year college to have a staff person assigned to a fund raising job who already has as many as three other jobs in the institution. They also noted that "Two-year colleges could raise significant private dollars if full-time staff were devoted to such areas as annual giving, corporate giving, and planned giving" (Wise & Camper, 1985, p. 134).

Some fund raisers have been caught between unrealistic expectations of presidents and trustees and inadequate development program funding. They have been expected to do more for less. Heemann (1979) indicated that tenure of development officers nationally is about three years. He suggested that there are programs "run by vagabonds." The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and the National Council for Resource Development are organizations

working to upgrade the competency of people directing resource development in colleges and university programs. This may evolve into structured training and education programs. Heemann recommended an accreditation process which could identify program weaknesses, identify strengths, bring pressure to define and accept realistic goals, and make resources available to achieve those goals (Heemann, 1979).

In studying the administrative role in development, Coloia (1980) concluded that development officers have become full partners in institutional decision making. He predicted that the development function will continue to have a significant impact on higher education. "The institution's chief executive officer and its volunteer cadre do more to influence the realization of fund raising potential than any other factor" (Leslie, 1979, p. 65). Although presidents and volunteers and development staff set the mode, as Leslie has pointed out, no institution will achieve its potential until the faculty becomes an integral part of the resource development function. In addition, "maximum gift dollars will depend on enlightened leadership and sound professionalism from presidents, chancellors, and chief development officers" (Leslie, 1985, p. 19).

Most researchers agree that the community college president will have an increasingly critical role in the development function. The president will have to spread time evenly

between marketing the college from a "tax-based standpoint" and in private fund raising activities in order to compensate for the erosion of tax support and to obtain funds to allow continuance of quality educational programs for their constituents (Wise & Camper, 1985).

Program Effectiveness

In the past 15 years, several researchers, notably Luck, Pickett, and Webb, have focused on the effectiveness of resource development programs. In his dissertation, Luck (1974) studied public community colleges nationwide, their foundations, and fund raising programs. He found that fewer than half of the 418 colleges surveyed participated in any type of fund raising, nor did they have an established foundation. He discovered that the number of community colleges instituting alumni programs was increasing. Of those colleges having a fund raising program, the majority did utilize techniques such as telephone campaigns, direct mail, and personal solicitation. At the time of his research, very few colleges had used any professional consultants in fund raising endeavors. He concluded that most colleges were not maximizing their fund raising efforts, nor were they utilizing the full potential of their foundations.

In 1976, the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE), a national organization comprised of 30 private

colleges, undertook research into the financing of undergraduate education. One of the many COFHE studies explored the development function. This study investigated 25 private college and university development programs and university relations efforts. Ramsden (1979) reported that in a time when colleges are even more dependent on private gift support, every institution needs to better understand the relationship between resources expended and results of the development effort. The COFHE study was undertaken partly because of this need. The study provided insight into the organizational structures and comparative costs of private college and university development programs.

In his 1977 research, Pickett identified a set of fund raising policies for private undergraduate colleges. Effectiveness was determined by relating policies to fund raising potential. The fund raising policies Pickett determined to be essential were:

1. resources were spent on fund raising
2. there was a structured fund raising organization
3. the functions of annual and capital drives, deferred giving, and prospect research existed
4. there was a number of professional staff
5. there existed a formal case statement
6. personal solicitation calls were made on prospective donors

7. outside professional counsel was utilized
8. publications such as annual reports and newsletters existed
9. gift clubs were used
10. trustees were involved in fund raising

In his investigation of policies related to increased gift income, Pickett reported that certain institutional characteristics determined fund raising potential. This potential was a function of college wealth (market value of the endowment), quality (number of graduates going on to post-graduate work), size (number of alumni), and socio-economic level of the clientele (cost to attend). Colleges which raised more than their potential were designated by Pickett as "overproductive." He indicated that "overproductiveness" was associated with trustee leadership, a sense of institutional direction, and the fund raising effort.

Other significant conclusions drawn in the Pickett study were that the development income alone was not an accurate measure of the unit's productivity, that location of the institution was not as important a factor as originally assumed, and that the image of institutional stability and quality was crucial. Stability in this case was synonymous with institutional age.

A related study by Webb (1982) identified policies or criteria for success of development programs in representative schools in the State University of New York system. Webb

identified major characteristics of ideal development programs and conducted a policy-relevant analysis of the SUNY system. A panel of experts was asked to establish a series of policy-relevant criteria for an "ideal" development program. No program in the study, however, met all the criteria established. Based on Pickett's methodology, Webb discovered that some schools raised more than their potential would indicate, and were classified as overachievers, while those that raised less than their potential would indicate were the underachievers. His analysis revealed the following:

1. The Chief Development Officer had many years of experience in the development field.
2. There were more professionals and more support staff in these programs.
3. Management by Objectives (M.B.O.) or some variation thereof was the predominant management technique used in these development programs.
4. There was significant presidential involvement in the development effort.
5. Administration and faculty also had active involvement in development.
6. There was support staff outside development with active involvement.
7. There were many volunteers used.
8. The chief development officer reported directly to the president of the institution.

9. The development office was successful in communicating its role and function to the entire institution.

Cramer (1967) expressed surprise at the poor correlation between amount spent on development and total amount received in gifts in a study of 55 private colleges. He attributed this to ineffective management and/or the absence of a sound case for support. Teitelbaum suggested that anomalies in amount of revenue obtained compared to costs to operate are due to incorrect cost data (Teitelbaum, 1979).

Wise and Camper (1985) made a series of suggestions for enhancing fund raising programs for two-year colleges:

1. Build a case nationally for giving that can effectively change corporate and private foundation policies toward two-year colleges.

2. Market the idea that the two-year college can be a major force in putting America back to work.

3. Disseminate examples of innovative programs so that when corporate and foundation donations are sought, facts and figures are available.

4. Adopt national gift reporting and accounting standards using the Council for Financial Aid to Education format.

Bremer's (1965) national study of 294 junior colleges resulted in the formulation of six essentials for securing philanthropic support:

1. There must be institution officials assuming responsibility for development.
2. Some alumni association should exist.
3. Alumni funds must be available
4. Volunteer groups are used in solicitation.
5. Institutional memberships in alumni and fund raising professional organizations must exist.

A second study in the same year explored the extent to which private junior colleges maintain development programs. It was noted in this study that generally the amount of philanthropic support was related to the existence of a development staff, use of volunteers, and alumni associations (Elkins, 1965).

From 1968 to 1971, Hargis and Blocker replicated an earlier study of Bremer and Elkins, in which they found that public two-year colleges reported average annual support totaling \$28,944. This represented about one third of the national average. The Bremer and Elkins study eight years earlier revealed that the average annual private support figure also represented about one third of the national average. These studies were done in California and show that there was virtually no change in the amount of support in this state between 1960 and 1971 (Stetson, 1984).

In 1975, McCain studied more than 1,000 two-year colleges nationally to determine current trends in obtaining outside financial support. His results indicated that:

1. 64% of those surveyed had some form of resource development program.

2. About half devoted a full-time position to development.

3. Private colleges utilized more personnel in the development effort than did public colleges.

4. Multi-campus districts emphasized resource development more than did single ones.

5. All institutions had limited alumni programs.

6. Federal grants contributed more money than any other source in public two-year colleges.

Leslie noted that systems having schools in all parts of the state, and which have their own bases for support, need minimal, if any, coordination. There are 106 California community colleges in 70 districts located in all geographic areas of the state which operate as separate entities within their own service area. These districts are part of a larger, loosely coupled system of state governance and support. This would indicate that state-wide coordination in California is probably unnecessary. However, coordination of development programs within districts is essential. Leslie wrote, "If institutional affinity and sources of support overlap, a centralized development system probably would be appropriate" (Leslie, 1985, p. 16). Leslie noted that organizationally, there are some differences that appear in public institutions. Some of the state institutions have college-based fund raising

programs, while others are constituency oriented. The latter are colleges which have foundations made up of community members who constitute the fund raising unit.

The literature reflected the importance of proper organization and management of the resource development function. It points to the relationship between program effectiveness, funding for resource development operations, and staffing resource development activities. Institutional support on a variety of levels seems essential for optimal functioning of resource development programs.

Foundations

Some of the literature relating to resource development focuses on foundations as vehicles for resource development. Institutionally related foundations are private, not-for-profit corporations closely aligned with public colleges. Some exist in name only, some serve as advisory bodies for investing funds raised, and some are very proactive in order to benefit the institution. The foundation can be a tool to be utilized for fund raising . . . not as the objective of funds raised, but rather a vehicle through which support can be solicited, received, managed and allocated to the institution (Simic, 1985). Legally, a foundation is a private corporation organized under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. It exists separately from the college, but its purpose is to conduct programs for the benefit of the

institution. Some 501(c)(3) organizations also exist to support charitable organizations such as hospitals, churches, boys and girls clubs, and so on. The feature in common to all such organizations is that contributions made to the foundation for the benefit of the charitable or educational entity are tax deductible at the federal and, in many cases, the state level (Simic, 1985).

Simic noted also that the foundation is a private corporation operating under federal and state laws, yet outside the jurisdiction of the state with regard to expenditure of the funds. This produces three advantages for the foundation:

1. Protection of contributions from state legislative encroachment.
2. Providing flexibility to take advantage of investment opportunities.
3. Provides for volunteer involvement.

In Sims' (1973) investigation of junior college foundations as a means of generating private support, he concluded that the college foundation is a viable vehicle through which the public junior college could make a strong bid for external voluntary support. In 1974, Silvera explored foundations associated with California community colleges in order to determine first, the amount and type of support received and, second, to formulate recommendations for designing foundations for California community colleges.

Forty-three of his 80 respondents reported having a foundation (about 53%) while 37 indicated some interest in beginning one. He also determined that cash gifts were the type of contribution most often received by foundations.

In his research on 24 Florida community college foundations, Sneed (1979) found that the traits of the five most successful or "financially effective" foundations were:

1. There was a development officer working at least half time and there was also a development staff.

2. There was a voluntary board of directors and those foundation directors participated in professional seminars to increase their competency levels.

3. There was a generally low-key approach to fund raising.

4. They had strong financial investment programs.

5. There was a strong focus on community service at the colleges with effective foundation programs.

6. College presidents displayed strong support for the foundation program.

7. There was a strong working relationship between the foundation and area bankers, attorneys, accountants, and other such professionals.

Hollingsworth (1983) reported that foundations associated with community colleges are more recent than those associated with four-year institutions. Her research showed that the first program of annual giving was begun at a community

college in 1906. However, the majority, more than 80%, of the community college foundations have begun since the late 1960s. Hollingsworth has indicated that, based on her research, characteristics of successful community college foundations included:

1. Strong public relations with the community
2. Involvement of community leaders
3. Organized, well-defined planning
4. A significant amount of funds raised
5. Personal solicitations
6. A full-time professional assigned to development
7. A clear and compelling case statement

This is not unlike Webb's list of factors associated with development programs which he found to be achieving beyond their potential.

Worth (1982) investigated the composition and characteristics of university foundation boards. He found that board members were selected either for their potential as donors or as fund raisers. Boards were rarely involved in institutional policy making, but they could influence institutional decisions through the allocation of gifts. In his 1979 research, Degerstedt found that 58% of the community colleges surveyed nationally had foundations. Of those without foundations, 49% reported no plans of starting one. However, of those colleges without foundations, 80% reported some type of fund raising program. Half used personal

solicitation, 2% used direct mail, 5% used alumni fund drives, and 29% used more than one of these methods. Forty percent of the foundations favored devoting funds raised to scholarships. Degerstedt noted that,

Community college foundations, indeed, seem to be exploding with much the same intensity as the forces which gave birth to community colleges themselves. And their successes should not be measured by the size of foundation assets alone, but by the countless ways they are helping colleges to blend with the community to achieve their goals. (Degerstedt, 1982, p. 64)

Legislation

Foundation and college board members as well as staff members must stay on the cutting edge of legislation which affects higher education, and they must take an active part in generating legislation and in lobbying for its passage. An example of this type of legislation may be found in a Florida law, enacted in 1983, which represents a landmark for two-year colleges. The bill was developed by the Florida Resource Development Council to encourage the legislature to appropriate tax dollars to match private dollars raised by Florida's public two-year colleges. The principal points of this act were:

1. One million dollars was appropriated for a Florida Academic Trust Fund for community colleges.

2. For each \$6.00 raised from private sources, the Trust would match with \$4.00, a 60/40 split. (Colleges must first determine its average annual cash donations for the previous

three years, and must raise that amount before becoming eligible to use the Trust funds.)

3. Each college would be given an opportunity to match at least \$25,000.

4. Funds in the Trust that were unmatched by March 1 of each year became available for matching by any other college.

5. Each college had to establish its own Academic Improvement Trust Fund as a depository.

6. The foundation at each college was responsible for maintaining, investing, and administering the fund.

7. The board of trustees at each college determined the uses for the proceeds (Wise & Camper, 1984).

The Florida Resource Development Council was, according to Wise and Camper, given every indication that such legislation would not be well received and the idea of matching private funds would be rejected. The legislation did pass, however. Legislators had realized they could not provide the support public two-year colleges needed. By passing this bill, the legislators encouraged and supported the colleges' efforts to broaden their financial base through private fund raising. Much can be accomplished through legislation, but public two-year college leadership must develop the vision to generate the bills and the perseverance to market, sell, lobby for them, and bring them to fruition.

In 1984, in California, Senate Bill 1714 (Carpenter) was

presented to the state legislature for approval. This bill was designed to create state matching funds up to \$25,000. per district to encourage community colleges to raise money locally (Bray, 1984). The bill passed both houses of the legislature but was vetoed by the Governor. Support for this kind of legislation points out acknowledgement by the California legislature of district-level fund raising potential and for the need of a structured effort on the part of community colleges in the establishment and support of resource development function.

Resource development activities will expand as government economics emphasize community college self-reliance, according to a May 1984 article in AdCom. An example of this type of self-reliance is the Copper Mountain campus of the College of the Desert in Joshua Tree, California. It is the only educational institution to have been presented the 1984 Volunteer Action Award by President Ronald Reagan ("Coachella," May, 1984). This college was honored because of its success in generating voluntary contributions of both financial and human resources to support the growth of the institution. Copper Mountain began with a \$200. quilt raffle and has now surpassed the \$2 million mark in funds raised. The college attributes its success to a well-planned, cohesive effort on the part of the entire institution and its constituency.

Summary

Through this review of the literature, an emergence of resource development efforts at educational institutions, specifically at public community colleges, has been revealed.

Cohen and Brawer describe community colleges as non-traditional, in that they are not structured like four year institutions nor are they frontiers of research. Community colleges have a history of meeting constituent needs and of open access. It was noted by Cohen and Brawer that in the last decade community colleges have seen shifts in enrollment and declines in funding. This, combined with rising costs of operation, has created a financial crisis. Degerstedt and Harper feel this funding problem has not come without warning. Fisher notes that those who believe the prosperity of the past will return are denying reality. Fisher feels that this kind of thinking will leave community colleges unprepared for the next decade.

Community colleges have begun to examine ways of generating external, voluntary support as a means of supplementing state funding. This will create a need, as Wise and Camper note, for members of the academic community to become more familiar with resource development. Webb and Pray both noted that resource development must become an integral college function in order to be effective. Researchers Leslie, Broce, Pray, and Rowland agree that good management and proper control over resource development activities is essential.

Another factor critical to development success is the personnel assigned to the program. Heeman and Wise and Camper have pointed to the lack of preparation and experience of many development personnel. In resource development efforts, community colleges will have to compete with many other non-profit organizations also seeking funds from the community. This will require a greater level of sophistication within the college development program.

Literature related to resource development has focused on the use of foundations or other auxiliary organization as a vehicle for generating and administering external funds. Degerstedt, Sneed, and Hollingsworth have reported on the viability and effectiveness of foundations for community colleges.

Some states are beginning to discover the practicality of local resource development programs for community colleges and some legislators are encouraging bills which promote local support. Florida has been the leader in this area and, in 1983, passed legislation which would allow for tax dollars to match private dollars raised by community colleges. California has, as yet, been unable to enact such legislation. In 1984 the Carpenter Bill was proposed to offer matching funds for community colleges, but the bill was vetoed by the governor.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The purposes of this study were to investigate resource development programs at California community colleges for the academic year 1984-85 and to identify a series of factors associated with successful resource development programs. These purposes were accomplished through an analysis of responses to written questionnaire items and from interviews with resource development personnel employed at districts and/or individual colleges statewide.

