Administrative Issues Journal

Volume 2
Issue 2 *VOLUME 2, ISSUE 2: OCTOBER 2012*

Article 16

10-2012

A LONGITUDINAL EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATION REVENUE

Van Patterson

Madeline Justice

Joyce A. Scott

A LONGITUDINAL EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATION REVENUE

Van Patterson
Panola College

Madeline Justice
Texas A&M University – Commerce

Joyce A. Scott
Texas A&M University – Commerce

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the annual revenue received by United States public Community College Foundations from 2008-2009 in relation to selected variables associated in the literature with successful foundation performance. This study also collected longitudinal data by replicating and expanding upon a similar study conducted by Dr. Sharon McEntee Carrier a decade earlier.

Linear regression analysis was used to collect descriptive statistics that described the frequencies, central tendencies, and distribution of the data. The researchers used linear regression and analysis of variances (ANOVA) to study the relationship between revenue gained in connection with private giving and college foundation operations for fiscal year 2008-2009, the degree to which the college president, chief resource development officer, and foundation board members were rated as playing a critical role in the foundation's operation, the degree to which meeting institutional strategic goals was rated as an important factor in evaluating the foundation's operation, the institution's geographic location, size (based on FTE enrollment), size of endowment, and organizational structure.

The explanatory variables, foundation operations, the Chief Development Officer's role in the foundation's operation, location, size, endowment, and the Chief Development Officer's perception of how fundraising efforts were appreciated by the institutions served were found to be statistically significant.

Keywords: chief resource development officer (CDO), college fund raising, college foundations, endowments, community college revenue

The dismal economic climate of the latter part of the first decade of the 21st century has influenced thousands of people to attend college (Community College Enrollment, 2008; Nevada, 2009). They seek educational programs that will quickly provide them with the training necessary for a rapid and profitable return to the workforce. Many decide to enroll at a local community college primarily because of its affordability when compared to 4-year institutions, the quality of instruction, and the ability of community colleges to provide specific training sought by local employers (Jacobson, 2005; Washington, 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pubic community colleges are the workhorses of American higher education as they educate a majority of students enrolled. From 2000 to 2008, enrollment at these institutions increased 17%, from 5.7 to 6.6 million students or approximately 95% of all students in 2-year institutions. From 2000 to 2008, full-time enrollment at public and private

2-year institutions increased to 2.8 million students, while part-time enrollment increased 11% to 4.1 million students (United States Department of Education [USDE], 2010).

Community colleges have grown faster than 4-year institutions, with the number of students they educate increasing more than a sevenfold rate of growth since 1963, compared to a threefold growth rate at 4-year institutions, but funding for community colleges has steadily declined over the past 20 years (Fitzpatrick, 2009). Community colleges have traditionally relied on three funding sources: state appropriations, local taxes, and tuition. Each source supplied approximately one-third of the school's total budget. Over the years, these funding sources have declined radically, particularly in the area of state appropriations (Matonak, 2008). As states struggle to create balanced budgets, many are choosing to accomplish their goals by severely reducing funding for institutions of higher education.

This trend has led more than one college president to agree that community colleges will soon need to call themselves publicly-assisted instead of publicly-supported institutions due to declining financial support from traditional state and local sources (Milliron, de los Santos & Browning, 2003). While humorous, this comment illustrates the frustration community college presidents experience each time state legislatures reject their requests for additional funding.

Recently, two issues have dominated state appropriations for higher education: the decline in the percentage of state budgets spent on higher education, and the changes in higher education spending directly linked to a state's economic circumstances (Hovey, 2001). In the early 1990s, 12% to 15% of all state appropriations went to higher education nationally. However, by mid-decade, appropriations had declined to approximately 8% to 11% (Carrier, 2002). This problem was compounded as federal, state, and local government appropriations declined by 5.7% (Watkins, 2000) in the same period.

Colleges are responding to growing costs by establishing 501(c)(3) nonprofit foundations to receive donations from alumni, donors, and other philanthropic agencies (Cohen & Brawer, 2002; Eldredge, 1999; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Ryan, 2003; Tisdale, 2003). Before the late 1970s, one did not typically see foundations on community college campuses, but by the end of the 1980s the number of Community College Foundations had grown to approximately 649 (Angel & Gares, 1989).

