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Abstract

Today, in the United States, there are more than 1.5 million nonprofit organizations (Urban Institute, National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2009). These nonprofits rely on people’s time and financial support in order to advance their organizations. The task of advancing organizations through financial and voluntary efforts is complicated. Given the unstable economy, this reliance on financial and voluntary efforts has become even more pronounced.

One example of nonprofit organizations is American colleges and universities. Higher education, like most other industries, has been affected by the unpredictable economy, especially the financial crisis that began in the fall of 2008 (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). To minimize the impacts of the financial crisis, universities can turn to their alumni, the group of individuals most likely to support institutions of higher education (McAlexander, Koenig, & Schouten, 2006; Weerts & Ronca, 2007; Weerts & Ronca, 2008).

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering and how they view the relationship with alumni. An electronic survey was distributed to CAOs belonging to the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s (CASE) District II.

CAOs reported placing a higher value on alumni financial gifts than alumni volunteer efforts. Further, CAOs reported that they target alumni based on age and
gender for alumni giving and alumni programming. While this study researched perception, the findings contradicted the research found in the literature. This is a recommendation for further investigation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction to the Study

A quantitative study was conducted to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering and how they view their relationship with alumni. The first chapter presents the background of the study, specifies the problem of the study, and introduces the theoretical framework and the research questions. The chapter concludes with definitions of special terms used throughout the study.

Problem Statement

Today, in the United States, there are more than 1.5 million nonprofit organizations (Urban Institute, National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2009). These nonprofits rely on people’s time and financial support in order to advance their organizations. The task of advancing organizations through financial and voluntary efforts is complicated. Given the unstable economy this reliance on financial and voluntary efforts has become even more pronounced.

One example of nonprofit organizations is American colleges and universities. Higher education, like most other industries, has been affected by the unpredictable economy, especially the financial crisis that began in the fall of 2008 (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). Charitable contributions to colleges and universities in the United States declined 11.9%, to $27.85 billion in 2009 (Council for Aid to Education, 2010). Today, leaders in higher education have an increasingly complex and difficult job, given
the unsettling economy and the growing reduction in support from the government, corporations, and foundations (Bloland, 2002; Dionne & Keane, 1995). Tuition dollars no longer cover the actual cost of educating students (Student Philanthropy Awareness Campaign, 2010). Further, universities are in a competitive marketplace which necessitates a greater responsiveness to students (Heckman & Guskey, 1998). Higher education has to rely more heavily upon individual support, corporate, and foundation grants to supplement the academic operations budget.

To minimize the impacts of the financial crisis, universities can turn to their alumni, the group of individuals most likely to support institutions of higher education (McAlexander, Koenig, & Schouten 2006; Weerts & Ronca, 2007; Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Alumni are connected to their universities in a special way as they are a living result of a university’s mission and ultimately, the purpose of higher education.

CAOs have a demanding set of responsibilities and are the people charged with the task of financially advancing institutions. van Nostrand (2003) suggested that the overall effective evaluation of the advancement operations is one the most challenging obstacles facing the advancement operation. An examination of CAOs’ perceptions and practices may assist universities in understanding if the relationship with alumni is a factor in increasing alumni giving and volunteering with their alma mater.

There is a need to assess whether CAOs believe the same fundraising and engagement strategy for both men and women should be used and whether CAOs are already using different strategies to achieve an increase in alumni giving and alumni volunteering. Currently, in higher education, more female students are enrolled than
male students (American Council on Education, 2010). Further, the amount of wealth that women stand to inherit makes women a viable constituent to target.

**Theoretical Rationale**

Alumni are integral to the life of any institution as they are the byproduct of the service of higher education. While people generally attend college for a short span of time, they are considered alumni for a lifetime by institutions. People grow and change throughout their lives and the relationship with their alma mater changes as life circumstances change. The relationship new graduates have with their alma mater is very different than the relationship of a busy parent or a working professional out of college 20 years, or an older alumni who may be planning an estate gift. How do CAOs view their relationship with alumni? Is it really viewed as lifelong? Do the practices of the CAOs reflect the true needs of alumni throughout the lifespan?

On any given college or university campus, the CAO is most often the person responsible for establishing and sustaining a relationship with alumni. Therefore, it is important to understand how CAOs view the relationship with alumni and also to understand how CAOs’ management practices and perceptions may influence this relationship and contribute to the financial advancement of the university.