The following research questions were used to guide the study:

1. How many California community colleges have resource development programs and are these a function of the district, individual college, neither, or both?
2. What is the present level of operation of the existing resource development program?
3. Which of the existing resource development programs are successful?
4. What are the specific features of the resource development program which development officers perceive as having led to their success?

Population

The public community colleges in California comprised the population for this study. All seventy community college districts were initially screened to determine where any type of resource development activity might be taking place. A post card survey (Appendix B) requested information on district level programs as well as those operating at individual colleges within districts. The post card additionally requested the names of individuals responsible for resource development at the institution. Identification of specific individuals to whom a questionnaire would be sent insured the proper delivery of the questionnaire and optimized the rate of return.

The results of the initial screening revealed that there were 97 possible resource development programs within the state of California. This group of 97 was the population from which questionnaire and interview data were gathered.

Data Collection Procedures

The collection of data was accomplished in two phases. First, a written questionnaire was sent to all development officers in the population and second, follow-up interviews were conducted with development officers of programs determined to be successful.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information on

both financial status and organizational structure of existing resource development programs. The questionnaire was developed based on information available in the literature and with the guidance of the dissertation committee. The questionnaire was pilot tested on ten development officers in community colleges outside California. Additionally, all ten were fellow interns in the 1984 NCRD National Resource Development Internship Program so there was some assurance that they all had some training in resource development. Minor adjustments resulted from this process and the final instrument, comprising 25 items, was distributed. A copy of the questionnaire with cover letter is found in Appendix A.

In October, 1985, 97 questionnaires with cover letter, return, envelope, and a complimentary pen were mailed. Sixty-six questionnaires were initially returned, and after phone call follow-ups, a total of 82 questionnaires were returned. This resulted in an 85% response rate. A total of 68 resource development programs were reported operating at the time of the survey.

Data from the questionnaire were first tabulated by hand then entered into the HP 3000 mini computer. Data were processed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data were computed using frequency tabulations and cross tabulations. This computer program allowed the examination of data sub-groups for further analysis.

In previous research, a comparison of cost to revenue has been considered a measure of effectiveness of resource

development programs. The work of Leslie and others has utilized an income-cost ratio of 5:1 as an indicator of program success. Recent research by Pickett, Webb, and others, however, has suggested the advisability of going beyond the comparison of income and cost in assessing effectiveness of resource development programs. For the purposes of this research, the 5:1 income-cost ratio was selected as the primary factor associated with success. In consultation with Dr. Pickett, it was decided that the most successful programs would also be assessed using the secondary criteria of institutional commitment (institutional support and long-term commitment to development involving individuals throughout the organization) and depth of staffing (full time, year round, experienced staff involved in ongoing professional development).

The first criterion, at least a 5:1 income-cost ratio, was used to select the most financially successful resource development programs. Questionnaire items 14 and 15 provided information on program income for academic years 1982-85. Only 37 respondents provided complete data for all 3 years as requested on item 14. As a result, there were 37 programs for which an income-cost ratio could be established. Thirteen of the 37 programs had a 5:1 or better income-cost ratio and, therefore, 13 resource development programs at California community colleges were determined to be financially successful.

At this point it became necessary to vary from the originally approved design of the study. The original intention was to rank order the top 20% of the resource development programs and to conduct follow-up interviews with the directors to determine the features that made the programs successful (Research Question 4). When only 13 programs met the income-cost criterion, it was decided that it would not be viable to select the top 20% of the 3 rankings as originally intended and still maintain an interview sample of adequate size. Because of this unexpected limitation, it was decided that all 13 resource development programs meeting the income-cost criterion would be selected for follow-up interview regardless of their rankings on the other 2 criteria. A second ranking was done so that each of the 13 programs could be compared on all 3 criteria. There was not, however, a comparative ranking of the other 24 programs for which data were available.

Interview

The second phase of data collection was done through on-site interviews with individual respondents of 13 programs identified as successful. Survey respondents from the previously identified 13 successful resource development programs were contacted and interview appointments were made. Interviews were conducted in Riverside, Coachella Valley, the Los Angeles area, the San Francisco Bay area, and, finally, in northern California.

Each interview dealt with several issues. First, development directors were asked questions about the college or district, about the development function, and about themselves. Each of the 13 individuals was then asked the same five questions. Those questions were:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

Respondents offered information freely in most cases. Only two individuals displayed some reluctance to discuss their programs.

Results of interview data were reported in a narrative format and programs were listed in alphabetical order. Both questionnaire and interview data were analyzed in order to develop the findings which follow.

Limitations

This study was designed to identify successful resource development programs at California community colleges. There may be successful resource development programs in community colleges in California that have not been identified in this study. Because of inherent limitations in the use of questionnaires as data gathering tools, including incomplete responses to certain items or total failure to respond to the survey instrument, other successful programs may have been omitted.

CHAPTER FOUR

Research Findings

The purpose of this study was to determine success factors associated with resource development programs in California community colleges. In this chapter, data gathered are presented in response to the four original research questions which guided the study. The four questions and resulting data appear in sequence.

Questionnaire Data

Research Question One

How many California community colleges have resource development programs and are these a function of the district, individual colleges, neither, or both?

The first part of the research question was answered by the number of respondents to the questionnaire. There were 68 resource development programs reported in California Community Colleges. Survey item 1, "Is your resource development function district level or college level?" and item 2, "Are you employed by the district, foundation, or other?" address the second part of the question.

In response to item 1, 57.6% of the resource development programs reported being operated at the district level and 42.4% were operating at an individual college.

Item 2 revealed that 85% of the respondents were employed by the college district, 12% were employed by an institutionally related foundation, and 3% employed by the private sector.

Research Question Two

What is the present level of operation of the existing resource development program?

Eight items (15,16,17,18,19,20,24,25) on the questionnaire were designed to determine level of the development operation.

Item 15, "Check the range of your district/college annual operating budget for resource development," revealed that in all 63 respondent programs, an operating budget existed for the resource development program. Table 1 indicates the ranges of funding these programs receive. Of the 63 respondents, 65% reported that they had an operating budget of less than \$35,000. Data revealed an equal distribution of respondents in the \$20-35,000 range and in the \$50-100,000 range.

Item 16, "Is the above budget district level or college level?" revealed the source of these funds. Respondents in 62.3% of the cases indicated the resource development operating budget came from district sources, while 37.7% were operated using individual college funds.

Item 17 asked, "For which of these activities is the resource development office responsible?" Table 2 indicates the specific resource development activities of respondent

Table 1

Range of Annual Operating Budget, 1984-85

Annual Operating Budget	Frequency	Percentage
Less than \$20,000	31	49.2
20 - 35,000	10	15.9
35 - 50,000	7	11.1
50 - 100,000	10	15.9
More than 100,000	5	7.9

N = 63

programs. This was a possible multiple response item, so activities are reported in percent of cases. Item 17 reveals the strong grant activity in 76.3% of the 59 cases reported. Two of the traditional resource development activities mentioned in the literature, annual campaigns and planned giving, are utilized frequently by respondents.

In item 18, respondents indicated the number of years the resource development program had been in existence. Table 3 summarizes this data. The median age of resource development programs was 2.9 years.

Item 19, "Do you have a case statement?" indicated 63.5% of the respondents were using a case statement, while 36.5% were not.

In item 20, "Do you have an annual formal evaluation process for resource development?" 26 respondents indicated use of a formal evaluation while 39 or 60% revealed that no formal evaluation took place in the resource development program.

Item 24, "Who else has active participation in the resource development function?" was designed to reveal other individuals outside the resource development office who actively participate in the development function. This was a possible multiple response item so it is reported in percent of cases. Table 4 shows that the largest single group of participants are foundation board members, with college presidents and other college administrative personnel second and third respectively.

Table 2

Activities Included in Resource Development

Activity	Count	Percent of Cases
Grants	45	76.3
Foundation Liaison	41	69.5
Corporate Relations	35	59.3
Annual Campaign	31	52.5
Planned Giving	23	39.0
Alumni Program	20	33.9
Capital Campaign	16	27.1
Direct Mailing	1	.5
Scholarship Program	1	.5

N = 59

Table 3

Number of YearsResource Development Program Has Existed

Years Existed	Frequency	Percentage
0	2	3.2
1	12	19.4
2	11	17.7
3	13	21.0
4	6	9.7
5	1	1.6
6	2	3.2
8	1	1.6
10	6	9.7
12	2	3.2
13	1	1.6
14	1	1.6
15	3	4.8
20	1	1.6

N = 62

Median = 2.9 years

Table 4

Other Participants in Resource Development Activities

Participants	Count	Percent of Cases
Foundation Board	50	74.6
President	48	71.6
Administrative Personnel	42	62.7
Faculty	34	50.7
Community Volunteers	28	41.8
Superintendent	17	25.4
College Trustees	15	22.4
Students	12	17.9

N = 67

Item 25, "Which of the following marketing techniques do you use in resource development?" indicates the type and level of marketing taking place. Table 5 summarizes the variety of marketing strategies in rank order by frequency of response. Again, this is a possible multiple response item and is reported in number and percentage of valid cases. Of the 51 valid cases reported, the most frequently used marketing strategy is direct mail, with the second most frequently used strategy being special events. Only 19.6% of the responses indicated that full market research was used.

Research Question Three

Which of the existing resource development programs are successful?

The determination of program success is based on a comparison of operating budget to a three-year income average, depth of staffing, and institutional commitment. Questionnaire items 3-13 plus 21, indicate depth of staffing, items 14 and 15 refer to fiscal information, and items 22, 23, and 24 indicate institutional commitment.

Item 3 asked, "Is your resource development position full time, half time, or less than half time?" Table 6 reveals the evenly mixed responses to item 3 regarding the chief development officer position. Of the 63 respondents, 39.7% indicated that the position was full time, while 36.5% reported less than half-time positions.

Item 4, "What is your title?" and item 5, "What was the

Table 5

Marketing Strategy Used in Resource Development

Marketing Strategy	Count	Percent of Cases
Direct Mail	42	82.4
Special Events	41	80.4
Brochure	32	62.7
Newspaper	27	52.9
Radio	12	23.5
Audience Segmentation	12	23.5
Full Market Research	10	19.6
Television	8	15.7
Signboard	6	11.8

N = 51

Table 6

Position Status of Chief Development Officer

Position Status of Chief Development Officer	Frequency	Percentage
Full Time	25	39.7
Half Time	15	23.8
Less Than Half Time	23	36.5

N = 63

title of your previous assignment or position?" were designed to indicate what position the chief development officer held and what sort of position that person came from. Position titles can be misleading, but they may provide a sense of how many people came to resource development from totally unrelated positions, and this might indicate a lack of preparation and/or experience. The titles of the respondents' present positions were diverse, as were their prior position titles. These are summarized in Tables 7 and 8 respectively. Table 7 shows the most prevalent title reported, 35.3%, was Chief Development Officer, while 20% were divided equally between titles of Foundation Director and Assistant to the President. Of the 67 respondents indicated in Table 8, 7.5% came from a chief development officer position, and 6.0% came from an assistant to a chief development officer type of position. The largest single group--9%--came from the classroom as professors.

Item 6, "Number of staff who report to you in your resource development capacity," indicated the resource development staff reporting to the chief development officer. Table 9 summarizes the responses. Of the respondents to item 6, 40.4% had one full-time staff member, a total of 12.8% had three or more full-time staff members, and 36.2% reported no full-time staff; 44.9% of the respondents had one part-time staff member, and 34.7% reported no part-time staff. While not indicated on the table, at least 14 of the 63 total respondents to Item 6 indicated no support staff whatsoever.

Table 7

Title of Chief Development Officer

Present Title	Frequency	Percentage
Chief Development Officer	24	35.3
Foundation Director	7	10.3
Asst. to President	7	10.3
Asst. to C.D.O.	5	7.4
President/Superintendent	3	4.4
Interim C.D.O.	3	4.4
Chief Instructional Officer	3	4.4
Public Information Officer	3	4.4
Chief Planning Officer	3	4.4
Chief, Voc. Ed.	2	2.9
Consultant	2	2.9
Miscellaneous Outside of Development	2	2.9
Chief Student Services Officer	1	1.5
Chief Business Officer	1	1.5
Grant Writer	1	1.5
No Position	1	1.5

N = 68

Table 8

Previous Title of Chief Development Officer

Previous Title	Frequency	Percentage
Miscellaneous, Outside Resource Development	12	17.9
Professor	6	9.0
Chief Development Officer	5	7.5
No Previous Position	5	7.5
President/Superintendent	4	6.0
Assistant to Chief Development Officer	4	6.0
Chief Officer, Planning	3	4.5
Public Affairs Officer	3	4.5
Chief Officer, Instruction	2	3.0
Chief, Voc. Ed.	2	3.0
Development Officer, Hospital	2	3.0
Public Information Officer	2	3.0
Learning Resources	2	3.0
Special Education	2	3.0
YMCA/YWCA	2	3.0
Director, Job Placement	2	3.0
Assistant to President	1	1.5
Chief Officer, Student Services	1	1.5
Director Emeritus	1	1.5
Retired, Private Sector	1	1.5

Table 8 (continued)

Previous Title	Frequency	Percentage
Public Relations	1	1.5
Athletic Director	1	1.5
Creative Arts	1	1.5
Military Education	1	1.5
Account Executive	1	1.5

N = 67

Table 9

Number of Full- and Part-Time Staff

Full-Time Staff	Frequency	Percentage
0	17	36.2
1	19	40.4
2	5	10.6
3	2	4.3
4	2	4.3
5	1	2.1
8	1	2.1

N = 47

Part-Time Staff	Frequency	Percentage
0	17	34.7
0.3	1	2.0
0.5	2	4.1
1.0	22	44.9
2	5	10.2
3	1	2.0
6	1	2.0

N = 49

Item 7, "Is your work assignment 10 months, 11 months, 12 months, or other?" revealed information about staff assignments. It was reported that 59 of the 68 respondents had a work assignment of 12 months. When this information is compared to the data in Table 6, it would seem that, based on the number of respondents with positions of half time or less in resource development, most chief development officers have responsibilities in areas other than resource development within their institutions.

Item 8, "How many years of experience do you have in the resource development field?" focused on determining the number of years of experience of the chief development officer. A wide range of years was reported. Table 10 indicates that range. While the range of responses spread over 35 years, the median number of years' experience in resource development was 4.2. There was an observable decline in the number of years of experience for development officers after about five years.

Item 9, "In your fund raising efforts, do you utilize prospect research/personal solicitation?" revealed that 67.2% of the respondents spent time researching potential donors and 77.8% used personal solicitation of donors as a fund raising strategy.

Responses to item 10, "To whom do you report directly for your resource development activities?" indicated the organizational placement of the chief development officer. Of the 67 respondents, 56.7% reported directly to the

Table 10

Years of Experience of Chief Development Officer

Years Experience	Frequency	Percentage
0	4	6.5
1	8	12.9
2	5	8.1
3	9	14.5
4	7	11.3
5	6	9.7
6	2	3.2
7	2	3.2
9	1	1.6
10	3	4.8
11	2	3.2
12	2	3.2
13	2	3.2
15	4	6.5
20	1	1.6
21	2	3.2
30	1	1.6
35	1	1.6

N = 62

Median = 4.2 years

president. The next largest group, 13.4%, reported directly to the foundation board, and 11.9% reported to the chancellor. Table 11 summarizes responses to item 10.

Item 11, "Please check those organizations to which you belong," item 12, "In 1984-85 how many conferences, seminars, or workshops relating to resource development did you attend?" and item 13, "Check all of the resource development publications or newsletters which you receive," were designed to establish the level of professional development of the chief development officer. This information is summarized in Table 12. Again, multiple response items are reported in number and percent of cases.