Community College Foundations help their institutions raise additional funds and increase volunteer involvement, yielding additional flexibility in administrative and investment decisions (Carrier, 2002). Funds raised typically supplement operating budgets, but some community colleges have begun to build endowments (Moore, 2000; Van der Werf, 1999).

Over the last decade, almost every community college in America has become a fundraiser (Jenkins, 1997; Van der Werf, 1999). Ed Coulter, chancellor of Arkansas State University–Mountain Home, summarized the situation well when he stated that 2-year institutions are not where they should be in regard to establishing successful development programs. As a result, these institutions as a group have received less than 2% of all funds given to higher education (Anderson, 2003; Fund Raising, 2008; Lanning, 2008; Summers, 2006). Faced with increasing costs, declining government support, and pressure to increase tuition, community colleges have realized the importance of fundraising to their future (Chitwood & Okaloosa-Walton Community College, 1990; Fund Raising, 2008).

As Community College Foundations gain experience in fundraising, they enjoy greater success (Weiger, 1999). For example, Honolulu Community College received an estate gift of $3.5 million, and Santa Fe Community College received $259,000 from individual donors in 2007 (Halligan, 2008). Similarly, Panola College in Carthage, Texas also received a single-donor gift of $251,500. No matter their size, foundations are important to the institutions they serve and will continue to grow as community colleges seek creative ways to counter the negative economic climate (Anderson, 2003; Council for Advancement and Support of Education [CASE], 2007).

As Community College Foundations mature and meet with greater success, they are the subject of more and more research studies. This expanding base of knowledge is beneficial to foundation directors, but there is still only a limited amount of longitudinal research pertaining to Community College Foundations (Anderson, 2003; Stewart, 2006). A review of the literature confirmed that few researchers have revisited previous studies, so little new information is available to confirm their results. Variables found to increase foundation revenue a decade ago may no longer be

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

effective, while those determined to have been statistically insignificant at the time may have a much greater impact on today's Community College Foundations.

Researchers contacted the Council for Resource Development (CRD) to discuss the present project. CRD Executive Director suggested that researchers replicate all or a portion of a study completed by Sharon M. Carrier, Barbara J. Keener, and Sherry J. Meaders in 2002. Their research was considered groundbreaking at the time because it illustrated how community colleges from across the nation implemented the principles of resource development. It provided longitudinal data, indicators of successful Community College Foundations, and a snapshot of how maturing programs were funded, staffed, and operated in their fundraising efforts. The project supplied longitudinal data to enable directors and foundation board members to make better-informed decisions as they competed for public support.

The Carrier study (2002) was the first to examine the annual revenue of United States public Community College Foundations in relation to selected variables associated in the literature with successful foundation performance. The present study was designed to replicate and expand upon the Carrier study, to look at new longitudinal data and determine if the significance of the variables established a decade earlier had changed in relation to annual revenue.

This study examined the following research questions:

1. Does the size of a foundation's operating budget significantly influence its ability to raise revenue?
2. Does the degree to which the college president is ranked as playing a critical role in the foundation's operation significantly influence a Community College Foundation's ability to raise revenue?
3. Does the degree to which the chief resource development officer is ranked as playing a critical role in the foundation's operation significantly influence a Community College Foundation's ability to raise revenue?
4. Does the degree to which the foundation board members are ranked as playing a critical role in the foundation's operation significantly influence a Community College Foundation's ability to raise revenue?
5. Does the degree to which meeting institutional strategic goals is ranked as an important factor in evaluating the foundation's operation significantly influence a Community College Foundation's ability to raise revenue?
6. Does an institution's geographic location significantly influence its foundation's ability to raise revenue?
7. Does a college's size significantly influence its foundation's ability to raise revenue?
8. Does the size of a foundation's endowment significantly influence its ability to raise revenue?
9. Does a foundation's organizational structure significantly influence its ability to raise revenue?

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

In addition to examining the annual revenue received by United States

public Community College Foundations from 2008-2009, the researchers examined additional variables in relation to revenue earned, including the degree to which meeting institutional strategic goals was rated as an important factor in evaluating the foundation operation. Other variables included a college's geographic location, size, endowment, and its foundation's organizational structure. Researchers used a modified and expanded version of Carrier's original survey.

Survey Validation

This was only the second time the survey instrument was used. The original survey was developed by a research team at the University of Florida in the 1990s. It was created following an extensive review of the relevant literature. Its format was similar to that used by the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) in its annual survey (Carrier, 2002). However, major revisions were made to adapt the CAE survey to accommodate the day-to-day realities experienced by development officers operating Community College Foundations, as described by community college fundraising experts and the literature (Carrier, 2002).