**Lifespan development theory.** In order to understand the relationship with alumni better, it is helpful to explore lifespan development theory, which looks at an individual’s lifespan and changing motivations as he/she moves through the different stages of life (Erikson, 1980; Baltes, 1987). Erikson (1980), a behaviorist, suggested a person’s “identity appears as only one concept within a wider conception of the human life cycle which envisages childhood as a gradual unfolding of the personality through
phase-specific crises” (p. 128). Further, Erikson suggested that there are eight life tasks or psychosocial crises from birth to old age, spanning the lifespan and that growth is phase specific; one cannot move from one phase to the next without completing the growth of each of the individual phases (Appendix A). This study concentrated on the final three stages: Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood and Late Adulthood, as they are the ages that universities will be engaging and soliciting. This study investigated whether CAOs are aware of and positively take advantage of the bonds formed in these developmental stages to further and ensure the financial health of the institution.

Young Adulthood is categorized by the years 18 to 35 and focuses on Intimacy and Solidarity versus Isolation. Erikson (1980) believed that people at this stage try to find mutually satisfying relationships through friendship and marriage. Further, Erikson (1980) believed if this stage was successfully negotiated, then a deep level of intimacy could be reached. If intimacy was not reached, it was thought that isolation and distance from other people would result, along with a feeling of superiority of others based on a shrinking world. It is during this stage when individuals enter college and lasting relationships are formed for traditional aged college students. It is when college students meet friends, begin serious intimate relationships, and build relationships with the university. The relationships with the university can be in the form of faculty mentors or even peer groups such as athletic teams or Greek lettered organizations. The bonds and relationships forged at or because of the university leads to successfully negotiating this psychosocial development stage (Erikson, 1980).

Middle Adulthood is categorized by the ages 35-65 and is the stage where professional responsibilities become very important, as does the role of being in control,
especially with family through passing of culture and values. Strength in this stage comes from the caring for others and the sense of control and connectedness to build a better society. Erikson (1980) called this generativity. This is the age that children begin to leave the home and personal relationships and professional goals change, causing major life changes. Erikson (1980) asserted that if this stage is not successfully negotiated then one could become self absorbed and stagnant. This is a very important stage as it is the timeframe when universities reconnect with their graduates, sharing the latest changes and improvements of the university, inviting them to join activities on campus, or providing opportunities for graduates to connect not only to each other but the university as well.

The final of Erikson’s (1980) stages of psychosocial development is called Late Adulthood and covers the ages between 55-65 to death. This stage is the result of life’s experiences and if one feels fulfilled, happy and content with the contributions he/she has made to society, then a sense of integrity and strength prevails. This comes from an individual knowing the world is large and has begun to accept the completion of his/her life and that death is the final stage of life. Erikson (1980) argued that if this stage is not successfully negotiated, then a sense of despair about life experiences could be felt. An understanding of this developmental stage could help universities connect with their graduates on an important level. If the alumni have remained connected and engaged to the university, this aids in their successful navigation of the stage. The university can also provide opportunities for alumni to feel better connected with their contribution to society by providing opportunities to thank alumni for their generous support of the university.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers and how they view the relationship with alumni.

Research Questions

The six essential questions guiding this study of Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral level institutions were:

1. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni give financial gifts to their alma mater?
2. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni volunteer with their alma mater?
3. Is there a relationship between the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers related to alumni giving and alumni volunteerism?
4. Do Chief Advancement Officers place the same value on alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts?
5. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions related to building a lifelong relationship with alumni?
6. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions on alumni giving and alumni volunteerism on the basis of gender?

Study Significance

According to the Voluntary Support of Education’s 2009 survey (Council for Aid to Education, 2010), the average percentage of alumni contributing to the Annual Fund was 10%, the lowest percentage in 50 years. In 2008, the alumni participation rate in the Annual Fund was 11% (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). Exploring the management
practices and perceptions of CAOs may assist in finding a solution to increasing alumni’s participation in financially supporting their alma maters.

As a result of an unstable economy and decreasing state, federal, corporate, and foundation support, institutions of higher education need to target all available resources in order to remain financially stable. Alumni, as the key consumer group of higher education, are an available resource who contribute in a variety of ways to support their alma mater. An exploration of the relationship universities have with alumni, specifically CAOs’ management practices and perceptions, is one way to begin to understand why the percentage of giving among alumni is so low (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). The Voluntary Support of Education Survey (2010) stated:

Charitable contributions to education institutions facilitate the objectives of both donors and institutions in a relationship that has endured through a variety of economic circumstances. Historical patterns indicate that as the economy recovers, financial contributions will rise again. However, 2009 was a difficult year for colleges and universities and, indeed, also for the individuals and institutions that care about them (Council for Aid to Education, 2009, p. 2).