Respondents indicated the professional organization they most often were affiliated with was the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Of the 55 respondents, 37 indicated they belonged to AACJC, which is not exclusively a resource development organization but rather deals with community college issues. The organization which is devoted to the resource development field totally and which 33 of the 55 respondents indicated affiliation with was Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). Of the publications most often received, the majority, 42 of the 58 respondents, indicated CASE Currents. This is the periodical produced by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education and is devoted entirely to resource development issues. The next most frequently received publication was the Grantsmanship News. The median number of conferences

Table 11

Organizational Reporting Line of
Chief Development Officer

Reports directly to	Frequency	Percentage
President	38	56.7
Foundation Board	9	13.4
Chancellor	8	11.9
Dean	6	9.0
Vice President	4	6.0
Board of Trustees	1	1.5
Resource Development Director	1	1.5

N = 67

Table 12

Profile of Professional Development

Professional Affiliation	Count	Percent of Cases
AACJC	37	67.3
CASE	33	60.0
NCRD	29	52.7
NSFRE	5	9.1
ACCA	2	3.6
N = 55		
Number of Conferences	Frequency	Percentage
0	12	18.2
1	14	21.2
2	18	27.3
3	11	16.7
4	5	7.6
5	2	3.0
6	3	4.5
12	1	1.5
N = 66		
Publications Received	Count	Percent of Cases
<u>CASE Currents</u>	42	72.4
<u>Grantsmanship News</u>	31	53.4

Table 12 (continued)

Publications Received	Count	Percent of Cases
<u>Fed. Grants/Contracts</u>	22	37.9
<u>ADVOCATE</u>	15	25.9
F.R.I. Newsletter	13	22.4
<u>Give & Take</u>	12	20.7
Actoline Foundation Newsletter	3	5.2
NCRD Newsletter	2	3.4
Barns Associates Newsletter	2	3.4
N = 58		

attended during last year was 1.9. One respondent attended 12. This respondent was from one of the programs focusing on grants, so these could be bidders' conferences as opposed to typical gatherings of this nature. A more detailed analysis of this response will be dealt with in the interview data.

Item 14, "Please indicate your approximate gift income for the following years," identified gift income for the years 1982 through 1985. Gift income was tabulated, and Table 13 indicates the median income reported for those years. The income figures generally increased over the three-year period. There were a total of 37 respondents reporting income data for all 3 years. This was the questionnaire item from which income averages were derived, so only 37 programs could be considered in assessing income-cost ratios.

Item 15, "Check the range of your district/college annual operating budget for resource development," was reported previously on page 51 and in Table 1 on page 52.

Item 21, "Have you used outside consultants for the resource development program?" showed that 61.5% of the respondents had not used any outside consultants.

Finally, institutional commitment to resource development was determined by items 22, 23, and 24.

Item 22, "Do you believe that you have institution-wide support for resource development?" showed that 57.8% felt that yes, there was support for development across the institution. Item 23, "In your opinion, is your resource development function perceived by your college/district as

Table 13

Median Program Income, 1982-85

Years	Median Income	Frequency
1982-83	\$40,000.	39
1983-84	60,000.	45
1984-85	80,000.	53

Note: Of the respondents, only 37 reported income data for all 3 years.

a continuing, long-term function or a short-range, stopgap measure?" revealed that 80% of the respondents felt that development was perceived as a long-term function.

A second look at item 24, "Who else has active participation in the resource development function?" showed how many different individuals were giving time to resource development activities. Table 4 summarized this data and showed that the largest participating group was the Foundation Board, followed by the college president and then administrative personnel.

Analysis of Questionnaire Findings

Based on questionnaire items 14 and 15, an income-cost ratio was assessed for each of the 37 programs for which complete data was given. Thirteen programs met or exceeded the 5:1 ratio previously established. Table 14 indicates the average income range of the 13 programs, while Table 15 reveals the range of annual cost to operate. Programs at Laney, Los Angeles District, and Los Angeles Valley had the highest income-cost ratio.

Utilizing data from questionnaire items 22, 23, and 24, the 13 programs were ranked on institutional commitment, and from questionnaire items 3-13 and 21, they were ranked on depth of staffing. As indicated in Table 16, there was a diversity in the three ranked lists. For example, the Los Angeles District program was ranked low in depth of staffing and last in institutional commitment, yet first in financial

Table 14

Range of Average Annual Income 1982-1985

Institution	\$100-500,000	\$500-1 million	over 1 million
Citrus	X		
College of the Desert		X	
College of Redwoods			X
Copper Mtn.	X		
Laney			X
Los Angeles District			X
Los Angeles Valley			X
Los Rios	X		
Marin	X		
Merritt	X		
Napa	X		
Riverside		X	
San Francisco	X		

Table 15

Range of Annual Operating Costs 1984-1985

Institution	Less than 20,000	20,000 - 35,000	35,000 - 50,000	50,000 - 100,000	More than 100,000
Citrus			X		
College of the Desert			X		
College of the Redwoods				X	
Copper Mtn.		X			
Laney	X				
Los Angeles District	X				
Los Angeles Valley	X				
Los Rios	X				
Marin		X			
Merritt	X				
Napa	X				
Riverside			X		
San Francisco				X	

Table 16

Program Rankings on Three Success Criteria

College	Income-Cost Ratio	Institutional Commitment	Depth of Staffing
Citrus	13	5	9
College of the Desert	6	2	2
College of the Redwoods	9	1	4
Copper Mtn.	11	7	5
Laney	3	11	7
Los Angeles District	1	13	6
Los Angeles Valley	2	8	10
Los Rios	10	6	13
Marin	7	4	8
Merritt	8	12	12
Napa	5	10	11
Riverside	4	3	3
San Francisco	12	9	1

status. College of the Redwoods, on the other hand, ranked very high in institutional commitment and depth of staffing, yet last in financial status.

As indicated in the Methodology chapter, the structure of the original design was modified. The original design called for interviews with programs rated in the top 20% of the ranked lists. It was apparent when only 13 programs met the first success criteria of a 5:1 income-cost ratio that, in order to have a viable sample to study, all 13 programs identified as financially successful would need to be selected for follow-up interviews.

Interview Data

Research Question Four

What specific features of the resource development program do chief development officers perceive as having led to their success?

In order to identify specific features associated with success of resource development programs, each of those programs which were identified as successful from questionnaire data was visited and interviewed. Each interview profiles the district, the development officer, the resource development program, and summarizes responses to five standard questions asked of all interviewees. The college resource development programs included are Citrus College, College of the Desert, College of the Redwoods, Copper Mountain, Laney College, Los Angeles District, Los Angeles Valley College,

Los Rios District, College of Marin, Merritt College, Napa College, Riverside City College, and San Francisco District.

I. CITRUS COLLEGE: The Institution

Citrus College was founded in 1915 and was the first community college to be established in Los Angeles County. It is the fifth oldest community college in the state. In 1964, Citrus College was established in its present location on 104 acres at the foot of the San Gabriel Mountains in a densely populated area east of Los Angeles. The enrollment at Citrus is currently around 11,000 students. One of the unique features of this college is a 1,500-seat performing arts center named for former college president, Robert Haugh.

CITRUS COLLEGE: The Development Office

In 1966, a foundation was created by the college trustees as a vehicle for accepting gifts. There was no board and no person to oversee the operation. It was simply an account through which donations could be handled.

In 1982, the college president decided to strengthen the foundation as a fund generating body. A director was hired who had experience in fund raising at a nearby private college, and new members were acquired for the foundation. The group met weekly at first to develop bylaws and to plan ways to bring in funds. The college president at that time was, according to the director, a most unique, creative, and wise manager. He was hired, the director reports, to reorganize

and update the college, and, in three years, when that had been accomplished, he moved on to another challenge. Under his guidance, the foundation brought \$100,000 in pledges the first year, \$200,000 in the second year, and nearly \$300,000 the third. This was done primarily through direct mail and solicitation of individual donors.

Citrus College now has a 30-member foundation board of directors plus a full-time director of development for the college. They have quarterly meetings on campus. This year Citrus has a new foundation president and a new college president, as well.

CITRUS COLLEGE: The Development Director

The current director came from a classroom background as an English teacher. She taught in an area high school for many years before coming to Citrus to work in public affairs. She worked for the first director of development doing public relations work and newswriting. When the director position became available one and a half years ago, she was promoted to that job. The director works with the foundation president and college president directly, and she assists the college president with various writing projects and social functions. The director is obviously at ease in social situations and is a very relaxed, pleasant person to talk with. In addition to development duties, the director also oversees the public affairs office.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director feels that a primary reason the college has done well is because it has very strong community leadership. It has a balance of "givers, doers, and organizers" plus a strong foundation president. She feels that she personally has a high level of interaction with the community after living in the area and teaching in public schools for 13 years.

The foundation membership has been selected carefully, and the level of participation and relative value of members is reviewed periodically. The director feels this has ensured maximum effectiveness of the foundation. Also, part of this effectiveness is due to the strong communication with the foundation board. A newsletter goes out to all board members periodically to keep them informed about all college activities and programs.

Early success, the director reports, can be attributed to the insight and talent of their three-year interim president, who really brought the foundation and development function into focus.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

A few years ago, a rather unusual project was begun at Citrus under the guidance of the former president. The project was called Save Our Community College (S.O.C.C.). Students

were asked to contribute voluntarily a tuition in whatever amount they could and the foundation would match it, and all funds would go to instructional programs. Students and staff contributed \$50,000 that year, and a total of \$100,000 went to assist instructional programs.

The most recent success has been a silent auction and dinner attended by about 200 people, in which \$14,000 was raised in one night. They auctioned things people could not usually buy. They got a professional baseball player who lives in the area to donate one hour of his time, many banks contributed tickets and condo rentals which they receive on a complimentary basis. An effort was made to ensure everyone had an enjoyable evening so that they might increase attendance to 300 people next year. The guest list was carefully controlled by the foundation and the development office. An attempt was also made to involve alumni as much as possible. There was a tremendous amount of press, according to the director, so that people would hear about the foundation and the college.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do they interface with institutional goals?

In order to maintain the match between the college needs and foundation dollars, the director, the foundation president, and the college president continuously communicate about mutual goals. The foundation, the director points out, exists to aid the college, and in order to do so, both must

be moving toward the same goals.

At present, the development goals are to initiate an alumni association as an arm of the foundation to assist in bringing in external funds, to increase foundation membership through an outreach committee, to continue to rejuvenate the foundation board, and to generate funds to continue to pursue computer literacy college-wide.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The greatest asset is having been annexed by Glendora recently. This is a "bedroom community" with a white, upper middle-class to affluent population with an interest in education.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

1. Put all your energy into finding the right leadership for the foundation and the right balance of members. The leader needs to be energetic, a philanthropist, a "people person," and have a good image in the community. This person must be able to bring in other similar people from the community.

2. Have a development staff which includes a director, a public relations person, a grant writer, as well as clerical support. One cannot run an effective development program singlehandedly.

II. COLLEGE OF THE DESERT: The Institution

College of the Desert is a 24-year-old community college serving the Coachella Valley area of California. This college offers standard curricula plus several new community co-sponsored programs such as golf management and culinary arts. There is a focus on the arts in this community, and the community members have supported a new sculpture center at the college.

The focus on arts has also led to the construction of the McCallum Theatre for the Performing Arts, a 1,200-seat auditorium which will represent the first phase of the Bob Hope Cultural Arts Center on the campus. The center is being constructed on college-owned land which is being leased to the cultural arts center for 66 years. It is located next to the main college entrance. The funding for this center has been community-based, with a local developer leading the fund raising efforts. A group called the Friends of the Cultural Center is the major fund raising body and will ultimately oversee the operation of the center. Even though the Friends of the Cultural Center is a community-based group, it has been given office space on campus from which to operate.

The president of the College of the Desert is a proactive, forward-thinking leader in the community, according to the director of development. The president and his wife both participate in many local events.

The college is located in a unique area. This desert area is relatively isolated, and there is a concentrated area

of moderately to extremely wealthy individuals.

COLLEGE OF THE DESERT: The Director of Development

The director has been at College of the Desert for three years. He is working as a consultant half time, paid out of foundation funds which are, in turn, disbursed by the college business office. The director is a former hospital administrator and fund raiser at the famed Eisenhower Medical Center in Palm Desert. He has in excess of 30 years' experience in resource development and is a long-time resident of the area. His office is located in a small corner of the administration building in an office filled with certificates and trophies.

College of the Desert is considering the expansion of this position to full-time status in the near future. The director works closely with the foundation board of directors as well as the college president.

The director has a personal commitment to the fund raising efforts at this college and is a sizeable contributor himself. He has many personal contacts in this community, especially among the more influential members. He is not an academician. He has come to education from the private sector, and he has a clear understanding of the importance of marketing and advertising your product. He is a strong advocate of utilizing the press and publicizing donors.

COLLEGE OF THE DESERT: The Resource Development Office

There is a strong foundation associated with this college, and it is the major fund raising arm of the institution. The foundation membership is now 30, and they are governed by an executive committee. The foundation has been in existence for about three years, and their efforts are coordinated by the development office. Currently, the development office has a staff of one half-time director, one full-time assistant, and one part-time staff person. The director of development is an ex officio member of the foundation, as is the college president, and there is a strong working relationship between both individuals and the foundation membership.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director answered that he was largely responsible for the success of the program. He felt that the key factor is what he called "people people," those who can work with and through others to get the job done. "People," he indicated, "give to people." He expanded on that and noted that the "friend raising" aspect of resource development is the critical base from which all fund raising programs emanate.

With his continued focus on people, the director began to establish a foundation auxiliary in late spring of 1985. This will be a group of community women who want to support

the foundation and college programs. This auxiliary already has a membership of over 100 people who refer to themselves as "a major force in support of quality education," to quote their president. These woman serve as goodwill ambassadors and organize special events for the college.

In its effort to cultivate and recognize friends and donors, the foundation spends 10% of its budget on recognition and acknowledgements of various types. There are large wall plaques commemorating donors on campus, and many buildings bear the names of individuals who have underwritten them financially. Additionally, there is a large pool and "fountain of knowledge" near the entrance to the college, which bears the name of its donor. Publicity and sharing information about successes is a large and carefully attended task of the development office. The director feels strongly that this type of recognition leads to further contributions.

2. Describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

The director was most pleased to have begun two very successful programs at College of the Desert: the Institute of Culinary Arts and the Golf Management Institute.

The Institute of Culinary Arts was made possible because of support from people in the restaurant and hotel business in the area, and a large donation of \$250,000 from the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union of the AFL/CIO. The program began operating last October and will be fully functional by

fall, 1986. Initially, the food service center was refurbished, and a teaching kitchen was installed in a classroom. The program, when completed, will include a small restaurant on campus with adjoining pastry shop, a series of refresher courses for area chefs, and a summer fast food course which will all tie in to the college degree program in Club and Hotel Management.

The Golf Management Institute came out of a strong local interest in golf. The director enlisted the aid of a local golf pro who spent nearly two years making contacts and cultivating interest in the Institute. The efforts paid off, because at the time of the interview, large earth movers, water trucks, and graders have arrived and begun the initial phase of the golf facility. To date, all planning, designing, and earth moving has been donated by local firms and individuals. The director indicated that when a person heard something was being donated, he, too, wanted to participate and donate a service. The idea mushroomed, and a fully functional golf complex is about to emerge.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The director responded that the primary goal of the development office is to raise money and utilize it to meet institutional needs. He indicated that a factor in fund raising success is community involvement on a variety of levels. Community members are enlisted for minor jobs or for

committee work at the outset, and if they prove to be effective and enthusiastic workers, they are considered for the foundation board of directors.

Goals for development are established jointly between the institution and the foundation. There is interaction between the college president and development director to determine priorities and directions, so the development goals always interface with those of the college as a whole.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

According to the director, there seem to be two factors that aid the development function. First, College of the Desert is the only college serving the community, which is located in the midst of an isolated desert region. As the director indicated, "It may just be the only game in town." The second factor is the concentration of well-to-do residents who have the means to support college programs. It is a group who also seem to enjoy social and cultural events, and their participation in such events is extremely high.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

- a. First and foremost, they must have a full-time director of development.

- b. There must be an adequate operating budget. He reiterates, it takes money to make money.

- c. Take great pains to provide information to

constituents, communicate openly and regularly, and include full financial disclosure in that information.

III. COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS: The Institution

College of the Redwoods serves the extreme northern coast of California. The district was formed in 1964, with classes held at Eureka High School. The present campus was opened in 1967. There are four branch campuses serving the southern Humboldt, McKinleyville, Eel River Valley, and Klamath-Trinity areas. There are two centers in addition to the other locations: the Del Norte Education Center is located in Crescent City near the California-Oregon border, and the newest center is at Fort Bragg, located between Eureka and San Francisco.