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

To validate the survey instrument, the research team at the University of Florida consulted 10 content experts, most of whom were members of the Council for Resource Development (CRD) Executive Board. These experts provided external validation reviewing the original survey instrument and providing extensive feedback which was incorporated into a revised draft (Carrier, 2002). A second panel of nine experts drawn primarily from the CRD Board provided further external validation.

Sample Selection

Subjects were Community College Foundation directors, whose institutions were members of the Council for Resource Development (CRD) from 2008-2010. The CRD web site indicated that the organization had approximately 1,100 members, each of whom were 18 years of age or older and who met the requirements of this study.

The Council for Resource Development (CRD) is an essential education and networking organization created to benefit community college development professionals through networking, supporting, and celebrating community college development professionals. The CRD is an affiliate of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and serves over 1,600 members at more than 700 institutions.

Collection of Data

CRD sent an email to its members encouraging them to participate in the study. The survey was created using the website *Survey Monkey,* an online tool that allows researchers to create web-based surveys, collect responses, and examine data in an efficient manner. Researchers can choose to collect information in various formats, and once the data have been collected, they can be exported in Excel format for further analysis.

A computer program called *G*Power* was used to determine the minimum number of surveys necessary to conduct the study. Utilizing these settings, the *G*Power* program recommended a minimum of 114 completed surveys be collected to ensure the likelihood of finding statistical significance if it actually existed. Once the minimum number of surveys was received, the data were downloaded and entered into a *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (SPSS) spreadsheet.

Treatment of Data

Following collection of the data, responses to the *Community College External Funding Survey* were coded and analyzed. A linear regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance to determine the degree of association between the dependent variable, the amount of foundation revenue gained in 2008-09, and the independent variables: foundation operating budget, the degree to which the college president, chief development officer, and foundation board members individually are rated as playing a critical role in the foundation operation; the degree to which meeting institutional strategic goals is rated as an important factor in evaluating foundation operation, college geographic location, college size, college endowment size, and organizational structure. In addition the researchers used analysis of variances (ANOVA) to study the relationship between revenue gained and variables in connection with foundation operations for fiscal year 2008-2009.

FINDINGS

The study sought input from 408 chief development officers (CDO). Of those invited to participate in the survey, 213 (52.2%) accessed the survey. Ninety-eight provided little or no information, while 115 respondents completed the survey. Community College Foundations from 41 states were represented in the study, and Table 1 shows additional information about respondents.

Asked to *identify the geographic setting of the institution,* 53.8% of CDOs indicated their institutions were located in a rural setting, and 24.2% reported their institutions were in suburban locations. The remaining colleges, 22.0%, were located in an urban environment.

A total of 131 CDOs also responded to the question asking about the perceived wealth of their college's service area. Of those, 6.1% indicated that their colleges were located in a *wealthy* service area: 44.3% described their service area as being of *average wealth*, and 49.6% reported their service area as being of *below average wealth*.

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

To whom the CDO reported varied by institution. The 128 responses received showed that most CDOs reported to a Chancellor (6.3%) or President (85%) of their institution, whereas the remainder reported to a provost (0.80%), vice president (6.3%), dean (0.80%), executive director (0.80%), or foundation board (2.36%). The total of these percentages exceeds 100% because several of the CDOs (3.15%) responded that they reported to more than one supervisor.

When asked about their place in the college's hierarchy, 81.5% of the 130 CDOs indicated that their position was at the senior or cabinet level. This is encouraging, as a review of the literature showed that CDOs who had direct access to information and decision makers were better prepared to perform their duties (Anderson, 2003; Brumbach & Council for Resource Development [CRD], 2006; Budd, 2008; Fund Raising, 2008; Sygielski & Carter, 2009).

Researchers were surprised to find that almost 20% of participating development officers were not members of their institution's executive committee. Researchers also discovered that 3.8% of responding institutions did not have a foundation or private gift development office and that 5.5% of the study CDOs were not part of their college's foundation team.

Chief development officers (CDO) face many challenges, from working with the president and foundation board, to completing additional assigned duties and being evaluated by outside constituencies. However, when asked what were the most important factors in evaluating a Community College Foundation's operations, as a group they ranked the "Number of repeat donors," an "Increase in individual giving," and "Total dollars raised" as the most important.