A selected review of current research literature has uncovered minimal research on CAOs and their management practices and perceptions with regard to alumni giving and alumni volunteering. However, there were many studies found on how to be more efficient at the specific tasks of fundraising. For instance, Sargeant (2001) explored the value of donors and specified a formula institutions could use to get the best return on investment (ROI). The formula is called the Lifetime Value (LTV). Sargeant’s (2001) research suggested a way for advancement professionals to calculate the LTV and also
suggested LTV can play a pivotal role in the development of a relationship fundraising strategy. Relationship fundraising is defined an approach to the management of the process of donor exchange that is based on the long-term value that can accrue to both parties (Sargeant, 2001). Sargeant (2001) suggested relationship fundraisers recognize the importance of the relationship with the donor and if treated with respect, donors will want to give over and over. Relationship fundraisers understand that they will see lower giving results in the beginning stages of the relationship, but the time devoted to the relationship is well worth the effort in the long run. Calculating LTV using relationship fundraising can assist fundraisers with an overall fundraising strategy as it is a way to segment donors to ensure the proper amount of time and resources are dedicated. It allows fundraisers to devote enough resources for higher end donors. Similarly, this allows fundraisers to offer more standard communications with those less engaged donors, ultimately allowing fundraisers to have the greatest impact within their own resources.

Additional research studies (Rooney, 1999; Greenfield, 1996; Sargeant & Kahler, 1999) spoke to fundraising expenditures getting the most efficient ROI in terms of resources spent on the function of fundraising such as the cost to raise a dollar and gift recognition. However, there is very little scholarly research focused on management practices employed specifically by CAOs to increase fundraising and friendraising success.

When investigating CAOs’ management practices and perception towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering, it is natural to examine gender differences. This is important because over the past decade it has been reported that more women than men
are attending college (American Council on Education, 2010). In 2004, 9.9 million women compared to 7.4 million men attended the nation's accredited post secondary schools. Further, and specific to advancement professionals, women make up 53% of the workforce and 1.6 million of the top wealth holders in the United States. According to Havens and Schervish (2003), women will manage most of the $41 to $136 trillion dollars which is estimated to transfer from generation to generation over the next 50 years. The statistics suggest the importance of understanding the economic power of women and examining their giving habits, motivations and intention for volunteering.

In general, the field of educational philanthropy as a respected entity, especially in the area of higher education, is still relatively new. The study intended to add to the scholarly research in the literature and give additional support to the field that sometimes gets criticized for not having enough of a scholarly focus rooted in theoretical foundation (Katz, 1999). The study also aimed to expand the literature to include CAOs’ management practices and perceptions on relationships with alumni.

Definitions of Terms

The following are a list of operational defined terms to be used in the study. Alumni refers to people who have attended classes or who hold an earned degree from any institution of higher education. Alumni is also defined as people who attended a college whether or not their degree was completed and conferred that the institution has an addressable address on file with no distinction between undergraduate and graduate level (Council for Aid to Education, 2010).
Cultivate or cultivation refers to engaging and maintaining the interest and involvement of a donor, prospective donor, or volunteer with an organization’s people, programs, and plans (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Donor refers to any alumni or person, organization, corporation or foundation that makes a financial gift (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Fundraising refers to the raising of assets or resources from various sources for the support of an organization or specific project (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Gift refers to a monetary donation given to an organization.

Institution refers to a college or university, an institution of higher education that grants degrees.

Institutional Advancement refers to a department or division of a college or university charged with engaging alumni and raising financial contributions.

Nonprofit organizations refer to organizations that are driven by community objectives and organized to obtain and manage the financial resources necessary to accomplish those objectives (Bell & Schaffer, 2005).

Perception refers to the apprehending by means of the senses or of the mind, cognition, understanding (Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/perception).

Pyramid of gifts refers to the classic distribution of gifts by size to a capital campaign. The graphic representation of this distribution—in which larger gifts, although small in number relative to the total gifts received, account for a disproportionately large share of the total objective—resembling a pyramid (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).
Relationship fundraising is defined as an approach to the management of the process of donor exchange that is based on the long-term value that can accrue to both parties (Sargeant, 2001).