In keeping with the geography and industry of the area, College of the Redwoods offers some unique programs in addition to the standard community college curriculum. There is a program in forest technology, including a demonstration forest on campus, and a construction technology program that includes classes in fine woodworking and cabinetmaking. College of the Redwoods is located in an extremely picturesque rural area.

COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS: The Development Office

The development office was begun five years ago under the Vice President of Instruction. In its second year, the office was changed so that organizationally it operated directly under the office of the president. For several

years, the development function included only grant writing. Last fall a full-time development director and half-time secretary were hired to expand the activities of the office.

There is a foundation that exists, but not as a proactive fund raising body. The foundation operates the bookstore and the cafeteria. There is a seven-person foundation board with only one community member. There is, however, a community group called the Citizens Advisory Committee. This 18-person committee plans special events and will be developing an annual campaign program next year for the first time.

The task of the development office is a mix of grant development, special events, and corporate giving. There is a resource development committee which is an internal advisory group made up of faculty and the Assistant Dean of Instruction. This group is supposed to act in an advisory capacity to the director of development.

COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS: The Director of Development

The director is a graduate of Arizona State University in Art Education and has a doctoral degree in Art Photography. She came to College of the Redwoods eight years ago because her husband had changed jobs and they moved into the area. She wrote a few grants and moved into the position of gender equity coordinator. She is now the director of development. The director feels the development function is still in a formative stage and growing, but the president is proceeding cautiously. She indicates she and the president are still

trying to sell the idea of resource development internally.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director feels the program has been successful because she has spent three to four years being involved in a development network. She was an NCRD intern and has attended both CASE and NCRD conferences regularly. This last year the college president attended the NCRD national conference in Washington, D.C., with her and was very motivated by it. One reason for the number of conferences and workshops attended is that the program has a substantial travel budget. The director feels that the success in grant development comes from the supportive relationship she has with the faculty, particularly in the vocational areas.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

To date the most successful projects have been grant funded programs. One was a chancellor's Office grant to develop a transfer center. They received \$90,000 for three years to assist students in matriculating to four-year university programs. The director feels the grant was awarded because of the backing from the area universities and contacts made by the college president in Sacramento.

College of the Redwoods received a \$280,000 grant for a computerized machine tool program from the California Worksite

Education and Training Act (CWETA) for a nine-month training and job placement program with area industry. Success in generating this grant was, according to the director, due to the large Native American population in the area.

The college received two small grants for foster parents' training in the district, but even though the dollar award was small, the director reports that benefits reaped in the community were great.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The director indicates that the college hopes to continue to pursue grants and, long range, to expand the foundation to include capital and annual drives, phonathons, and other more traditional development functions. There is some disagreement within the district as to the best way to proceed, according to the director. In addition, they want to further "friend raising" efforts in order to move to generating more corporate and private foundation gifts.

The Resource Development Committee and the director work together to develop the goals and ensure an interface with institutional goals. The director would like to be working more closely with the college president in this effort.

Because this is a rural area and because the director lives quite far out of town, she feels she does not have adequate access to community agents. She would like to see a more proactive posture for the college president in the

community. The director cites an example from a small college president from South Carolina speaking at the NCRD conference. He apparently goes downtown every morning for coffee at "the coffee shop" and to meet with local folks and get to know what is going on in the community. Even though he dislikes coffee, he still makes it part of his daily routine because it is paying off. This president feels this activity is directly responsible for the fact that \$2.5 million has been raised in seven years.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The director feels that community funds are very difficult to raise in such an isolated and rural environment where there is a large economically disadvantaged population. The other side of that coin, however, is that with this type of population and close proximity to an Indian reservation, the college has access to grant money for which many community colleges would not qualify.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

- a. Have full support from both the faculty and the administration for resource development.

- b. Attend good professional development seminars with CASE, NCRD, or other similar groups and take advantage of those networks.

- c. Begin "friend raising" activities long before you

try fund raising.

d. Have a full-time director, a full-time assistant, and a full-time secretary. Additionally, one person cannot do both grant development and resource development adequately.

IV. COPPER MOUNTAIN COLLEGE: The Institution

In 1966, the residents of the Morongo Basin voted to join the Coachella Valley Community College District and the result was a few course offerings from College of the Desert in rented classrooms. The makeshift facility was soon outgrown. Because there was a need for a permanent local community college, a group of residents banded together in 1981 to form the 35-member auxiliary organization called "Friends of Copper Mountain College." The new college was to be built in Joshua Tree, California, one of the more remote desert areas in southern California. Of the population residing in the area, an estimated 60% live at or below the poverty level, according to the dean. To build an entire college with only voluntarily contributed local money was more than ambitious, but in April of 1985, the facility was completed and Copper Mountain joined the district with College of the Desert. Copper Mountain College presently has about 3,100 students on campus and at the Marine Corps base nearby, and a staff of 35.

COPPER MOUNTAIN COLLEGE: The Development Office

Copper Mountain is a sort of "family" operation. It is quite small, and one gets the feeling that whatever needs to be done will be accomplished because everyone will pitch in and do it. It seems an excellent example of everyone having a common goal and working together to reach it.

The proximity of the development office to the other offices is partly a product of the size of the operation. One room houses the faculty offices and the development function, and next door is the administrative area where the dean and the director of business and institutional services have their offices and where a four-person clerical staff works in a sort of "bull pen" arrangement in one room. The present development office consists of a full-time director who is funded half by the auxiliary and half by the district. There is one full-time clerical person and a half-time public information person also in the development office.

COPPER MOUNTAIN COLLEGE: The Development Director

There is a new director of development at Copper Mountain who has been with the college since October of 1985. The position was previously held by an interim director, and prior to that, the director of business and institutional services and the dean of the college both acted as coordinators of the various development efforts. The present director works with the Friends of Copper Mountain and the dean. The director is a former hospital administrator.

The organizational hierarchy of this college is quite unusual. There is no college president at Copper Mountain, in spite of the fact that it is one of two independent colleges in the district. The dean, for all intents, is the president. Because the dean had been associated with this college before it was a permanent facility, and because he was the key person involved in getting the initial community support and funding for the college, it was considered advisable that this interview be with him rather than the new director of development.

The dean came out of the private sector with a background in finance. During the initial phases of the college building program, he spent literally seven nights a week going to meetings, dinners, community events, and conducting focus groups with local community members. This lasted for two years. His commitment was a reflection of the entire staff's willingness to do whatever it took to get this college going.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The college has become successful, according to the dean, because of a totally unique commitment on the part of the members of the community and the entire college staff. The commitment of the community is reflected in the amount of time and money spent on the college. There are two major donor recognition walls in this first phase of buildings, and every classroom was sponsored by an individual or family, and

each classroom is marked with a small plaque by each door recognizing the donor. The staff commitment is further reflected in its willingness to participate in a payroll deduction plan to jointly sponsor a classroom at a cost of \$10,000. In addition, the staff has relinquished pay raises in recent years so that more money could go into the college itself.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

The most obviously successful project is the school itself. There have been a few events along the way, however, which the dean felt were very successful. In the beginning, the Copper Mountain building project was kicked off with a quilt raffle in 1981. That was a \$200 beginning to what is now a two-million-dollar program. The college interaction with the military base has been substantive. There have been classes on base for some time, and some of the top military personnel are involved in the college auxiliary. This close relationship led to the military providing all the initial ground clearing and grading and building site preparation as a giant training exercise. This later produced some controversy and would not likely be easily duplicated elsewhere.

The road leading to the college was cleared, but the county refused to pave it. All the area Rotary Clubs jointly contributed \$100,000 to develop the road, which is now called Rotary Way.

In 1984, a group of 150 workers from 65 area businesses voluntarily built an entire house in one weekend in July. The house sold for nearly \$50,000. The project was nicknamed "PDQ for CMC." The workers were determined to finish in a weekend, and at 12:30 a.m. Monday morning, the San Bernardino building inspector issued an occupancy permit. The group has committed to building a second house this year.

Recently, there was another project called "Send your property to college" in which people contributed cars, houses, land, jewelry, even a horse . . . all of which were sold and the cash put back into the college.

The message from all these kinds of events is that area residents are strongly committed to this college and are prepared to give all they can to ensure its success.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The primary development goal is to keep the momentum going and to maintain the interest level so that the support will continue into the second phase of the building program. The second phase, another building which will double the size of the college is scheduled to begin in the fall of 1986. This phase, unlike the first, will be 90% funded by the state.

It is obvious that, at this institution, college and community goals are the same. The task of the development office is to coordinate and manage the operation.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The demographic features which would have made it normally impossible to build such a facility have been instrumental in the development of Copper Mountain College. The Morongo Basin is spread out all over the desert, and the economic status is quite low. There is no major city, no major industrial or manufacturing area, and no large commercial center. In addition, the tiny communities in the area had, historically, never gotten along and could not agree on any joint projects prior to this. To many, these would have been overwhelming odds.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Market your strengths. How you are perceived in your community is all-important.

b. Obtain a commitment from within the organization. Once internal support is present, outside support can be pursued.

c. Remember that the development process proceeds in small steps and is very slow. The organization must be patient.

d. Remember that people give to people. Development staff must be well known and valued in the community as well as in the organization.

e. Get as much support as possible from legislators.

f. Coordinate and closely control the fund raising

element of your development program. Do not let everyone go out on their own and try to generate interest and funds.

V. LANEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE: The Institution

One of five community colleges in the Peralta Community College District, Laney College was established in 1953. Laney is the largest of the colleges in the district, serving more than 11,000 students. The campus covers 30 acres and is located in downtown Oakland. This district serves a large minority population, and Laney in particular is located in an area that is approximately 65% minority. This district has been in the news recently due to a series of financial difficulties.

LANEY COLLEGE: The Development Office

This college development effort consists solely of applying for grants and administering funded programs. There is, according to the director, a district level foundation, but he views it as inactive and ineffective.

LANEY COLLEGE: The Director

The director came to this job in 1982. He has a Ph.D. in chemistry and was a classroom instructor at the college level. He feels he was "chosen" for this job because of his ability to write. As a chemistry teacher, he obtained laboratory equipment through grant funds, and that was the beginning of his present career. His title is director of occupational education and special programs, and he devotes

half of his time to generating external funds and has one hourly staff person who handles clerical duties. The director sees his development role as disseminating information about grants available and spreading the word about their successes throughout the campus. He works directly for the Dean of Instruction.

The director has a fellowship this year which allows him to travel and to make presentations at conferences all over the United States and Canada. This explains the large number of conferences attended, as indicated on item 12 of the study questionnaire.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

In the director's estimation, part of the reason for the success in bringing large amounts of grant money to Laney is the sheer number they apply for. In fiscal year 1985-86, the district grant report shows that Laney applied for 33 grants and was awarded 14, for a total amount funded of \$695,859.

Another factor leading to the success in grant development is the director's willingness to assist faculty and staff in the writing and editing of grant proposals. The director is presently promoting, in his lectures and on campus, the idea of using grant writing as staff development. He feels there is no better way to keep the faculty, especially those in vocational and high-tech areas, current with latest technological changes. Given the financial woes of the

district, he indicates that grants also offer the resources to continue to offer sound instructional programs.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

The major success, the director recalls, was a computer-aided design and drafting program funded by Bausch and Lomb. The program at Laney has been re-funded over several years, and this year Bausch and Lomb updated all the equipment in this half-million-dollar laboratory. Laney is training about 100 students a year in the facility.

Laney has a transfer opportunity program that has been funded three times through the Fund for Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE), U.S. Department of Education. This program enables Laney to encourage community college students to transfer to a four-year university to complete a degree program. The director indicates that colleges and universities regularly come to the Laney campus to recruit students and that Laney is the fourth largest contributor of students to the University of California at Berkeley.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization?: How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The grant development function works through the office of instruction, so all grant proposals are designed to support instructional goals. The director indicates that the goals for the future are to continue to enhance occupational programs

and to ensure that they are job-specific enough to allow for maximum levels of employment for Laney graduates. Additional goals are to see a sizeable amount of funding go to strengthening academic programs, and to find funding to mainstream remedial students and provide greater access for students with low test scores. These goals are consistent with the institution's five-year master plan.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

There is little individual wealth in Laney's service area. There is, however, a tremendous amount of business and industry which, according to the director, is a significant source of funds and donations. The large minority population has been a positive factor, the director feels, in obtaining many grants.

The director indicates that he sees himself as a realist and feels that in order to get external funds you must "look for an angle and play it. You have to build on both your strengths and weaknesses."

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Have realistic goals and enough resources before you begin a program and remember that it takes a couple of years to do the groundwork. This job takes a pragmatist as well as a "people person."

b. Become involved with an organization like NCRD to

get some insight into what resource development is all about.

c. In dealing with grant programs, do not merely give people information on grants available. There is no real incentive for faculty to participate, so one must be proactive. It is "like growing a crop, you constantly have to cultivate it."

d. Publicize what you have accomplished, both internally and externally.

e. Remember that you cannot succeed in any type of resource development without an institutional commitment.

VI. LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE: The District

The Los Angeles Community College District, with its nine community colleges, makes up the largest two-year college district in the world, according to its brochure. In 1929, Los Angeles City College held its first classes. Today this giant educational system serves nearly 100,000 students and employs about 8,000 people. The district covers an area of more than 880 square miles. The chancellor of the district, Dr. Leslie Koltai, has been in that position since December of 1972.

The Los Angeles Community College District offers a tremendous number of diverse educational programs. It offers the standard transfer, developmental, and community education programs plus more than 300 different career areas.

The district office is located in the heart of Los Angeles, in a large office building. The district offices

utilize seven floors of the building, with the chancellor's office, the board room, a press room, the communications center, the legal staff, and the development office all on the twelfth floor. Additionally, each of the members of the board of trustees has an office on the twelfth floor. The facility looks like the corporate offices of a major private company rather than like an educational institution.

LOS ANGELES

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT: The Development Office

This is rather a unique organization, again a reflection of the size of the district. At the individual college level, there is a person responsible for development. This is usually a dean-level position which is devoted only partially to development. Most of the colleges have a foundation which is associated with each college development activity.

At the district level, there is a significant change taking place. Plans are underway to reorganize to enable the district to maximize its resource development efforts. There is presently an acting development person who is on loan half-time from her position as dean of one of the colleges. She is working directly for the chancellor at this time. There is now a senior director for occupational education and technical programs at the district level. The plan is to make that position responsible for corporate fund raising, and a new district-level foundation will be established to seek only corporate support. There will be four major functions under this senior director: public grants and contracts,

business and industry relations, resource development, and a general manager who will deal with accounting and legal issues. The individual college development functions will be coordinated from the district, but each will operate independently. Their mission will be to generate community-based support.

The organizational change has been planned with the help of a consultant, but has not been formally approved by the district. All the present fund raising at the district level is designed to provide seed money to implement this new plan.

The interim director predicts that within one year the new program will be in place and the district will begin a "Corporate Affiliates" program to cultivate local corporate officers. Plans are for full involvement in corporate fund raising within three years.

LOS ANGELES

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT: The Development Director

This interim director came to the district in 1975, directly from college as a sociology major. She was originally hired to write management reports for the district. She held that position for five years. During the writing of a grants management study, she became interested in, and subsequently involved in, federally funded projects. Last year she was promoted to a dean of one of the Los Angeles colleges to coordinate federally funded programs. She is presently on loan back to the district to assist the chancellor in the reorganization of the district development function. It is

her assumption that she will have the major resource development position under the senior director when the reorganization is complete. The interim director is a warm, soft-spoken, nearly shy person who sincerely believes in what she is doing. She is very methodical in her study and organization of the development process. She believes in having every aspect of the system in place before the program becomes operational.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

This program started from the bottom up. The people on individual campuses within the district, especially faculty, began to exert pressure for funds to meet needs of their specific programs. There was an effort to get fund raising underway on each campus. This spread up to the district level.

At the district level there is internal support for the development function, and there is solid coordination and control of all development efforts so no one goes out on his own and sends inappropriate messages to the constituency. There is a strong commitment district-wide, according to the director, to "show excellence" to their constituents.