For this study, the research questions were analyzed in the format of hypotheses to get a better picture of fund raising activities. Hypothesis numbers cited below align with the order of the research questions.

Hypothesis 1 proposed that there was no significant difference in foundation revenue and the size of its operating budget. The data indicated that the size of a foundation's operating budget influenced its ability to raise revenue. The hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the degree to which the college president was ranked as playing a critical role in the institution's foundation operation. The data indicated that there was no statistical difference between the degree to which the college president was rated concerning his or her role in the foundation's operation and the Community College Foundation's ability to raise revenue. The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the degree to which the chief development officer (CDO) was ranked as playing a critical role in the institution's foundation operation. At the .05 level of significance, a statistically significant difference was found between the degree to which the CDO was ranked as playing a critical role in the foundation's operation and foundation revenue, and the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 4 proposed that there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the degree to which the foundation Board members were individually ranked as playing a critical role in the institution's foundation operation. Hypothesis 4 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 5 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the degree to which CDOs ranked meeting institutional strategic goals as an important factor in evaluating the institution's foundation operation. Hypothesis 5 was not rejected, based on these findings.

Hypothesis 6 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the college's geographic location. The data indicated that there was statistical difference between a college's geographic location and the foundation's ability to raise revenue. Hypothesis 6 was rejected, based on these findings.

Hypothesis 7 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and a college's size based on FTE enrollment. Hypothesis 7 was rejected, indicating that there was statistical difference between a college's size and its foundation's ability to raise revenue.

Hypothesis 8 analyzed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and the size of a community college's endowment(s). Hypothesis 8 was rejected, indicating that the size of a foundation's endowment

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

influenced its ability to raise revenue.

Hypothesis 9 proposed whether there was a significant difference between foundation revenue and a Chief Development Officer's (CDO) perception about how his or her efforts were appreciated by the institution he or she serves. Hypothesis 9 was rejected, indicating that there was a statistical difference between the foundation's ability to raise revenue and a CDO's perception of how his or her efforts were appreciated by the college they served.

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

There are many variables that influence a Community College Foundation's ability to raise funds. Each variable determined to be statistically significant in this study should be considered in the context of how it affects the foundation as a whole. The following discussion first addresses variables found to be significant and positive in this context and then proceeds to examine those that were not.

The variable *operating budget* is a good example. This study revealed a significant and positive relationship between a foundation's operating budget and its revenue. This finding reinforced existing studies and research (Anderson, 2003; Berry, 2005; Errett, 2004).

Of the 117 respondents to this question, 70.1% reported an operating budget of $500,000 or less; of these, six reported an operating budget of zero. This percentage is much smaller than that Carrier reported from her 1998 study when 92% of respondents noted a foundation operating budget of less than $500,000 (Carrier, 2002). This smaller percentage of foundations operating on budgets of $500,000 or less indicates that more community colleges have chosen to invest more resources in their fundraising operations.

The mean operating budget in this study was found to be $521,256.74, which is more than twice the average operating budget of $232,479.08 reported by Carrier a decade earlier. Data also showed that 28.2% of Community College Foundations now operate on budgets in excess of $500,000, while 15.4% have operating budgets between $500,001 and $1,000,000, 9.4% have operating budgets between $1,000,001 and $2,000,000, and 3.4% have budgets between 2 and 5 million. An exceptional two institutions (1.7%) reported budgets in excess of $10,000,000.

Carrier's review of the literature convinced her that a foundation's operating budget would have a significant and positive influence on foundation revenue. Unfortunately, her data did not support her belief, so she theorized that the many ways a Community College Foundation could be funded and respondent confusion about what information was being sought may have affected the survey outcomes (Carrier, 2002). To reduce confusion, the present researchers added instructions to the survey so respondents would have a clearer idea of what information was being sought, which may explain why this variable emerged as significant in this study but not in Carrier's.

These findings support the contention that if community colleges are going to raise private donations successfully, they must make investments in fundraising comparable to those made by 4-year institutions decades earlier (Summers, 2006). College leadership must properly fund the institution's development office (Duronio & Loessin, 1991; M. T. Miller, 1991; Sygielski & Carter, 2009). To choose otherwise is extremely shortsighted as it limits the overall resources an institution can generate (Wisdom, 1989).