Return on Investment (ROI) refers to a measure of the efficiency of an organization or program, calculated as the ratio of net income received to the expanded funds (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Stewardship refers to a process whereby an institution cares for and protects its philanthropic support—its gifts and those who give them—in a way that both responds to the donor’s expectations and respects the act of giving (Savage, 2000).

University refers to colleges and universities, an institution of higher education that grants degrees.

Volunteer refers to a person who donates time working on a particular task or project for an organization.

Volunteerism refers to the practice of using volunteers for any task, short or long term. (Retrieved from www.encarta.msn.com).

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided the foundation of the study which included an introduction and statement of the problem, the theoretical rationale, the study significance, the purpose of the study, essential research questions guiding the study, and key definition of terms.

The next chapter will present a review of the literature, followed by the study methodology. An analysis of the data, followed by conclusions and recommendations, are the final chapters.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

The purpose of the study is to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) and how they view the relationship with alumni. CAOs have a very demanding set of responsibilities. van Nostrand (2003) suggested that the overall effective evaluation of the advancement operation is one of the most challenging obstacles. Investigating the management practices and perceptions of CAOs and their relationship with alumni is important, especially since the percentage of alumni supporting their alma maters is at the lowest rate in 50 years (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). The following chapter presents a review of the literature including an examination of the profile of CAOs, a presentation of the current literature on lifespan development theory and its application to educational philanthropy, and an examination of industry practices on alumni giving and alumni volunteering including an examination of what role, if any, gender plays.

Theoretical Framework

Lifespan development theory (Erikson, 1980; Baltes, 1987) provides the theoretical foundation to this study. In order to understand the relationship with alumni better, it is helpful to explore lifespan development theory, which considers an individual’s lifespan and changing motivations as he/she moves through the different stages of life (Erikson, 1980; Baltes, 1987).
Erikson (1980), a behaviorist, suggested a person’s “identity appears as only one concept within a wider conception of the human life cycle which envisages childhood as a gradual unfolding of the personality through phase-specific crises” (p. 128). Further, he suggested that there are eight life tasks or psychosocial crises from birth to old age, spanning the lifespan and that growth is phase specific; one cannot move from one phase to the next without completing the growth of each of the individual phases (Appendix A).

This study focuses on Erikson’s (1980) final three stages of psychosocial development: Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood and Late Adulthood as they are the ages that universities will be engaging and soliciting alumni. This study investigated whether CAOs are aware of and understand the bonds formed during these developmental stages to advance and ensure the financial health of the university.

Young Adulthood is categorized by the years 18 to 35 and focuses on Intimacy and Solidarity verses Isolation. Erikson (1980) believed this to be the stage where people try to find mutually satisfying relationships through friendship and marriage. Further, Erikson believed if this stage is successfully negotiated, then a deep level of intimacy can be reached. If intimacy is not reached it is thought that isolation and distance from other people will result, along with a feeling of superiority of others based on a shrinking world.

It is during this stage when individuals enter college and lasting relationships are formed for traditional aged college students. It is when college students meet friends and begin serious intimate relationships, as well as begin their relationship with the university. The relationships with the university can be in the form of faculty mentors or even peer groups such as athletic teams or Greek lettered organizations. The bonds and
relationships forged at or because of the university lead to successfully negotiating this psychosocial development stage.

Erikson (1980) characterized Middle Adulthood by the ages 35-55-65. In this stage, professional responsibilities become very important, as does the role of being in control, especially with family, through the passing of culture and values. Strength in this stage comes from the caring for others and the sense of control and connectedness to build a better society. Erikson called this generativity. This is the age range children begin to leave the home and personal relationships and professional goals change causing major life changes. Erikson asserted if this stage is not successfully negotiated then one can become self absorbed and stagnate. This stage is a very important timeframe for universities to connect with their graduates. It is when universities share the latest changes and improvements and provide opportunities for graduates to connect not only to each other but the university as well.