The Director of Communications is very supportive of the development function. He has done much of the prospect research, written the case statement, and does promotion and advertising for development activities. There are many brochures and other printed information associated with

development activities. The interim director of the development effort indicates that it is helpful that the district have their own printing and graphics capability within the district, as that saves a great deal of money.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

A most successful project, according to the director, was not the biggest money maker. It was a needs assessment study which was done and a new organizational strategy which was developed to effectively coordinate all elements of the district development function. A result of the study will also be the establishment of a district-level foundation. When this is complete, the district will be effectively tapping every possible source of support from local community level to regional corporate support and state and federal special funding.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The goals of this district have been outlined. They are to organize a total district-wide, multi-level development program. The district wants a structured and coordinated effort in obtaining external voluntary support. In the new organizational plan, all institutional and development goals will be fully integrated and the structure will enable the director to prioritize needs and determine fund raising

strategies with a district-wide perspective.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

This district office has a "corporate look," and an effort is being made to establish a presence in downtown Los Angeles. This enables district officials to interact with local corporate leaders and open channels to corporate giving through the current downtown redevelopment activities in which the district actively participates.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Have a centralized control over all development activities. There cannot be people all over the district going out to do soliciting for a multitude of programs and giving different information to constituents. The director related an example of a large corporation having been solicited for funds for several different programs by several different individuals in the district. The director was contacted by the company and told that she could have someone call them back after they "got their act together."

b. Have a full-time development director. People need to see the same face and hear the same message consistently. People need to know whom to call.

c. Design the development function so that it is fully integrated with other elements of the organization. There needs to be a solid communication flow so that everyone knows

the development game plan. This, again, ensures consistency within the organization and constituents hear the same message from everyone.

d. Make sure all staff members are "goodwill ambassadors" for the development office.

e. Complete all necessary groundwork before any type of solicitation takes place. People within the institution are often too impatient to see results, especially in terms of income. A great deal of time and thought will ensure that the system is in place and that all members of the development staff and everyone who interacts with them knows their role in the development process and that everyone sees the "big picture."

VII. LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE: The Institution

Los Angeles Valley College was established in 1949 and is one of the nine colleges in the Los Angeles Community College District. The college was originally adjacent to Van Nuys High School and moved to its present site in the San Fernando Valley in 1951. There are approximately 21,000 enrolled in this college. Its unique curricular offerings include a large theatre program, with certificates in Motion Picture Production, Technical Production, Acting, and Directing.

LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE: The Development Office

The history of this development office is quite unusual. In the early 1970s, there was a development office but it was relatively short-lived due to a major redistribution of administrative personnel. In 1980, the function was reinstated and the present director assumed the development duties. For a brief time this was a full-time position, but as other responsibilities were given to the director, development became only a portion of a full-time assignment.

The implementation of a new college foundation is underway and it is anticipated that the foundation will begin operating within one year. The college is presently deliberating over potential members. The foundation will take over many of the activities the present director is responsible for. The director indicates that the foundation will add structure to the development function which he feels now operates in a "seat of the pants" manner too often.

The record keeping aspect of the development function is quite structured. District mandated forms are used to log all solicitations and donations. The director is working to get this information managed by computer in the very near future.

Since about 1975, there has been an auxiliary association called The Patrons, which is made up largely of community women and is a non-profit corporation designed to raise money solely for scholarships. This 30-member group is now involved

in a variety of activities from teas and receptions to selling greeting cards. The Patrons have a treasury of about \$20,000 and a partial list of their activities includes generating 15-20 scholarships per year, and 30 awards of appreciation to school and community groups. They hosted area school principals in an information sharing and recruitment project, they hosted a graduation reception, and they hosted two Dean's Teas.

LOS ANGELES VALLEY COLLEGE: The Development Director

The director has been in his present position since 1981. He began teaching in the district in 1970, but has lived in the San Fernando Valley since 1947. He was the coordinator of handicapped programs just prior to his present development position. The director's academic background includes a Master's degree in history and credentials in Counseling and Educational Psychology.

The director has very strong community ties partially because he has lived in the area for nearly 40 years and partially because he makes a concerted effort to be available for community activities. He is a long-time Rotarian and presently holds office in that organization. Additionally, the director is a participant in local chamber of commerce activities.

The director and the college president have a strong working relationship. He indicates that the president has a very positive outlook, and her philosophy is, "If you want to

do something, you can do it!"

The director will be retiring in three years but feels he wants to continue to work with the new foundation as a private citizen.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director candidly responds that his personal energy and connections have made the difference in the development effort at Los Angeles Valley College. He has made himself available to the community both in individual contact with community members and through various civic organizations for nearly 20 years. The director prides himself on being a resource person to the community. If he cannot respond to a request or question, he will find someone who can. The director also describes himself as a "motivator and a hustler." He, like the college president, seems to have a very positive attitude, and he feels he can accomplish anything he really wants to accomplish.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

The director feels the easiest programs to get funds for are scholarships. The college has received several sizeable memorial funds, two of which were from former faculty members. The college has a large local alumni base and, even though they have no formal alumni association as yet, the college

receives many unsolicited gifts from alumni. The Patrons are primary solicitors of scholarship funds within the community.

The college has been awarded some significant grants recently. One grant was from the Kellogg Foundation for the nursing programs totaling nearly \$200,000.

The director indicates that they have received quite a few donations of equipment. Another rather unique donation was several original, signed and numbered Salvador Dali prints of, as yet, unknown value, and three rare stamp collections. The college will, according to the director, probably sell or auction these items in the near future.

Recently, the local Rotary Club donated \$1,000 in building materials to the college to build wheelchair ramps for one of the older buildings. Again, the director attributed this donation to his active participation in the Rotary.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The first and most significant goal is the establishment of Foundation at Los Angeles Valley College. The college will then be able to tie all the pieces of the development effort together and the director feels that this will result in a more structured, stable, and effective development program. There will be an alumni organization instituted as part of the plan, but its relationship to the foundation is as yet undetermined.

In the long term, the director hopes to begin tapping

some of the long-cultivated sources to begin a program of renovation of older buildings and classrooms on campus. The plan is to have donors recognized by having buildings or rooms bear their names.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The director notes that this is not an area of tremendous individual wealth. This district skirts more affluent areas of the San Fernando Valley and, in fact, there are some areas of real poverty nearby. There is a significant industrial base in the area and the director feels this has real potential as a source of contributions in the future. There are many people, according to the director, who have remained in the area, so many alumni are not only living in the community, but they are on the faculty and staff as well.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Know your school and community. The director feels it is critical that development people "do their homework" carefully before even starting a development program.

b. Set attainable goals.

c. Do not try to operate a development program all alone. Be sure you have staff support and volunteers.

d. Development should be the only job you have.

e. Become known by people inside and outside the institution.

f. Remember you have to spend money to make money. It takes financial commitment to get started.

g. Keep accurate records, not only for accounting purposes, but to be able to share information about your successes. Use this information to your advantage.

VIII. LOS RIOS COMMUNITY COLLEGE: The District

Los Rios is a multi-campus district covering 2,400 square miles in the Sacramento area. There are three colleges in the district: American River, Cosumnes, and Sacramento City. Sacramento City was founded in 1916 and is one of the oldest community colleges in the state. Los Rios is the third largest community college district in California, with a present combined enrollment of about 40,000 students and about 700 full-time faculty members, according to a district brochure.

LOS RIOS

COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT: The Development Office

Located in the district offices, which are housed in an attractive new office building away from the individual college campuses, the development function operates out of the Office of Planning and Research. There are three foundations within the district, one associated with American River College, one at Cosumnes, and one at the district. The major foundation is the Los Rios Foundation, whose primary function is community relations. They see themselves as advocates of the colleges. Their role is "friend raising" rather than fund raising. The strong community base has

produced many gifts, but they have largely been in the form of equipment donations as opposed to cash.

There has been no structured approach to fund raising to date, but the foundations have moved to a unified method of reporting. This indicates that they are beginning to work together, even if on a limited basis. During most of their eight to ten years in existence, the Los Rios Foundation has had no liaison or leadership from the colleges. The foundation has simply been a group of community members trying to help their local community colleges. Two years ago, the present director assumed the position of special projects director and executive secretary of the Los Rios Foundation. In this position she works directly for the chancellor of the district. The director is working to move the district foundation into a more proactive position. She is conducting "advocacy training" with the foundation board members. The purpose is to equip the board with ways of effectively sharing information about district needs with the community, which she hopes will lead to a greater number of gifts. There is a 30-member foundation board which meets annually. The board includes the three college presidents, the district vice chancellor, the chancellor, and an ex-officio member from each of the three colleges. If the executive secretary is added to the list of district employees on the foundation, it leaves a total of 21 community members on the board.

LOS RIOS
COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT: The Development Director

The director spent 18 years as a newspaper reporter before coming to the district as community information services manager. She had virtually no development experience prior to this job. The director has worked in the district for 15 years and was promoted to her present position two years ago. This is virtually all the information she shared about herself. This is a very fast-moving, fast-talking individual who seems both highly motivated and high spirited.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

One reason cited by the director was the strong community interaction, both on the part of the foundation members and the college faculty. There seems to be a large number of instructors with strong community ties. Some teachers also seem to have a strong link to the business community through their vocational advisory groups. The director indicates that this is why the district has done so well in the area of equipment donations. Another factor which has resulted in local gifts from business is the reputation that the Los Rios graduates have in the area. They are considered by the community to be well trained, competent, productive employees, according to the director.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

When the Sacramento Kings were looking for a practice facility which met the national Basketball Association specifications, they discovered there was nothing in the area. The club donated funds for a complete gym with instructional wing to the district. While the Kings have playing rights under a mutual use agreement, the students have an exceptional facility to use the rest of the time.

General Motors has contributed to the auto maintenance and repair facility and, in addition, this corporation made it a designated training facility for General Motors service people.

Los Rios has had one totally community-based fund raising activity. Individual donations funded the construction of an olympic track facility.

The district has recently produced a slide show about the college and development-related needs. This is, according to the director, a very professional production which visitors see when they come to the district or which they take on the road to service clubs or community organizations. The director sees this as an outstanding marketing tool.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The director indicated that one of the primary development goals is a more coordinated and proactive resource development effort. One way in which the Los Rios District will augment its present development effort will be to begin a contract education program and to continue to develop the new Institute of Business. There will be one representative from each college working in one location to determine contracting needs and recommend which school or division or individual in the district can best do the training needed by a particular organization. This is being developed along the lines of the Technology Exchange Center in the Orange County area. In the near future the district plans to also pursue more municipal government training, especially with fire and police departments.

Little information was provided about how goals are established with the chancellor; only that development goals are supported by the chancellor and that there is some interface between development and institutional goals because of the close working relationship between the director and the district chancellor.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The director indicated that one factor impacting the development function is that Sacramento is a high-growth area. There is, however, no large industry and not a great deal of individual wealth in the area. It is primarily a government-oriented city, which includes state government and military personnel. This region of the state is largely agricultural, but there are presently a large number of small businesses emerging in the city.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Belong to an organization like CASE and read development related publications.

b. Make resource development a district priority if you want to be successful.

c. Generate community involvement and use volunteers in development activities. It would be preferable if a community member ran the development function.

d. Know your community and stay in touch with it.

e. Remember to be patient with the development function, especially in the beginning.

IX. COLLEGE OF MARIN: The Institution

Marin Community College District was formed in Spring 1926. The present 77-acre campus in Kentfield came into

existence in August of 1926, but it was officially named College of Marin in 1948.

There are several unique programs in this district, including Marin Adventures, in which 3,000 people a year participate in an outdoor natural history program; the Kids College, designed for elementary and high school students and offering diverse courses from astronomy to speed reading; and the Emeritus College, which has been established to meet the educational and social needs of older adults.

COLLEGE OF MARIN: The Development Office

When the current director of development was hired four years ago, the board of trustees simultaneously instituted a development committee to direct the director. The committee was soon after eliminated as unnecessary and the director has been designing and coordinating the development effort alone since that time. There has been limited and fragmented leadership from the college president because of many reorganizations and changes in the district office.

There is a foundation associated with the College of Marin which has existed for 20 years. Its sole function has been to generate scholarship funds. The director indicated that she has tried for four years but as yet has been unable to broaden the scope of foundation activities. The college development office has assumed all other fund raising activities.

COLLEGE OF MARIN: The Director of Development

After 13 years as a homemaker, the director returned to the workforce. She went to work for a small college in Washington, in the Office of Public Information. After her children were grown, she returned to California and took a job at College of Marin. She was active in CASE, was on the NCRD Board, and participated in NCRD activities at the national level. Last year, her job was upgraded to dean of development and information services. This new responsibility includes resource development, coordination of administrative computing, and institutional research. The director feels that resource development is the hardest job on campus, but predicts that within 10 years the status of development officers will be equal to that of chief instructional, business, and student services officers.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

College of Marin has, according to the director, been fortunate enough to see a team effort building. She feels she has taken the faculty and staff from a place where they were suspicious to where they now feel development is a team effort. They feel some responsibility to development. The director feels, also, that part of the success has come from her ability to motivate others into action and her "stubborn and pragmatic" nature. Whenever asked how many people work

for her in development, she indicates that she always replies "175." She feels this reflects the institution-wide participation in the development effort.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

The director reports that the most frequent and substantial income for College of Marin comes from the San Francisco Foundation. This community foundation is the administrative body which deals with trusts and bequests of individuals in the Bay Area. Most of the funds received have come from the Buck Trust, which was set up solely to benefit County of Marin. The magnitude of this trust is reflected in the \$500,000 in gifts and grants received in 1985.

When the director first began in this position, she perceived that there was ill will between the college and the San Francisco Foundation. The Foundation apparently felt that the college lacked credibility. The director spent a great deal of time and effort to improve the relationship, and she feels they have achieved that goal.

Another successful project was a fund raiser to refurbish the theatre and fine arts center. This project raised \$100,000, but the director attributed most of the success to the participation of actor-comedian Robin Williams.

The director notes that some of the major contributions were windfalls. For example, they recently received \$100,000 in a bequest they had not previously been aware of.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

For the first time since she took the job, the director has been willing to establish a dollar goal for next year. She has set a goal of one million dollars. She feels that, given the present level of commitment and support, this is a very realistic goal. She has established several secondary goals. The college hopes to broaden their base of support even more, to generate more unrestricted gifts, and to increase the size of each individual gift.

The director indicates that it has been difficult to develop a consistent interface between development and institutional goals. The current president's primary goal is, according to the director, focusing on building programs to meet student needs. The director has been the one to establish development goals, but it has been difficult, given the turnover in presidents.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

Marin is an area of high per capita income but, according to the director, it is not necessarily the most charitable. There has been a lack of support for traditional causes and, instead, there is a tendency to support "trendy" programs within the community.

Then additionally, there has not been much support from the business community. As a result, the focus has been on

individual donors. As has been mentioned, the San Francisco Foundation, executors of the Buck Trust, has been of significant assistance to College of Marin.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Have a very open and honest discussion about expectations before anything else happens. Clarify in advance what the institution expects of the development function and its director and what role the institution will play in the development effort.

b. Obtain a broad base of support from faculty and staff for development. They must understand the development function, and they must have trust and confidence in the development staff.

c. Make it clearly understood that building a development program is a slow process, and that it takes at least three years to do the groundwork. Also, clarify that the development effort is no "quick fix" for the lack of traditional institutional funding.

d. Obtain the participation of a large number of people for the development effort.

e. Establish a genuine community-based foundation associated with the college, with carefully selected members who have the ability and willingness to generate funds.

f. Develop some type of job description for the foundation board so they will know what is expected of them.

g. In the face of adversity, remain optimistic . . . it is contagious. People will always rally around the positive person.

X. MERRITT COLLEGE: The Institution

Merritt is one of the five Bay Area colleges in the Peralta Community College District. It is located on 125 acres in the foothills of Oakland. Merritt is the newest of the Peralta Colleges and was named after Dr. Samuel Merritt who, in 1850, found and named the "land of the oaks," which became the city of Oakland. As mentioned in the Laney College interview data, this district is undergoing some financial difficulties. It has laid off 80 employees in the Peralta District since September 1985, according to the director of development at Merritt.

MERRITT COLLEGE: The Development Office

This office, like that at Laney, does only grant development as opposed to a full resource development program. Again, the district-level foundation was perceived by the director as ineffective. The director is solely responsible for getting grant information out to faculty and staff, but he feels that his other duties only enable him to devote 15 to 20% of his time to generating external funds. He perceives his responsibility as "stimulating interest in grants" within the college. In order to do this, the director involves faculty in writing proposals but feels only about 15 of the

150 faculty members recognize the value of grants, are willing to spend the writing time, and are not afraid to take the risk.