The next variable found to be significantly and positively related to foundation revenue was how the chief development officer (CDO) rated his or her role in the foundation's operation. The average response for the CDO was 1.19, suggesting that most respondents considered their role to be *very critical* or *critical*. These findings reinforce the literature on the importance of having a well-qualified and experienced, full-time chief development officer on staff (Anderson, 2003; Fisher, 1989a; Ryan, 1989; Sygielski & Carter, 2009; Wong, 2007).

If community colleges are to have successful development programs, they must hire development officers who are responsible for soliciting donations. Whether full- or part-time, these individuals must be given the tools and support staff they need to do their job.

Care must also be taken not to overload development officers with additional duties. A majority of survey respondents (56.4%) indicated that they "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that "The chief development officer is over burdened with other institutional work." Only 22.2% of the sample disagreed with the question, while 18.8% were undecided on the issue.

Additional duties prove a distraction from a development officer's fundraising responsibilities, thereby diminishing his or her effectiveness. Alternatively, the CDO may pursue these extra duties because they are easier than raising money. Ultimately the college will suffer because seeking private donations will become a low priority for the development officer.

Another variable found to be significantly and positively related to foundation revenue was a college's geographic location. Community College Foundations in urban locations raised, on average, more money than those in either suburban or rural settings. Data also showed that foundations in rural locations out-performed foundations in suburban locations, which supports previous studies indicating that a college's geographic location may influence its foundation's ability to raise money (Fife, 2004; Jenkins, 1997; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Meaders, 2002).

A college's size was also shown to be significantly and positively related to foundation revenue. This finding supports the contention put forth by Carrier (2002) and other researchers that foundations at larger community colleges raised more money than those at smaller colleges (Fife, 2004; Phillippe & Eblinger, 1998). Utilizing the Katsinas typology, 7 colleges in this study were designated as small, 31 medium, and 81 large. On average, the small community colleges raised $662,036, medium colleges raised $689,512, and large schools raised $1,954,029.

There was a significant and positive relationship between endowment size and foundation revenue. This finding reinforces those of other researchers (Carrier, 2002; Weir, 2002). The average endowment of the colleges participating in this study was $6,895,231 (See Table 2) or more than triple the average endowment of $2,220,437 discovered by Carrier just a decade earlier. Carrier arrived at her figure after reviewing data submitted by 310 institutions.

Chief development officers (CDO) from 107 foundations submitted total earned income from endowed interest/investments for 2008-2009. Of those, 1 foundation reported that the information was not yet available; 6 reported a balance of $0; and 66 foundations showed a combined positive balance of $32,211,467. The average income for these foundations totaled $488,053. Unfortunately the remaining 34 foundations lost substantially, with a combined total of -$41,887,851 and an average loss for each foundation of -$1,308,995. Two foundations simply responded "negative" to this question, so the data represent the combined and average loses of 32 foundations. Endowment income for all community colleges participating in this study showed a net loss of -$9,676,384.

In addition to replicating a portion of Carrier's study, the researchers sought to determine if a foundation's ability to raise funds was influenced by how it was organized. A review of the literature revealed limited relevant information. Questions were derived from a "board audit" created by John Joslin, a Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) and Senior Consultant for Talisma Fundraising (Formerly Donor2), to examine various characteristics about how Community College Foundations are organized. Due to the volume of data collected about how a foundation's organizational structure could influence its ability to raise money, the researchers decided to concentrate solely on CDO responses to the statement: "The College Development Officer feels that his or her efforts are appreciated by the institution he or she serves." An analysis of the data showed a significant and positive relationship between how a development officer perceived his or her efforts were appreciated and foundation revenue. The finding supports previous literature linking this variable to turnover rates and productivity in the advancement area (Fisher, 1989a; Sygielski & Carter, 2009).

A majority of the CDOs (77.8%) either strongly agreed or agreed that their efforts were appreciated by the institution they served. A dozen (10.3%) responded that they were undecided, while 9.4% indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 2.6% said the question was not applicable. The researchers found it interesting that almost 20% of respondents were either undecided or convinced that the work they were doing was not appreciated. Some "undecided" or "not applicable" responses may have stemmed from CDOs' concern about the confidentiality of the data and the dissemination of the final report.

No significant relationship was found to exist between the amount of money raised by a foundation and how CDOs rated the role the college president played in fundraising. This finding emerged despite the fact that respondents believed that the president played a very critical or critical role in the foundation's operation.