The final of Erikson’s (1980) stages of psychosocial development is called Late Adulthood and covers the ages between 55-65 to death. This stage is the result of life’s experiences and if one feels fulfilled, happy and content with the contributions they have made to society then they will have a sense of integrity and strength. This comes from knowing the world is large and has begun to accept the completion of life and that death is the final stage of life. Erikson purposed that if this stage is not successfully negotiated, then a sense of despair about life experiences can result. An understanding of this developmental stage can help universities connect with their graduates on an important level. If the alumni have remained connected and engaged to the university this aids in their successful navigation of the stage. The university can also provide opportunities for
alumni to feel better connected with their contribution to society by providing opportunities to thank alumni for their generous support of the university whether giving money or volunteer efforts.

Applying lifespan development theory, specifically Erikson’s (1980) final three stages of psychosocial development, to the phases of the alumni relationship suggests that universities maintaining positive lifelong relationships with alumni starting from when they are students and understanding the life changes and developmental stages of alumni could potentially increase participation in alumni giving and volunteering. Keeping alumni active throughout their lifetime could be one of the strategies for increasing alumni participation in the Annual Fund, thus increasing alumni giving participation rates.

Using lifespan development theory as a foundation for practice allows universities to view the relationship with alumni as lifelong and one that grows, develops, and evolves as one ages rather than being just about the immediate give and take. As an example, universities could offer a curriculum of programs which addresses the life needs of alumni throughout their lifespan, potentially encouraging them to remain connected and financially support the university.

**Alternative Theoretical Viewpoints**

Erikson’s (1980) stages of psychosocial development have been criticized. Baltes (1987), for instance, differed from Erikson in that he suggested one could move between the phases in linear fashion and that change in adulthood was both multidirectional and multidimensional. Multidirectional means no single path in development is taken for healthy development to occur. Multidimensional refers to the fact that development
cannot be described by a single criterion such as increases or decreases in behavior; for example, young children who go to school. Formal schooling increases a child’s knowledge base and cognitive abilities, but restricts their creative ability. Baltes (1987) argued that looking at the total context, or the total life situation, of one’s life is most important.

Harder (2009) also believed that the stages are not linear and that people can move into stages without having completely worked through the prior stage. Harder (2009) also suggested looking at the concept of development as a spiraling concept, not stages that are passed through and not to be visited again.

A more common practice found after a review of educational philanthropy literature references exchange theory, whether economic or social (Harrison et al, 1995; Weerts & Ronca, 2007). Social exchange theory (Homans, 1958) implies a “give and take” reciprocal relationship must exist for action to occur. The “give and take” is between the alumni giving of their time and money and, in turn, getting something of perceived value, which is determined individually.

Weerts and Ronca’s (2007) social exchange theory suggested the “cost” of giving and volunteering at an institution is weighed against the benefits the alumnus has received or will receive from the institution, i.e. quality of education, career gains, social connections, and prestige. This relationship is seen in economic terms where costs and benefits play a role in whether the relationship continues. Exchange theory implies a more reciprocal relationship to engaging and soliciting alumni. The college or university will offer a particular singular set of programs in hopes that alumni donate money.
Studies (Dugan, Mullin, and Siegfired, 2000; Haddad, 1986; Harrison, Mitchell, & Peterson, 1995; Keller, 1982; Monks, 2003; Weerts & Ronca, 2007) support social exchange theory in that alumni support for their alma mater is largely due to their perceived value of past experiences in extracurricular activities. Additional research studies found alumni perceptions of their alma mater, satisfaction with their experience, and level of involvement as variables in alumni as exchange factors (Caboni, 2003; Clotfelter, 2003; Loessin, Duronio & Borton, 1986; Miracle, 1977; Monks, 2003).

Other research studies (Belk, 1979; Harrison, Mitchell, & Peterson, 1995; Bingham, Quigley, and Murray, 2002; Yoo & Harrison, 1989) suggested an economic exchange between experience at the school and giving. Bingham, Quigley, and Murray (2002), Harbarbaugh (1998), and Coelho and McClure (1993) defined the value as recognition, distinguishing them from their fellow alumni. Harrison et al.’s (1995) research goes a step further to say when acknowledging alumni donations:

Giving to higher education involves a mutual satisfaction of needs. We propose a market structure in which alumni supply donations and, in return, colleges provide recognition to donors. The price in this exchange is the developmental cost to the college of raising a dollar of donations, and this cost captures the benefits rendered in donors (Harrison et al., 1995, p. 398).

Profile of Advancement Offices

Managing alumni volunteers has become the responsibility of the Advancement area. CAOs oversee the Advancement operation and can use lifespan development theory as a framework for the work done with alumni volunteers, allowing CAOs to connect
with alumni throughout the course of their lifetime, making the relationship a truly meaningful one.