MERRITT COLLEGE: The Director of Development

The director came from a classroom background. He taught primarily history at the high school level, but has had counseling and testing experience also. The director has a doctorate in higher education and has written 23 books on the history of the San Francisco Bay area. He was also an NCRD Intern three years ago.

In 1978, the director came to Merritt as part of the student services division. Because of his ability to write, he was given the task of coordinating the grant development program. Presently, the director is responsible for not only grant development, but all of student services, including placement, the tutorial programs, cooperative education and facilities. He was less than enthusiastic about describing his work. He indicated that development had taken "a back seat" to his other duties, and he is concerned about keeping his job in the present financial climate.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director is not altogether convinced that they are successful. He said they were awarded only about 30% of the grants they applied for. According to a district grant report dated October 18, 1985, Merritt had applied for 23 grants in

fiscal year 1985-86 and had 12 funded, totaling \$355,959. They had applied for 15 grants from the Fund for Instructional Improvement and were awarded two, totaling \$15,000.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

One vocational education instructor has, according to the director, taken the lead in grant development and has generated the bulk of the funds. He is apparently responsible for developing a computer electronics program from a \$300,000 grant.

Another large grant-funded project is a retraining program at the General Motors Fremont plant.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

According to the director, there are no goals and there is no interface between development and the institution. He indicated that they are trying to avoid bankruptcy at Peralta and that they have a \$4-6 million deficit. He further commented that there has been a multitude of press recently describing the problems as "mismanagement, malfeasance, and fiscal irresponsibility" on the part of the district administration. According to the director, there is poor communication and no "peer interaction" at Merritt College.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The director feels that the demographic features of the Merritt service area have had no impact on the grant development function.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Seek help and advice from organizations such as NCRD.
b. Visit and observe other development programs that have been successful.

c. Have a full-time development director with experience in resource development.

d. Have a coordinated effort between the district and colleges within the district in generating external funds.

XI. NAPA COLLEGE: The Institution

This single college district is located 50 miles north of San Francisco in the heart of the wine country. The college was established in 1942 in the downtown area as part of the local high school district. In 1964 the college severed ties with the high school district and in 1965 began operating independently in what is now the present facility, a short distance out of town. Napa College now has centers in St. Helena and in downtown Napa.

Napa College has an enrollment of nearly 9,000 and offers standard community college curriculum. Their most unique

program is a six-acre vineyard and a viticulture program. The college expects to produce and sell its first crop in about two years.

NAPA COLLEGE: The Development Office

There is presently a divided development function at Napa College. Part of the effort comes through the college in the form of grants development and equipment donations. The other part of the development effort comes through a foundation. To date, the foundation has not brought in the majority of voluntary gifts and donations, but has been largely a public relations and public information group. According to the director, the entire effort will be merged into a single, coordinated development function next year. The strong presidential commitment and the interest on the part of the foundation members in resource development activity is reflected in their continuing attendance at a privately operated fund raising school in Contra Costa. The school consists of six major seminars over the year and costs about \$200 per person. All of the foundation membership as well as the director are attending. Presently, the major source of funds is either grants or in-kind donations to the college.

NAPA COLLEGE: The Development Director

The director's academic background is in political science and psychology. He graduated from UCLA with a doctorate in higher education and he worked at the Center for

the Study of Community Colleges before coming to Napa. The director has been at Napa College for three years and has a variety of jobs. Among his duties are resource development, special projects for the president, liaison between data processing and administrative personnel using the computer systems, staff development, grants, and program evaluation. The director's present title is assistant to the president, planning and resource development.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director feels that they have been successful because of the leadership of the president of the college. He created the position now held by the development director because he apparently believes very strongly that this development effort can be an important and viable program for the institution. The president comes from a rather extensive background in grant development, according to the director. This explains his perspective on development.

The director and the president have built a positive internal environment in support of grants development and they had some very rapid success, bringing \$68,000 to the institution within the first six months of operation.

The director also attributes their success in all aspects of development to "creativity and hustle." Additionally, he notes that people in the community are beginning to hear about

and believe in the college and its case for needing external support.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

First among the director's most recently successful projects was a grant with Sony which was originally a \$68,000 employer-based training project. After a couple of years it took on what the director terms a life of its own. Since the original grant they have received hundreds of thousands of dollars in equipment and consulting services, according to the director.

Last year the college had three programs--machine tool, welding, and drafting--that were literally dying, and the three faculty members in those departments were getting ready to retire. The programs were on the verge of being closed down when the development office assisted in obtaining a \$227,000 grant for establishment of a computer integrated manufacturing program. The programs have, according to the director, skyrocketed and doubled in size in one year.

Because they are in the heart of the wine country, they received a donation of a six-acre vineyard a couple of years ago. They expect to sell grapes and/or wine produced from this vineyard in conjunction with their viticulture program.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The president and director work closely in determining goals and to ensure integration with college goals. Their primary goal is to achieve more coordinated, cohesive effort among the various development functions.

The director and president hope to make the foundation more proactive and to increase their visibility and activity on campus. They want to not only continue the institutional support but to make sure that foundation members clearly see needs and have a complete understanding of all aspects of the college. The director and president also want to continue to expand the faculty activity in grants development, especially for staff development programs. It is their hope to also implement a planned giving program in the near future.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

The proximity to many wineries has led to many donations to the college's viticulture program. Additionally, the wine industry has been supportive through gifts of their products for raffles and door prizes for college activities. The tourist industry is substantial in this area.

In the college district, there are many wealthy individuals, and this, according to the director, has had some impact on their ability to raise funds. There is not much other industry in the Napa area, so the majority of

corporate contributions come from outside the immediate area. The director again attributes the success of the program to "creativity and hustle."

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Have presidential leadership and support for resource development programs.

b. Have an internal awareness about what external funds can really mean to the institution.

c. Avail yourself of training opportunities from CASE and NCRD.

d. Have a full-time resource development director with at least one full-time clerical assistant.

e. Pursue a wide range of foundation activities as well as grants.

f. Utilize your own institution's library facility for research on grants.

XII. RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE: The Institution

This institution was established in 1916 in what is now the heart of a Riverside residential area. The community has grown up around the college and, as a result, this institution has a kind of "neighborhood" quality. Riverside City College has an enrollment of more than 13,00 students and offers 46 transfer programs and 34 occupational programs. The college

serves, in addition to Riverside, the communities of Alvord, Jurupa, Moreno Valley, Corona, Norco, and Val Verde.

RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE: The Development Office

The Riverside City College Foundation is the resource development arm of the college. The foundation was established in October of 1975. There were originally nine members and they met twice a year. In August of 1983, an executive director was hired, and the foundation board of directors was increased to 21 members. This was apparently a turning point for the foundation. Previously, there were several college-employed individuals given the task of trying to act as liaison with the foundation. Most of the interaction was through the student services division. When the commitment was made to hire a professional development person as executive director, the change in the amount raised and level of organization and control was significant. From 1975 to 1977, there was virtually no activity reported in the foundation treasury. In 1979 and 1981, the foundation income averaged about \$2,800 per year. By 1984, the income jumped to over \$140,000 annually. The Executive Director has expanded the operation to include the "Riverside City College Associates," a community group of nearly 200 members, and an integration of the alumni association. The alumni group has become the "friend raising" body, and the alumni association and the foundation board have cross-membership to ensure a coordinated effort.

The executive director works closely with the college

president, and her office is in the administration building in close proximity to the president's office. The executive director is employed by the foundation, but her office space and one full-time secretary are provided by the district. The executive director sits on the president's cabinet to ensure communication and coordination of efforts.

RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE: The Development Director

The executive director works with the foundation on a full-time, year-round basis. She is from the Riverside area and has spent 15 years working in resource development related jobs. The director came to the foundation from a position as an executive director of YWCA programs. She has, through many years of interaction with community-supported organizations, developed a strong sense of what the community is like and what appeals to it. Additionally, she has made friends and contacts among the influential members of the community. She is a quiet and conservative woman who considers herself a key community member first and a person associated with an educational institution second. She indicated that she is not of the academic world and often has difficulty adjusting to the people and demands of academia.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

In the director's opinion, several organizational factors have aided the development activities. There is a very methodical selection of foundation board members. Upon agreeing to serve, members are given a clear picture of what strengths led to their selection, and what role they will be expected to play. Another factor is the close working relationship between the director and college president. While the president does not participate in foundation activities as a member, he works closely with the director. An example of the coordination of college and foundation events was a celebration on campus honoring the various members of the many college advisory committees of occupational/vocational programs. These people had never been acknowledged, nor had they any idea of the other community members they know who were also participating on advisory committees for the college. It turned into an outstanding "friend raising" activity.

Another reason given for their success is the strong community relationship with the college. The campus is surrounded by residences and is like a big community park in the midst of the neighborhood. The college promotes this neighborhood image through activities such as the annual neighborhood picnic on campus and the recent purchase of an older home adjacent to the college as a site for more foundation

and alumni activities.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

In order to purchase a house in the neighborhood, the foundation and alumni sponsored an activity in which the alumni purchased a \$50 name tile which would be placed on campus. There was also a tile-signing party on campus. Enough money was raised from these projects to purchase the house.

Another recent success was the acquisition of several hundred acres in the Moreno Valley area, where the college is considering a new center. This land was donated to the college because the owner was specifically identified and cultivated over time and finally added to the foundation board of directors. According to the director, the man was told at the outset why the college was interested in him and, apparently, over time, he was convinced of the college need, and he made a gift worth millions of dollars.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The director indicated that some of the college and foundation goals were established first, and they went out and hired someone who could achieve them. The director has to guarantee that the foundation makes a percentage of income over and above her salary as a provision of her continued employment.

Short-range goals are established between the executive director and the college president. The overall goal has been to generate alternative funding sources for Riverside City College. Another major goal has been to cultivate community interest and participation in college and foundation activities. A recently defined goal is marketing the college and trying to attract students.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

Again, the proximity of the college to the community and its location in a residential area has developed increased community awareness and a high profile for the college. The neighborhood grew up around the college and the campus is perceived as a comfortable and pleasant place to go. The fact that the college has been around a long time is a factor, as is its tradition of community interaction.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

- a. Have a full-time staff to carry out the development function. There should be someone at the vice chancellor level in order to have adequate "clout."

- b. Have adequate leadership from both the college and the foundation presidents. Foundation leadership is critical, however. The chief development officer must have management skills necessary to run the operation effectively.

- c. Have full commitment from the college president for

a resource development program.

d. Remember that marketing is critical to the success of development activities.

e. Develop a strong level of community awareness about the college and the foundation. The community must believe in the institution and have some commitment to it as well.

XIII. SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE: The District

This district consists of San Francisco City College and seven centers for adult school programs which collectively enroll about 70,000 students. San Francisco City College was founded in 1935, and it serves a large minority population.

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT: The Development Office

The district development function began operation in February 1983. The office maintains contacts with all local, national, and governmental agencies and corporations with grant funding potential. The primary job of the office is to prepare, catalog, and disseminate information about available grants, assist in the preparation of proposals, and to monitor project funds and success. According to the 1984-85 annual report prepared for the district, 17 proposals were funded last year, for a total of over \$1 million.

There are, according to the director, several small foundations operating with City College, but they each support a small, specific type of program such as aeronautics and hotel-restaurant. The college has recently added a

scholarship coordinator, but this person has three other jobs at the college as well.

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE: The Development Director

The director has a language arts background and began teaching English at the community college level in the 1960s. She decided to pursue an administrative position and finished her doctoral work hoping it would aid in achieving her goal in administration. She was assigned to the position of director of development three and one half years ago. In the director's opinion, she was appointed to the position because of her ability to write well. Next year she will be leaving this position and returning to the classroom to teach English once again. She expressed relief that she would be returning to teaching.

Questions:

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

The director initially expressed surprise when told that the San Francisco development program seemed to be successful. She indicated that one has little opportunity to measure one's own success against similar programs. She said, however, that she did feel positive about the total amount of money generated by the development office last year. The director attributes much of this to her ability to work with the faculty. She produces a newsletter regularly to let them know what is available and what the local successes have been

in receiving grants. The director takes grant applicants through the entire grants management process. She feels that while people are often given assistance in writing proposals, many are virtually abandoned after that. She gives assistance in actually running the project and even in preparing the final summative evaluation reports. The director indicated that normally there is little motivation for writing grants on the part of the faculty. She is working to provide some of that motivation.

Another factor cited by the director as contributing to their success was the production of a quality proposal. Applications adhere strictly to proposal guidelines and are well-written pieces of work.

2. Please describe the most successful projects you have undertaken in the last two years. What key factors made them successful?

Even though it was not a large sum of money, the director was very pleased that the district was awarded \$3,500 from the Vanguard Foundation for the Gay-Lesbian Planning Project. This was important because of the controversial nature of the program, because it addresses the needs of a large Bay Area population, and because of the increased attention being given to AIDS.

The director feels that, for her, the best grant they ever received was the \$1,500 from a private donor which allowed her to participate in the NCRD Internship program. According to the director, "that made all the difference."

One of the largest grant awards was the San Francisco Mayor's Office of Community Development for remodeling the North Beach Auditorium. The grant application requested \$158,000 and they received \$165,000.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals for resource development in your organization? How are they established? How do resource development goals interface with institutional goals?

The director states that a major goal of the development office is to create more faculty interest in grant writing. A long-range goal is to develop a district foundation with the necessary personnel to both seek grants full time and to begin efforts in alumni and scholarship programs. She hopes there will be three major components of their future program: planning, research, and a true resource development function. The chancellor supports these goals and apparently feels they are consistent with the district five-year plan.

4. Are there any unique demographic features in your service area which have impacted on your success?

In the director's opinion, the area demographics have little to do with their ability to obtain grant funds. She indicated that they simply write their proposals to fit the guidelines provided by the funding source. The director feels having a large minority population helps some, however, because so many grants target minorities.

5. What advice do you have for other similar institutions engaging in or contemplating a resource development program?

a. Have a full institutional advancement program which includes research and planning, resource development, and public relations.

b. Have an administrator in charge of development, with at least full-time staff members.

c. Have access to and utilize information and word processing facilities.

d. Develop a structure wherein the director of development works directly with and for the chancellor.

e. Have your own graphic artist for resource development.

Analysis of Interview Findings

Institutions and Districts. The thirteen resource development programs studied in this portion of the research were located in diverse geographic regions of California. Some programs were very rural, while others were located in or around large metropolitan areas. Some multi-campus districts covered large, heavily populated regions, while the smaller, single-campus districts served fewer people. The programs in which interviews took place had enrollments that ranged from 3,100 to 100,000.

In addition to traditional curricular offerings, some

districts presented fairly unique programs, usually representative of some feature of their service area. For example, in the wine country north of San Francisco there was a viticulture program, and in the heart of the redwoods, there was a demonstration forest on campus as part of the forestry program.

Colleges or districts in which these programs operated ranged in age from 5 years to 71 years, and they employed from 35 to 8,000 people.

The Development Office. All resource development programs studied were located in some facility either on campus or in district offices. They all operate 12 months a year. Seven of the directors worked in very attractive offices in close proximity to the president or chancellor. Only two directors had offices hidden away in an unobtrusive corner of the administration building.

All development offices were staffed with a full- or part-time director. In only four cases were the directors full time. Nine were half time or less in their capacity as development director, although all but one were full-time employees. Six directors had part-time staff, and three directors had both one full- and one part-time staff person. The remainder had access to district clerical staff.

In all but one case, the development director and staff were supported by district funds. One director was supported totally by the foundation, but her staff was funded by the

district. Three of the development offices were in multi-campus districts, and they were located in district offices in totally separate facilities away from any college campus.

The Development Directors. Of the development directors interviewed, the majority were employed by a community college district in which there was an active foundation or auxiliary. In only one case was the director a foundation employee. All other directors were employed by the college district.

The directors were generally all personable, assertive, socially adept individuals. Five directors had earned doctoral degrees, and the level of experience in the field of resource development of the directors varied from one year to thirty years, the majority having three to five years of development experience. Most of the directors perceived the possibility of a serious "burn out" factor associated with resource development jobs. Four of the thirteen indicated they were anticipating leaving their jobs in the near future, while two others were about to retire.

The majority of development directors had been long-time residents of the area and had been actively involved in community groups and functions. The vast majority of directors report quite candidly that they personally are the driving force behind the resource development at their location.