To gather additional detail about the role of the president in fundraising, the researchers added three questions to the survey.

1. The college president is engaged in the fundraising process.
2. The college president is familiar with the techniques necessary for soliciting private donations.
3. The college president works in cooperation with the executive director, foundation board members, and volunteers.

CDOs' responses to questions fell between *strongly agree* and *agree*, indicating that even though the statistics did not show a significant relationship between the role of the president and foundation revenue, presidents are making their presence felt. Chief development officers as a group view their presidents' endeavors to help raise money for the foundation positively. Even though the results of this research question were not found to be statistically significant, the data support the literature on the subject.

No significant relationship was found to exist between the amount of money raised by a foundation and how the chief development officer rated the role of individual foundation board members in raising those funds. This finding contradicted respondents' belief that foundation board members played a *very critical* or *critica*l role in the foundation's operation. This result differs from Carrier's, which showed a statistically significant relationship between the two variables.

The researchers were disappointed to find no statistical relationship between the role played by individual foundation board members and the revenue raised. The literature reflected general agreement about the importance of board member participation and its impact on the success of the foundation (Broce, 1988; Weir, 2002). The mean score collected from CDO responses totaled ($M = 1.17$) on a 4-point Likert scale with 1 representing *strongly agree* and 2 *agree*. In spite of these numbers and the fact that Carrier's study found that a significant relationship existed, no similar results were found in this study. This finding led the researchers to postulate that using a Likert scale with a greater range of responses might have produced results similar to Carrier's.

Community College Foundations exist to strengthen the schools with which they are affiliated. The best way for them to fulfill their purpose is to pursue external funding to assist the college in reaching its strategic goals (Brumbach & Villadsen, 2002; Fund Raising, 2008; Glass & Jackson, 1998b) and, as a group, CDOs agreed. When asked to indicate the importance of meeting institutional strategic goals when evaluating the foundation's operation, the average response was between *very important* and *important*. Although much support was found among CDOs for this variable, no statistically significant relationship was found to exist between this variable and revenue raised.

IMPLICATIONS

This study has far-ranging implications for institutional leaders who need to evaluate their fundraising operations for adequacy of staffing and funding. Dr. Andrew Matonak, president of Hudson Valley Community College, believes that "Fundraising is a proportional game" and that the more time and money you put into the effort, the more gifts you can expect to receive (Matonak, 2008).

In this connection, the college president should "audit" the development office to determine how many additional duties have been assigned. It may be that these other tasks are substantially limiting the amount of time the chief development officer (CDO) can devote to his or her primary responsibility, raising money.

If the CDO is a member of the president's cabinet or executive committee, the president should take steps to ensure that he or she is treated as an equal member of the group. Implementing these steps would go a long way to making sure that CDOs believe their efforts are appreciated by the institutions they serve.

The study also holds implications for the work of the development officer who should seek to strengthen and expand the roles of the president and individual foundation board members in the fundraising effort. In the case of the president, the literature from the past two decades emphasizes that, in fundraising, the president must lead the way. The president's effectiveness can be enhanced through participation in organizations such as the Council for Resource Development (CRD). Without his or her leadership, direction, and support, the foundation will not be able to reach its full potential.

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

The chief development officer (CDO) must also ensure his or her own professional development along with that of foundation board members. The CDO must remain up to date on current federal, state, and local government regulations, tax law, and other environmental factors that could negatively affect the foundation. As to Board members, they must be educated concerning their responsibilities, general principles of fund-raising, and giving instruments available through the foundation. They are an important link to the community the college serves and may assist in making fundraising successful.

Finally, the benefits a community college can derive from a substantial endowment fund are numerous, allowing them to offer additional scholarships (Weir, 2002), purchase equipment, or maintain their physical plants. In today's economic climate, it is imperative that colleges build toward their futures, and with the help of their foundations it is possible to create an endowment to ensure future stability and growth.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Based on the findings of this study, the researchers recommend that future studies concentrate on examining the operational budgets of Community College Foundations to determine more precisely how the budget impacts a foundation's ability to raise money. Results could provide a better understanding of the relationship between these variables. Data collected could serve as benchmarks to illustrate appropriate funding levels for development offices and foundations based on college size, geographic location, or relative wealth of the college's service area.