Furthermore, today there are two main professional development resources for higher education institutional advancement professionals. They are the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGBUC) and The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). AGBUC was “founded in 1912 and is the only national association that serves the interests and needs of academic governing boards and campus CEOs and other senior-level campus administrators on issues related to higher education governance and leadership” (Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2010). CASE was founded in 1974 as the result of a merger between the American Alumni Council and the American College Public Relations Association. According to their website

CASE is a professional association serving educational institutions and the advancement professionals who work on their behalf in alumni relations, communications, development, marketing and allied areas. CASE helps its members build stronger relationships with their alumni and donors, raise funds for campus projects, produce recruitment materials, market their institutions to prospective students, diversify the profession, and foster public support of education (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, 2010).

In the past several decades, alumni relations and development have become more recognizable professions, where one can gain advanced credentials. Today, a doctoral degree in philanthropy is available. The first doctoral degree in philanthropic studies was
awarded in 2008 at Indiana University’s Center on Philanthropy (Hall, 2008), giving more credibility to the profession.

**Profile of Chief Advancement Officers**

To provide an accurate representation of the profile of CAOs, an historical presentation of the position is presented. Colleges and universities have been raising money since the founding of Harvard College in 1636 (Durand, 2002; Kelly, 1991; Murray, 2007, Wagner, 2005; Worth, 1993). But it was not until the mid 1900s that development offices were established and staffed with full-time professionals whose major responsibilities were to raise funds to advance institutions (Kelly, 1991).

In most cases, CAOs are the individuals responsible for raising funds to advance the mission of the university as well as build relationships with alumni and community members. CAOs supervise not only the development tasks but also alumni relations tasks commonly referred to as friendraising or the engagement and reconnecting of alumni, as well as communications, and community, government, corporate and foundation relations activities. Since CAOs are charged with securing financial support to advance the institution, they are traditionally members of the president’s executive management team and play a major role in the leadership of the institution (Kinnison & Ferrin, 1989; Murray, 2007; Smith, 1986; Worth, 1993; Worth & Asp, 1994).

Currently, there is limited research on the management practices of CAOs (Dean, 2007; Murray, 2007). Dean’s (2007) research suggested there was not even a basic profile of CAOs in the literature. Murray’s (2007) research found that CAOs themselves felt there was minimal peer-reviewed research on the management practices of Chief Advancement Officers.
Dean’s (2007) research study investigated the perceptions of CAOs about the influences of socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors of alumni on major giving to higher education institutions, as well as investigated the differences between institution type and size of alumni population. Dean (2007) also constructed a profile of CAOs using his research demographic findings. He surveyed CAOs at 283 Carnegie Classified Doctoral Research Universities and had a net population of 275 institutions; 25 CAO subjects were included in the pilot study and 166 CAOs returned the survey for a 66% response rate for the full study.

The results of Dean’s (2007) study indicated that at public colleges and universities, 55% of CAOs were male and 43% were female. As for private colleges and universities, 76% of CAOs were male and 24% were female. In reviewing years in current position, fundraising experience, and years in institutional advancement, there were very similar percentages. The mean in years in current position for females was 4.9% (N=63), males represented 5.9% (N=100). The mean for fundraising experience measured in years was 20.1 (N=63) for women and 20.8 (N=100) for men. As for years working in institutional advancement, the mean length of service for females was 18.6 (N=63) and males represented 18.8 (N=100).

Ninety three percent of respondents indicated Caucasian as their ethnic background, followed by 5% African American and 1% Hispanic/Latino. Twenty three percent of respondents had an earned Bachelor’s degree. More than half of the CAOs had an earned Master’s Degree 55% (N=91) and 18% had an earned Doctorate. Four percent indicated they had earned a Juris Doctor degree.
Murray (2007) investigated the managerial practices of 136 CAOs who completed the 2005 Voluntary Support of Education survey at private Baccalaureate-Type I colleges and universities. Eighty two CAOs completed the request for an interview resulting in a 64% response rate. The study found that 75% of the respondents were male and 24% were female, similar to Dean’s (2007) study. Murray’s survey also found 57% identified as Caucasian; 31% did not respond to the question. Two identified themselves as African American and one as Asian Pacific Islander and one as Chicano/Latino, also similar to Dean’s (2007) research.