All directors agreed that professional development activities are important, especially those directors who were in the field three years or less. Those who had been involved

in resource development for 15 to 30 years expressed concern that there was nothing new presented at conferences and workshops for them, so they did not attend any longer. Most had belonged to either CASE or NCRD or both.

The majority of directors had developed some system of information management. Most of the data they shared was quickly accessible. Some had a computerized information management system, and one was just preparing to begin a computerized process.

One factor common to most of the directors, particularly those with full resource development programs, was their personal commitment to their institutions and their programs. These directors do not have any trouble selling the idea of resource development within the community or their own organization because they believe in it so completely themselves.

Interview Questions. The following is a summary of responses from development directors to structured interview questions.

1. Why, in your opinion, has this resource development program been identified as successful?

Most interviewees suggest they are themselves the primary reason for resource development success. The directors cited personal energy, creativity, hustle, stubbornness, and pragmatism as ideal traits for people in resource development. The majority also cite as a factor their long-time residency

in the area and their many personal contacts within the community.

Most directors indicated that a factor in their success was the leadership of the president or chancellor in resource development and the amount of time spent by that president or chancellor participating in development activities. It was also felt that the close, positive working relationship between the development director and the president or chancellor was a factor in their success.

Having strong support within the organization for resource development was felt by the directors to be all-important. Faculty and staff commitment, they felt, was of prime importance to the success of the program. In one institution, faculty and staff relinquished pay raises so that a new college building could be constructed. In addition, the staff raised another \$10,000 from payroll deductions to sponsor a classroom in the building. This represents a significant level of personal commitment. Another director indicated that she always responds to questions about her staff by saying that 175 people (the entire staff) work in resource development at her institution. That exemplifies the team atmosphere wherein faculty and staff work together to generate friends and funds.

In virtually every case, there is a strong public relations effort at institutions that have been successful in resource development. Several directors indicated that one of the most important reasons for their success was strong

community relations. They cite having proactive leadership in the community, usually associated with a foundation or auxiliary, and having a positive reputation as an institution that produces well-educated graduates. In one case, the school was located in a residential area and was strongly promoted as an integral part of the neighborhood.

Many directors reported that recognition of donors was an important feature of their program and contributed to their effectiveness in the community. One director indicated that about 10% of the budget is spent on acknowledgements of donors. When you consider that the three-year income average for that institution was in excess of \$700,000, that is a sizeable amount spent on recognizing friends and donors.

In those programs focused in grant development, success was attributed to producing a quality product, guiding applicants through all aspects of the grant process, assisting in the writing and editing.

The final factor mentioned most often by development directors as contributing to their success was their affiliation with CASE and NCRD. Although interest and participation declined over the years for directors, the consensus was that these organizations had contributed greatly to each director personally and to the profession as a whole.

2. Describe your most successful projects in the last two years.

These projects ranged from major capital campaigns to small community programs in which the dollar value was not nearly as significant as the public relations value.

The major projects described included a culinary arts school, a golf facility, a residence purchased by the foundation to promote the neighborhood image, and, in one case, building the college itself. These projects were all funded by community support. Some came in the form of cash and some "in-kind" contributions such as bulldozing, paving, and planting. The directors indicated that all this support came to the institutions because of a strong campaign to promote the project and a significant level of personal commitment of individuals within the community and the college.

Another type of project described exemplifies the level of community spirit that makes projects of this nature succeed. In one community, an entire house was built in one weekend by an army of local construction, electrical, plumbing workers, and area contractors. They donated all the time and materials, and the house was sold, with all profits going to the college. This represents an extraordinary team spirit and strong volunteerism in the community. The entire college staff was involved, and those who could not hammer nails made sure that there was plenty of food and drink.

Another successful project was institution-based, rather than generating support from the community. In this case, the

faculty, staff, and students contributed at whatever level possible. For students, it was done in the form of a "voluntary tuition." The funds raised in this "Save Our College" campaign were matched by the foundation, and all proceeds went for improvement of instructional programs.

Two directors had programs which they felt were of significance, not because there was much money involved, but rather because of the importance of the program to the community. As one director indicated, sometimes these types of projects do more to help to develop the relationship between the institution and the community than all the public relations you can buy. Both of these projects were small-scale grants, one from a private foundation and one from the state.

3. What are your short- and long-range goals? Who makes them? How do they interface with institutional goals?

About 60% of the directors work with the college president or chancellor in establishing development goals. In three cases, the president of the foundation was included in the planning process. One director works through a resource development committee and she felt this was less than effective. This director desired more involvement from the president of the institution in establishment of goals. One director established goals for development singlehandedly.

The array of goals for these programs was diverse. The first, most frequently cited goal was either to institute a foundation or to develop the existing one. In some cases,

it was to begin a district-wide foundation and, in some, to build the foundation membership and make them more proactive. Some having solid foundations sought to renew and develop existing foundation members. As one director said, "We just want to keep the momentum going."

The next most frequent response was a goal of increasing income. One director indicates that for the first time in four years, she has been willing to set a monetary goal. Up until now she has been too busy just laying the necessary groundwork. About a third of the directors hope to broaden their base of support, generate more unrestricted gifts, and increase the size of individual contributions.

Another frequently cited goal was to build a more structured, controlled, stable resource development effort. Some felt it was, as one director put it, "totally seat-of-the-pants" operationally. One director felt that ideally there should be a triple focus on planning, research, and full resource development, all coordinated and interrelated.

There was agreement on the part of interviewees that cultivating more friends and building community awareness, interest, and participation were essential to resource development and must be a continuous goal.

The last commonly sought goal was to implement alumni programs. Some admit to being unclear about the relationship of the alumni program to resource development. Many feel they should adopt the "Long Beach model" of having the alumni group act as a friend raising body only, and then let it feed

the foundation or development office and fund raising activities.

4. Are there demographic features in your area which impact your resource development program?

The diversity of demographic features was great. Four of the districts were perceived as middle to upper income, while four others were perceived as being economically depressed. One director reported that within the college service area there was a 60% poverty level among residents. Four of the cases had very large minority populations, and, of those, two also had large industrial areas in their districts.

Three of the directors indicated that because they were the only community college in a relatively isolated area, they received more attention from community members than did perhaps other community colleges in the state. As one of those directors said, "We are the only game in town."

Two of the directors felt the age of the college might be a factor, because the residents had seen them as part of the community and as "old friends."

One director felt there was no demographic impact.

5. What advice would you give to other community college resource development programs?

The 13 directors interviewed gave several of the same bits of advice. They responded with between two and seven items; the majority listed five items. The responses are listed below in order from most frequent to least frequent

response.

1. Have a full-time resource development director with a support staff, and utilize volunteers. There should be a full advancement program, if possible.

2. Generate institutional commitment for resource development with full presidential involvement. The function should be fully integrated with other elements of the institution.

3. Be patient and remember it requires time and laying careful groundwork to establish a resource development program.

4. Develop community awareness and involvement in your program and be sure you know your constituency.

5. Market your strengths.

6. Have an adequate operating budget: "It takes money to make money."

7. Have the chief development officer work directly for and report directly to the college president or the district chancellor.

8. Organize a structured resource development program with some centralized control.

9. Keep accurate records which are readily accessible to help you share information with constituents. Financial disclosure is important.

10. If there is a foundation, there must be strong, proactive leadership in the community by the foundation president and board of directors. Remember, "People give to

people."

11. The chief development officer must have excellent managerial skills.

Summary

Included in this chapter were data gathered by on-site interview from all 13 community college districts or colleges identified in the first round of analysis from questionnaire data. Each program was described in terms of the institution, the resource development function, the development director, and the directors' responses to five questions. The questions addressed the directors' perceptions of the effectiveness of the development program, the most successful recent projects, resource development goals, the impact of area demographics, and the development directors' advice to others in regard to operating a successful resource development program at a community college.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter summarizes the findings of an analysis of success factors associated with California community college resource development programs. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section examines specific factors associated with successful resource development programs; the second section examines implications in the light of research findings; and the final section presents recommendations for further study.

Factors Associated With Success

Based on the findings of this research, there are several factors which are identified as being associated with success of resource development programs at California community colleges.

One of the primary factors associated with success is the individual staff member responsible for the resource development function. The researcher observed that successful resource development officers generally exhibited the following characteristics: They were personable, socially adept, pragmatic, creative, assertive, self-confident, committed to the resource development concept, and active participants in community activities. They generally had strong managerial

skills, and they resided in the geographic region for some time. When asked, these people indicated that, in their opinions, they were the driving force behind the successful resource development program at their college or district.

A second factor is the institutional support for resource development. The incorporation of resource development as a major function of the college adds credibility and leads to greater success. The successful programs generally had long-term support and were seen by the institution as a continuing function. Successful development officers generally felt there was a strong working relationship between themselves and the college president or district superintendent.

A third factor is the presence of an operational foundation or other similar auxiliary organization. These organizations offer not only the obvious advantages of tax exempt status, but they are ideal vehicles for gaining community participation and understanding. A foundation can also be a means of identification of potential donors. In areas where constituents had an appreciation for and active involvement with the institution, resource development programs tended to be more successful.

A fourth factor is an adequate operating budget for the resource development program. Time after time, chief development officers repeated that it "takes money to make money." The necessary means for communicating with constituents (i.e., brochures, newsletters, invitations, individual letters, personal visits, telephone calls, meetings and receptions,

etc.) cost the institution money. This factor also reflects the institutional commitment to the resource development program.

A fifth and final factor is having adequate staffing for the resource development function. It is very important to remember that in addition to paid staff, a well organized cadre of community volunteers as well as students can constitute an adequate staff. The identification of factors associated with success in resource development programs has implications for community colleges in California.

Implications

Given the decreased funding from traditional sources and rising costs of operating educational institutions, most community colleges in California would benefit from and welcome additional funds. Community colleges in California can increase revenue in several ways. Because these institutions are supported on an Average Daily Attendance formula, they could work to increase enrollment substantially and retain all those enrolled through the end of each semester in order to increase revenue. Another method would be to charge higher tuition. A third means of generating funds would be the operation of a successful resource development program.

The resource development function could prove to be the most lucrative and easiest to achieve of all the possible

ways of bringing more revenue to the college or district. Resource development can be instituted without state legislative interaction, it is relatively simple to start up, it brings in significantly greater community interaction, it has the potential to bring in large sums of money, it can develop positive public relations for the college or district, and it can be a viable function with long-term positive effects for all community colleges in California.

Based on this study, the guidelines for operating a successful resource development program for California community colleges should include:

1. Effective resource development personnel. Top administration of community colleges should select development staff meticulously. Continuing professional development should be encouraged, especially in the case of the development officer who is relatively new to the field. Top administration should be aware of the high stress and early burn-out which seems to appear in many people in resource development positions.

2. A foundation or other similar auxiliary group. A foundation is a means of generating community action and support as well as a vehicle for raising and administering funds. If there is such an organization in place but in limited operation, the following tasks should be considered.

- a. Renew the membership of the organization. Examine the participants' past performance and eliminate those who have not been productive.

b. Research and acquire new members and carefully select the executive committee of the organization to ensure effective leadership.

c. Establish a plan of action as a short- and long-term guideline for the organization.

d. Include a marketing plan and utilize staff experienced and adept at marketing and advertising for such organizations.

3. Active participation of members of the community. Community colleges were developed as a means of bringing education for adults to the community. A part of the mission is to meet the educational needs of the community. Too often, the tendency seems to be to offer what the college thinks constituents need, with sometimes limited interaction with those community members for whom programs are designed. The community member then becomes the silent partner in what is supposed to be a school-community partnership. In such case, community members have no vested interest in the college. If they are then asked to participate in a resource development function or to share their personal wealth with the institution, they have no reason to do so. They have not been actively associated with the institution previously, so why should they start now? Motivation theory suggests that people respond and are motivated by things they value. One cannot value something one does not fully understand. If people in our communities have an opportunity to participate in and fully understand community colleges, and if they value

community colleges as educational institutions, these citizens will tend to support community colleges financially.

4. A full-time program with adequate staff and operating budget. Resource development should be given a prominent place in the organization in terms of planning and interacting with all divisions of the institution. Resource development impacts all areas of the college organization and cannot operate in isolation. As this study and the literature have indicated, there should be a direct and strong working relationship between the chief development officer and the president or superintendent. Additionally, top administration should allow for the interaction of resource development staff with chief officers of instruction, business services, and student services, as well as the executive office, even though the chief executive officer will be the most visible fund raiser.

5. Centralized control of the resource development program. In single college districts, this is relatively simple to achieve. In multi-campus districts, there should be a development function at each individual campus to interact with the local constituents, and there should also be a district-level development function to provide coordination and control for optimal efficiency. The control factor is important so that internal groups, clubs, or individuals do not get caught up in the enthusiasm of bringing funds to the institution or their department or interest group and try to go out on their own to solicit donations. This can deliver

mixed messages to constituents and potentially give the impression that the institution is not effectively run. This control also eliminates the possibility of constituents being solicited too frequently. All messages delivered to constituents should be consistent and timely.

6. An alumni organization. This is a relatively new concept for community colleges, but there is potential for expanded constituent involvement through alumni organizations. The alumni arm, however, should be the fund raising organization only. If both organizations are fund raising, they operate in conflict. All development functions should be fully integrated and complementary.

7. Adequate time to develop the program. Top administration and active community members must remember that the results of resource development activities do not happen quickly, especially in a system where development activities have not historically existed. The program should be developed for three to five years. During that time, careful evaluation should occur. At the conclusion of this first phase, a careful evaluation should be made to determine whether the resource development program is viable for the institution.

This study has shown that demographic features have limited impact on the success of resource development. Far more important is the commitment of the institution and the expertise of the resource development staff. This study indicated that it made little difference whether a development

program was operated by the district or the foundation, as long as the effort was well coordinated and controlled.

Recommendations

The primary recommendation of this study is that all California community colleges consider implementing a resource development program which is adequately staffed and budgeted and which is integrated with other institutional functions.

For those institutions with minimal resource development programs, it is recommended that top administration review the commitment to resource development and reevaluate its position in the organization. Programs operated on a limited basis without adequate resources and commitment will not achieve results.

A second recommendation is made to institutions preparing prospective educational administrators. Education professionals in administrative positions should have benefit of an overview of the resource development process to allow them to be more fully prepared to perform their duties. These educators should be introduced not only to the benefits that can exist from resource development, but also how to plan, organize, and staff an effective program. Understanding the development process can be a real investment in the future of an educational institution.

Those organizations serving development professionals (i.e., CASE or NCRD) should consider first working with

institutions which train educators to better inform them as mentioned above. Second, these organizations should take heed of the comments of development professionals who have been in the field five or more years who feel no new information is presented at conferences, seminars, or in associated publications. This study pointed to the burn-out rate for many long-time development officers. These issues should be addressed by said organizations, which should offer opportunities for renewal, motivation, and stress reduction for senior professionals.

Of the 13 development directors interviewed in this study, 4 had been NCRD Interns and 2 others had held offices in either CASE or NCRD. This suggests that the training and professional development offered by these organizations is significant. It is suggested that these organizations consider expanding the internship format to offer this type of intensive training to all new development officers. It is also recommended that these organizations make a greater effort to bring information to the public regarding the need for voluntary support of public educational institutions, especially community colleges.

Future study of resource development in publicly-supported educational institutions could prove useful. Because there was no consistent structure to any of the programs investigated in this study, it could be beneficial to examine optimal organization and management models for community college resource development programs.

Methods of monitoring, storing, and reporting cost-income data were extremely diverse and often non-existent. It could be appropriate to develop a plan for consistency of information processing and dissemination within the California community college system.

A study of motivation factors of donors to California community college resource development programs would be helpful in refining the cultivation and solicitation process.

Because the Pickett model for determining potential for effectiveness of fund raising programs cannot be directly applied to California community colleges, a study might be designed to devise an alternative method for determining potential for success of community college development programs which, when matched against actual program activity, can be an optimal tool for evaluation of programs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
Questionnaire and Cover Letter

SURVEY OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

This survey is part of a doctoral study under the auspices of University of San Diego. The data is being collected to provide insights and information about current resource development programs in the California Community Colleges. Please take a few minutes out of your busy schedule to respond to this questionnaire. Your time and cooperation is sincerely appreciated. *PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED BY OCTOBER 25, 1985*, so that I may comply with program deadlines. A special pen has been provided as your gift for helping with this study. Thank you!