Case studies could serve to collect additional information about successful presidents and chief development officers with high performing Community College Foundations in rural, suburban, and urban geographic locations. The presidents' and CDOs' assessments of their fundraising strategies and most effective techniques for soliciting private donations could be a valuable resource to leaders at institutions with low-performing operations. Best practices collected from such studies could provide community college presidents and CDOs at similar types of institutions with information they could use to improve their operations.

Finally, additional research needs to be conducted to determine how a foundation's organizational structure influences its ability to raise revenue. A review of the literature revealed only limited information. A case study of a successful foundation could examine specific aspects of the organization, such as committee structure, board leadership and training, investment policies, or the use of technology and outside consultants. Information collected from such a study could provide benchmarks and additional insights into the workings of a successful Community College Foundation.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. (2003). *Fundraising programs in community colleges: Factors that contribute to effectiveness.* Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3110089)

Angel, D., & Gares, D. (1989). The community college foundation today: A history, characteristics, and assets. In A. M. Cohen & F.B. Brawer (Series Eds.) & J. L. Catanzaro & A. D. Arnold (Vol. Eds.), *Alternative funding sources* (New Directions for Community Colleges No. 68) (pp. 5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berry, J. (2005). Characteristics of effective philanthropic fundraising at historically black colleges and universities: An analysis of endowment development. Retrieved from Pro Quest database. (UMI No. 3325520)

Broce, T. E. (1988). *Fund raising: The guide to raising money from private sources.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Brumbach, M. A., & Council for Resource Development (CRD). (2006). *The chief development officer: A job analysis* (Resource Paper No. 13). Washington, DC: Council for Resource Development.

Brumbach, M. A., & Villadsen, A. (2002). At the edge of chaos: The essentials of resource development for the community's college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(1), 77-86. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from ERIC database.

Budd, S. (2008). What presidents want from their development staff and what we've got to give in return. *Dispatch:*

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

The News Magazine of the Council for Resource Development, 2008(Fall), 8-9.

Carrier, S. M. (2002). The relationship of selected institutional variables to community college foundation revenue. Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3083981)

Chitwood, J. P., & Okaloosa-Walton Community College (1990). *A decision-making analysis of fund raising options in a public community college*. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Cohen, A. & Brawer, F. (2002). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Community College Enrollment. (2008). Community college enrollment rises as economic angst grows. *Community College Week, 21*(6), 3.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). (2007). *Community colleges: Fund-raising is a team sport*. Retrieved December 3, 2008 from CASE, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education web site: http://www.case.org/Content/Miscellaneous/Display.cfm?CONTENTITEMID=7258

Duronio, M. A., & Loessin, B. A. (1991). *Effective fund raising in higher education: Ten success stories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eldredge, R. G. (1999). The advancement president in higher education. Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 9941904)

Errett, C. D. (2004). The giving tree: Trends in philanthropic giving in Texas community colleges. Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3126129)

Fife, T. E. (2004). Fund-raising effectiveness in selected community college foundations. Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3154201).

Fisher, J. L. (1989a). Establishing a successful fund-raising program. In J. L. Fisher & G. H. Quehl, *The president and fund raising* (pp. 3-17). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.

Fitzpatrick, L. (2009). Can community colleges save the U.S. economy? *Time*. Retrieved from http://www.time.com/time/magazine/ article/0,9171,1909623,00.html

Fund Raising From the Top. (2008). *Community College Journal, 74*(4), 30-31. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Glass, J., & Jackson, K. (1998b). Integrating resource development and institutional planning. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22*(8), 715-35. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from ERIC database.

Halligan, T. (2008, February). Growing your donor base. *Community College Journal, 78*(4), 27-29. Retrieved September 22, 2008, from ERIC database.

Hovey, H. (2001). State funds for higher education: Fiscal decisions and policy implications. In J. Yeager, G. Nelson, E. Potter, J. Weidman, & T. Zullo (Eds.), *ASHE reader on finance in higher education* (pp. 179-198). Boston: Pearson.

Jackson, K., & Glass, J. (2000). Emerging trends and critical issues affecting private fund-raising among community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*(9), 729-744. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Jacobson, D. (2005). The new core competence of the community college. *Change, 37*(4), 52-61.

Jenkins, L. W., & Glass, J. C., Jr. (1999). Inception, growth, and development of a community college foundation: Lessons to be learned. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 23*(6), 593-612.

Lanning, P. (2008, January 4). The true state of fund raising at two-year colleges. *Community College Times*, p. 8.