Scully (2008) advised that having a diverse advancement staff assists in outreaching to diverse groups of alumni. When looking at diversity in higher education and advancement professionals in particular, the percentages of non Caucasian professionals is not representative of the shifting population. It is important to note 36% of students enrolled at U.S colleges and universities are students of color; furthermore, the collective spending power of diverse populations is more than 1.3 trillion dollars and there is a population shift happening. In nearly 40 years, 52% of people in the U.S. will be people of color and 48% Caucasian (Scully, 2008). The Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) is the leading professional organization for Advancement professionals. They completed a survey in 2002 which indicated that only 5.8% of full time advancement officers in the CASE membership identify as racial or ethnic minorities (Netherton, 2002).

In terms of CAO experience and longevity in their role, Murray’s (2007) study indicated that 61% of CAOs responded to having been in their current positions for four years or less as opposed to 3% who responded to being in their positions for 15 to 19
years. Only one respondent had been in the position for more than 20 years. Thirty percent of CAOs responded having been in the position for 5-9 years and 5% to 10-14 years.

When examining the time spent on the different responsibilities of the CAO, Murray (2007) found that 70% of CAOs spent 20% or more of their time on university-level administrative duties and 30% of their time on working with individual major donors. The study also found that CAOs felt the most critical aspects of their relationship with the institution’s president is trust, and the president’s understanding of the role each play in fundraising, as well as access to and involvement with trustees, as significant trustee involvement in development activities generates greater fundraising results (Murray, 2007).

Alumni Giving

Now that a profile of CAOs has been presented, the responsibilities of the CAO will be explored. CAOs are responsible for financially advancing the mission of the university. After a review of the literature, several studies on the analysis and the efficiencies of fundraising strategies and the relationship between alumni and alma mater were found.

Beyond examining a profile of CAOs, Dean (2007) investigated the influence of socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors of alumni on major giving to higher education institutions. The study found there were five socio-demographic factors that had a positive influence on alumni major giving. They included being married to another alumnus, having an annual income greater than $100,000,
having earned an undergraduate degree from a business school or college, time since earned degree, and having earned more than one degree from their alma mater.

In terms of alumni involvement, Dean’s (2007) found 11 factors to have a positive influence on major giving. They included service on a university volunteer board or committee, a positive attitude towards stewardship of gifts, identification with the mission of the institution, overall influence in alumni involvement, visiting campus frequently and feeling an obligation to the alma mater attending events, reading the institution’s publications and frequently visiting the alumni website, and the perceived need of the institution for major gifts.

There are other studies on the analysis and the efficiencies of fundraising strategies. Rooney (1999) researched a better method for analyzing the cost and benefits of fundraising at universities as well as the total costs and net benefits associated with development efforts in general. The study suggested a methodology to enhance internal decision making, accountability and performance evaluation. Sargeant and Kahler (1999) researched the returns on fundraising expenditures to establish a typical return that might be expected to accumulate from a variety of fundraising methods. A survey was mailed to 500 fundraising charities in the United Kingdom. The findings suggested organizations need to publicize their efficiency with fundraising as there are many donors who believe organizations are not very efficient.

Sargeant (2001) presented a conceptual framework on how to calculate the Lifetime Value (LTV) for nonprofit donors. His research examined to relationship fundraising and defined it as an approach to the management of the process of donor exchange that is based on the long-term value that can accrue between alumni and alma
mater. The study suggested that at the heart of relationship fundraising is the concept of LTV. Once fundraisers understand how much a given donor may be worth to an organization, over time they can begin to tailor their strategies appropriately and for the lifespan of the relationship.

Also examining the relationship between alumni and alma mater is van Nostrand (2003) who suggested institutional advancement has a long history of quantifying and measuring monetary donations, but still has not found an efficient way to quantify the overall relationship between alumni and their alma mater. The study used a case study to present a new model of synthesizing a range of data from alumni surveys to create five major indices representing the overall relationship between alumni and their alma mater: the Student Experience Index, the Reputational Index, the Connectivity Index, the Participation Index, and the Donor Index. The five indices provide a quantified model of the efficiency of the advancement operation (van Nostrand, 2003). The five indices suggested a more holistic approach to alumni giving.

The Student Experience Index was described as a reflection of the alumni’s perception of their entire student experience and is the foundation for advancement success. van Nostrand (2003) further suggested that alumni perceptions of their experience evolve over time. The Reputational Index relates to how alumni reflect upon the institution’s reputation today whether positive or negative. The Connectivity Index refers to the degree to which alumni feel connected to the university and relate to an active sense of belonging rather than passive attitudes as in the prior two indices.