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CHECK ANY OR ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY

1. Is your resource development function:
(1) ☐ district level (2) ☐ college level 5

2. Are you employed by:
(1) ☐ district (2) ☐ foundation (3) ☐ other (list: _____) 6

3. Is your resource development position:
(1) ☐ full time (2) ☐ half time (3) ☐ less than half time 7

4. What is your title? _____ 8,9

5. What was the title of your previous assignment or position? _____ 10,11

6. Number of staff who report to you in your resource development capacity:
☐ full time # ☐ part time 12-15

7. Is your work assignment:
(1) ☐ 10 months (2) ☐ 11 months (3) ☐ 12 months (4) ☐ other (list: _____) 16

8. How many years of experience do you have in the resource development field? _____ 17,18

9. In your fund raising efforts, do you utilize:
a. prospect research (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 19
b. personal solicitation (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 20

10. To whom do you report directly for your resource development activities?
(1) ☐ president (2) ☐ vice president (3) ☐ dean (4) ☐ board of trustees
(5) ☐ foundation board of directors (6) ☐ other (list: _____) 21

11. Please check those organizations to which you belong:
(1) ☐ Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) 22
(2) ☐ National Council for Resource Development (NCRD) 23
(3) ☐ National Society of Fund Raising Executives (NSFRE) 24
(4) ☐ American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) 25
(5) ☐ others (list: _____) 26

12. In the 1984-85 school year, how many conferences, seminars, or workshops relating to resource development did you attend? _____ 27,28

13. Check all of the resource development publications or newsletters which you receive:
- (1) ☐ Fund Raising Institute newsletter 29
 - (2) ☐ Give and Take 30
 - (3) ☐ Foundation/Alumni ADVOCATE 31
 - (4) ☐ CASE Currents 32
 - (5) ☐ Grantsmanship News 33
 - (6) ☐ Federal Grants and Contracts Weekly 34
 - (7) ☐ others (list: _____) 35
14. Please indicate your approximate gift income for the following years:
- 1982-83 \$ _____ 36-43
 - 1983-84 \$ _____ 44-51
 - 1984-85 \$ _____ 52-59
15. Check the range of your district/college annual operating budget for resource development:
- (1) ☐ less than \$20,000 (2) ☐ \$20,000 to \$35,000 (3) ☐ \$35,000 to \$50,000
 - (4) ☐ \$50,000 to \$100,000 (5) ☐ \$100,000 or more 60
16. Is the above budget:
- (1) ☐ district level (2) ☐ college level 61
17. For which of these activities is the resource development office responsible? (Check all that apply)
- (1) ☐ liaison with the foundation 62
 - (2) ☐ annual giving 63
 - (3) ☐ capital campaign 64
 - (4) ☐ planned giving 65
 - (5) ☐ alumni programs 66
 - (6) ☐ corporate relations 67
 - (7) ☐ grants 68
 - (8) ☐ others (list: _____) 69
18. How many years has your resource development office existed?
- _____ years 70,71
19. A case statement is the message conveyed to your constituency which explains your mission, goals, values, and is your general appeal for support.
- Do you have a case statement? (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 72
20. Do you have an annual formal evaluation process for resource development?
- (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 73
21. Have you used outside consultants for the resource development program?
- (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 74
22. Do you believe that you have institution-wide support for resource development?
- (1) ☐ yes (2) ☐ no 75
23. In your opinion, is your resource development function perceived by your college/district as:
- (1) ☐ a continuing, long-term function, or, (2) ☐ a short range, stopgap measure

Who else has active participation in the resource development function? (Check all that apply)

(1)_____president of the college	77
(2)_____district superintendent	78
(3)_____other college administrative personnel	79
(4)_____college board of trustees	80
(5)_____foundation board of directors	81
(6)_____faculty	82
(7)_____students	83
(8)_____community volunteers	84

25. Which of the following marketing techniques do you use in resource development? (Check all that apply)

(1)_____full market research	85
advertising and publicity using the:	
(2)_____radio	86
(3)_____television	87
(4)_____newspapers	88
(5)_____signboards	89
(6)_____brochures	90
(7)_____special events	91
(8)_____audience segmentation	92
(9)_____direct mail	93
(10)_____others (list: _____)	94

26. If you wish to receive information gathered through this study, please write your name and address on the
 BACK OF THE RETURN ENVELOPE. Thanks!

COMMENTS: _____

PLEASE RETURN TO:

PAULA JENNER

4564 BLACKWELL ROAD

OCEANSIDE, CA 92056

DEADLINE: OCTOBER 25, 1985

One Barnard Drive, Oceanside, CA 92056-3899 • 9th Street and Stratford Court, Del Mar, CA 92014-2716
(619) 757-2121 (619) 942-1352

October 7, 1985

Dear Colleague,

Some time ago I contacted you or your institution regarding your Resource Development function. This survey is a continuation of that investigation. The enclosed questionnaire is part of a doctoral dissertation at University of San Diego. It was developed in consultation with a CASE member and with the cooperation of MiraCosta College.

This survey is designed to be relatively easy to answer and should take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete. A return envelope has been provided for your convenience. Because of university dissertation requirements, I would be most appreciative if you could return this survey by October 25, 1985. A special gift has been enclosed to help you along. I will share information obtained in this study if you wish to receive it. Thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely,

Paula J. Jenner

APPENDIX B
Post Card Survey

☐ ☐ We have a resource development func-
 yes no tion at the college district. The district
 development officer is:

 name

 address

☐ ☐ We have a resource development func-
 yes no tion at our individual colleges. The
 development officers are:

_____	_____
name	college
_____	_____
name	college
_____	_____
name	college

Paula J. Jenner
MiraCosta College
One Barnard Drive
Oceanside, California 92056

MAIL STA. 4

APPENDIX C

Criteria for Evaluating
Fund Raising Programs (Heemann)

FUND RAISING

OBJECTIVES

1. Are annual goals specified in writing for each component of the fund-raising program?
2. Is there a list developed each year that specifies in priority order the purposes for which the institution would like major restricted gifts to be made (e.g., a chair in medieval history, scholarships for needy students, equipment for a language laboratory, etc.)?

MANAGEMENT

3. Does the head of the fund-raising program have the respect of those who report to him/her?
4. Does each member of the staff know what is expected of him/her and how it relates to the work of others; does a team spirit prevail?
5. Are there programs for improving the performance of staff and preparing them for greater responsibility; is the staff able to capitalize upon them?
6. Is there a formal procedure for evaluating all staff; and is there a system of compensation based upon those evaluations?
7. Do the head of the programs and other members of the staff have the respect of the president and other key members of the faculty and staff?
8. Do the head of the program and other members of the staff have the respect of the volunteers with whom they work?
9. Are there written policies and procedures governing the acceptance, management, and allocation of endowment and endowment income?
10. Does the development program have cooperative working relationships (regardless of organizational structure) with alumni, public relations, and publications units and the news bureau?
11. Does the head of the program compile an annual comprehensive report of gifts received by the school and all its affiliated organizations in accordance with Management Reporting Standards for Educational Institutions: Fund Raising and Related Activities and participate in the Survey of Voluntary Support of Education conducted by the Council for Financial Aid to Education?

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

12. Is there a table of organization?
13. Are there up-to-date job descriptions for all staff members?
14. Does the head of the program have ready access to and frequent contact with the president of the institution and other key members of the administration?

RESPONSIBILITIES

15. Is there a system in place by which prospective major donors are identified, evaluated, cultivated, and assigned for solicitation?
16. Is there an annual giving program in place that stresses both increased gift totals -- especially unrestricted gifts -- and increased participation?
17. Are alumni, parents, students, and other individuals solicited through the annual giving program; is maximum advantage being taken of corporate matching gift programs in accordance with Guidelines for the Administration of Matching Gift Programs?
18. Are major gifts for capital purposes, including endowment, systematically solicited; are special occasions such as school anniversaries and class reunions routinely used as occasions to solicit major gifts?
19. Are deferred or planned gifts systematically promoted among and solicited from alumni, faculty, and other individuals?
20. Are the giving programs of corporations and foundations researched on a continuing basis and both annual and special (major) gifts solicited from them?
21. Are the president and other key members of the administration and faculty actively involved in soliciting gifts; is the president's time used economically and effectively?
22. Do the members of the institution's boards participate in the fund-raising program both as meaningful contributors and as active solicitors?
23. Has a sufficiently large group of volunteers been recruited, trained, and motivated to help solicit funds for the institution?
24. Have programs been implemented by which all contributors are recognized and motivated to continue their support at increased levels?
25. Have programs been implemented that recognize the work of volunteers?

BUDGETING AND EVALUATION

26. Are accounting procedures sufficiently sophisticated to determine the costs -- including managerial, indirect, and overhead costs -- of each program component?

27. Does the head of the fund-raising program methodically compare the results of each component of the program with those of other institutions, both in terms of totals and cost-effectiveness?

NOTES

APPENDIX D
Colleges In Which Interviews
Were Conducted

COLLEGES IN WHICH
INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED

Citrus Community College
18824 E. Foothill Boulevard
Azusa, California 91702

College of the Desert
43-500 Monterey Avenue
Palm Desert, California 92206

College of the Redwoods
Eureka, California 95501

Copper Mountain College
6785 Sage Drive
Twentynine Palms, California 92277

Laney Community College
900 Fallon St.
Oakland, California 94607

Los Angeles Community College District
617 W. 7th Street
Los Angeles, California 90017

Los Angeles Valley Community College
5800 Fulton Avenue
Van Nuys, California 91401

Los Rios Community College District
1919 Spanos Court
Sacramento, California 95825

College of Marin
Kentfield, California 94904

Merritt Community College
112500 Campus Drive
Oakland, California 94619

Napa Community College
2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway
Napa, California 94558

Riverside City College
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, California 92506

San Francisco Community College District
50 Phelan Avenue
San Francisco, California 94112

REFERENCES

References

- Bailey, Anne Lowrey. (1985, January-February). So you want to get a grant: Some advice from the experts. Change, pp. 40-43.
- Bornheimer, Deane G. (1967). The director of development in selected independent, liberal arts colleges of moderate size. Ed.D., Rutgers University. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Brakeley, George A., Jr. (1980). Tested ways to successful fund raising. New York: AMACOM.
- Bray, Arnold. (1984, May). ACCCA advocate: Under the dome. AdCom. p. 8.
- Bremer, Fred H. (1965). Philanthropic support for public junior colleges. Ph.D., University of Texas. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Broce, Thomas E. (1979). Fund raising. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Carpenter, D. S., & Walker, R. L. (1985). The place of the academician in fund raising. AAHE Bulletin, 4, 11-14.
- Coachella Valley Community College District finds success in private funding. (1984, May). AdCom, p. 1.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1982). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Coloia, Louis Samuel, Jr. (1980). Fund raising in private higher education: An analysis of the role of the development officer as administrator at selected institutions. Ph.D., Loyola University of Chicago. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

- Cramer, R. V. (1967). Financial development in private higher education and the effects of related variables. Ph.D., University of Connecticut. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Degerstedt, L. (1982). The strategies and perceptions of community colleges and the foundations: A national perspective. In W. H. Sharron (Ed.), The community college foundation (pp. 49-66). Washington, D.C., National Council for Resource Development.
- DeNevi, D. (1983, May). Notes of an NCRD Intern: Billions in funding for the asking. AdCom, p. 2.
- Elkins, Floyd S. (1965). Philanthropic support of private junior colleges in the United States. Ph.D., University of Texas. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Elsner, P. (1983, October). Urban focus. Community and Junior College Journal, 54(2).
- Fisher, James L. (1985). Role of the public college or university president in fund raising. In M. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development (pp. 49-56). Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Harper, W. A. (1976). College foundations bring in the \$\$\$.
Change, 2, 48-49.
- Heemann, Warren (Ed.). (1979). New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Heemann, Warren. (1985). Criteria for evaluating advancement programs. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Hollingsworth, Patricia. (1983). An investigation of characteristics of successful community college foundations. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service. No. 233-756).
- Leslie, John W. (1969). Focus on understanding and support: A study in college management. Washington, D.C.: American College Public Relations Association.

- Leslie, John W. (1979). Variations in fund-raising potential among colleges and universities. In W. Heemann (Ed.), New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. 59-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Leslie, John W. (1985). Organization of fund raising at public institutions. In M. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development (pp. 13-23). Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Luck, Michael F. (1974). Characteristics of foundations and fundraising in public comprehensive two-year colleges. Ph.D., Southern Illinois University. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Luck, M., & Tolle, D. (1978). Community college development: Alternative fund-raising strategies. Indianapolis: R & R Newkirk.
- McCain, J. C. (1975, January). Resource Development Programs in Two-Year Colleges: A National Survey. Paper presented at the meeting of National Council for Resource Development, Washington, D.C.
- Marchese, T., Bernstein, A., & Newman, F. (1985, January-February). Change on the foundations: What's the issue? Change, p. 5.
- McGinnis, Dennis Robert. (1980). A study of fund raising programs at selected state colleges and regional universities. Ed.D., University of Georgia. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Meyer, James D. (1971). A study of fund raising programs in selected institutions of higher education in the United States. Ed.D., University of Wyoming. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

- Muller, S. (1977). The definition and philosophy of institutional advancement. In A. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of institutional advancement (pp. 1-9). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Payton, Robert. (1985, January-February). The taming of the corporation: Private sector responsibility. Change, pp. 27-30, 52, 53.
- Perrote, Ronald J. (1974). Fundraising in higher education in the United States with special reference to selected institutions in the state of Michigan. Ph.D., Michigan State University. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Pickett, William L. (1977). An assessment of the effectiveness of fund raising policies of private undergraduate colleges. Ph.D., University of Denver.
- Polk, Charles H. (1979). Why public colleges need private funds. In J. E. Bennett (Ed.), Building volunteer support for the two-year college: How-to information on fund raising, community relations, news/information, and government relations (pp. 4-5). Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Porter, W. E. (1958). The advancement of understanding and support of education. Washington, D.C.: The American College Public Relations Association.
- Pray, F. (Ed.). (1981). Handbook for educational fund raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Ramsden, Richard. (1979). The COFHE development study: Insights and implications. In W. Heemann (Ed.), New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. 23-41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Rowland, A. (Ed.). (1977). Handbook for institutional advancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Schermerhorn, John R., Jr. (1986). Management for productivity (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Schneider, P. (1978). The art of asking: Handbook for successful fundraising. New York: Walker and Company.

- Silvera, Alfred L. (1974). The design and utilization of nonprofit foundations affiliated with California public community colleges. Ed.D., University of Southern California. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Simic, Curtis R. (1985). The private foundation at a public university. In M. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development (pp. 25-36). Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Sims, Lester M. (1973). The college-related foundation as a viable concept for resource development in Alabama junior colleges. Ed.D., University of Alabama. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Sleeper, Jim. (1985, January-February). The foundations: Who, what, when, and how. Change, pp. 12-14.
- Smith, Hayden W. (1979). Voluntary support: The end product of fund raising activities. In W. Heemann (Ed.), New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. 1-21). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Smith, Hayden W. (1983). A profile of corporate contributions. New York: Council for Financial Aid to Education.
- Sneed, Jean Jarvis. (1979). Variables associated with the effectiveness of nonprofit foundations affiliated with selected Florida public community-junior colleges. Ed.D., Florida State University. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Stats and facts: The California community colleges in 1982. Sacramento: Chancellor's Office.
- Stetson, Nancy E. (1984). The development of an historical perspective on private financial support for public two-year colleges. Ed.D., Nova University.

- Titelbaum, Robert. (1979). How to find out what it's really costing you to operate all those fund raising programs. In W. Heemann (Ed.), New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund raising (pp. 71-83). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Webb, C. (1982). A policy-relevant study of development programs at representative institutions within the State University of New York. Ph.D., Michigan State University.
- Wilmer, W. (1980). An assessment of the institutional advancement process at selected small, independent colleges in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Wise, S., & Camper, M. (1984, March). Fund raising for two-year colleges. Paper presented at meeting of National Council for Resource Development Interns, Spokane, WA.
- Wise, S., & Camper, M. (1985). Fund raising for two-year colleges. In M. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development (pp. 131-140). Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Worth, Michael J. (1982). Boards of university related foundations: their characteristics, roles, and relationships to presidents and governing boards of host institutions. Ph.D., University of Maryland. In A. Rowland (Ed.), (1983). Research in institutional advancement: A selected, annotated compendium of doctoral dissertations. Washington, D.C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.