Matonak, A. J. (2008). Closing the funding gap: The changing role of community college presidents. *Dispatch: The News Magazine of the Council for Resource Development* (2008, Fall), 14-15.

Meaders, S. J. W. (2002). The identification of readiness factors in community college grant development operations: A national perspective. Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. AAT 3084023)

Miller, M. T. (1991). The college president's role in fund raising. Retrieved from ERIC database.

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

Milliron, M., de los Santos, G., & Browning, B. (2003). Feels like the third wave: The rising tide of fundraising in the community college. (New Directions for Community Colleges No. 124) (pp. 81-93). Retrieved from EBSCOhost database.

Moore, A. H. (2000). *Public policy influences on public college and university foundations*. Occasional. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Nevada. (2009). Nevada 2-year college enrollments spike due to faltering economy. *Community College Week, 21*(11), 14.

Phillippe, K., & Eblinger, I. R. (1998). *Community college foundations: Funding the community college future.* AACC Research Brief 98-3. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges, 1-14. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Ryan, G. J. (1989). Reasons for success. In A. M. Cohen & F.B. Brawer (Series Eds.) & J. L. Catanzaro & A. D. Arnold (Vol. Eds.), *Alternative funding sources* (New Directions for Community Colleges No. 68) (pp. 15-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stewart, K. D. (2006). The community college president: Leader or fundraiser? Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3214518)

Summers, D. (2006). Why are community colleges so slow to jump on the fund raising bandwagon? *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(10), B22-B23. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Sygielski, J. J., & Carter, L. S. (2009). 10 ways to help ensure successful resource development. *Dispatch: The News Magazine of the Council for Resource Development,* Fall 2009, 14.

Van der Werf, M. (1999). For community colleges, fund raising has become serious and successful. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(31), A42. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ584094). Retrieved from ERIC database.

Washington. (2002). Washington college enrollments climb as economy slides deeper. *Community College Week, 15*(7), 13.

Watkins, T. (2000). Public community college revenues 1989-94. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 24*(2), 95-106. Retrieved from ERIC database.

Weiger, P. (1999, October 18). Getting on the fund-raising gravy train. *Community College Week, 12*(5), 6. Retrieved from Professional Development Collection database.

Weir, C. S. (2002). *A case study of fund-raising success at Westark College.* Retrieved from Pro Quest database (UMI No. 3055350).

Wisdom, P. E. (1989). Another look at costs. In J.L. Fisher & G.H. Quehl, *The president and fund raising* (pp. 147-159). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.

Wisdom, P. E. (1989). Another look at costs. In J.L. Fisher & G.H. Quehl, *The president and fund raising* (pp. 147-159). New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan.

Wong, W. (2007, June). Hunting for alumni dollars. *Community College Journal, 77*(6), 20-23. Retrieved September 22, 2008, from ERIC database.

United States Department of Education. (2010). *The condition of education, 2010.* NCES 2010-028. National Center for Education Statistics, Retrieved from ERIC database.

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11

Van Patterson (vpatterson@panola.edu) is the Vice President of Institutional Advancement at Panola College. He completed a B.A. in Business Administration from Baylor University, an M.A. in Business Administration from East Texas Baptist University, and an Ed.D in Supervision, Curriculum and Instruction - Higher Education from Texas A&M University-Commerce in 2011.

Madeline Justice (Madeline.Justice@tamuc.edu) is a Professor and former department head in the Department of Educational Leadership at Texas A&M University-Commerce where she teaches online doctoral courses in the Higher Education. She has served the university for 20 years. Her research interest includes curriculum development, diversity, and reading in the public school and higher education. In addition, she conducts emotional intelligence and educational research in diverse settings. She holds a B.A. in English & Government, an M.A. in Government & History from Texas Woman's University, and an Ed.D. in Supervision, Curriculum and Instruction - Higher Education from East Texas State University (now Texas A&M University-Commerce).

Joyce Scott (Joyce.Scott@tamuc.edu) served 32 years in higher education administration at four public universities, a national association, and a state university system as academic officer. She returned to full-time teaching at Texas A&M University - Commerce in 2006. She teaches live and online, focusing on current issues, higher education reform, teaching effectiveness, and leadership preparation. She holds a B.A. in French and English from the University of Connecticut, an M. A. in French from the University of Virginia, and a Ph. D. in romance languages from Duke University. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi.

DOI: 10.5929/2012.2.2.11