The fourth indice is titled The Participation Index and measures how actively involved the alumni are in the entire university, not just the advancement area. The fifth
and final indice is titled Donor Index and represents the degree of philanthropic connection that alumni have with the university.

Bingham, Quigley, and Murray (2002) investigated the influence of gift acknowledgement programs on alumni giving behavior. The research was a field experiment at a private four year college in the late 1990s and used five acknowledgement programs to evaluate two elements: the frequency of communication with alumni and the form of communication used. The first program was the existing acknowledgment program which involved a single communication with alumni. The second and third programs expanded the first program by expanding to a second communication with alumni. The fourth and fifth programs expanded to three communications with alumni. The findings of the study suggested that a timely and thoughtful acknowledgment program actually increases giving and that recognition and acknowledgment is a key factor in increasing giving. Although the study was done at one institution, its findings have implications for other colleges and universities.

Besides specific scholarly research, CAOs use a philanthropic benchmarking resource titled the Voluntary Support of Education Survey (VSE) conducted through the Council for Aid to Education (Council for Aid to Education, 2009). It addresses relevant giving data in higher education. For the past 50 years, the survey data has been the preeminent source of information on private giving to higher education and private K-12 education. The survey results are often used by institutions as a benchmarking tool to measure individual institutional success as the survey data represents about 85% of the total voluntary support to colleges and universities in the United States. The data from the VSE is used in this study to provide a historical context to giving in higher education.
A contemporary issue found in professional development publications has been the notion of universities moving away from the general community of alumni and focusing on the major donors, those alumni capable of making million dollar or more gifts. Nelson C. Lees, a senior consultant for Marts & Lundy, wrote about the giving pyramid, which refers to the classic distribution of gifts by size to a capital campaign. The graphic representation resembles a pyramid where larger gifts, although small in number relative to the total gifts received, account for a disproportionately large share of the total objective (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).
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*Figure 2.1 Donor Pyramid, (Fund Raising School, 2002).*

Lees thinks it is time to cultivate a strong and more effective relationship with the donors in the middle of the giving pyramid, the broader base of alumni who can give five or six figure gifts in a more strategic manner, and ultimately show the full worth of the entire alumni community (Mayer, 2010). Donald M. Fellows, also from Marts & Lundy,
suggested large fundraising campaigns are feeling the effects of the economy and that institutions have seen the need to engage donors who can make significant gifts, not mega gifts (Masterson, 2010). Some in higher education believe that in times of economic crisis institutions should go back to basics and focus on stewarding, the loyal, dedicated, and supportive alumni (Hoye, 2010).

With the current unpredictable economy, only time will tell if the mega gifts of the 1990s, which is defined as the decade of the mega gift, will occur again. Outreaching to the middle of the giving pyramid and a consistent focus on stewardship is a good fundraising strategy during times of financial crisis, but is also a solid Advancement practice at any time.

**Alumni Volunteering**

Beyond alumni financial giving, alumni volunteer efforts are another important area requiring exploration. Philanthropy in general has existed since the beginning of time as depicted by the tomb of Egyptian nobleman Harkhuf, whose works date back to 2,300 years before Christ (VanBuren, 1990). There was emphasis in Greek civilization on projects that served the greater population. It has been stated that the Romans started the practice of philanthropy, giving gifts to individuals and establishing charitable organizations (VanBuren, 1990).

American higher education has benefited from philanthropy since its beginning in the mid-1600s with the founding of Harvard College, now known as Harvard University, when the early colonists went out in search of funding to establish this new college (Tempel, 2003). These efforts were the precursor to all giving and volunteer efforts in
American higher education. It really has not been until the last 30 years that the majority of literature on educational philanthropy has been published (Cook & Lasher, 1996).

Many colleges and universities engage alumni by offering them volunteer and participation opportunities (Heckman & Guskey, 1998). Some colleges and universities see these volunteer opportunities as ways to keep alumni connected (Weerts & Ronca, 2007) and have very sophisticated volunteer management programs; in contrast, other colleges and universities have limited opportunities for alumni to volunteer, thus limiting the connection with alumni and not focusing on the lifelong relationship.

Volunteer tasks in higher education have evolved throughout history. It was once the role of volunteers to encourage classmates to attend reunions and support the team at homecoming. Today, alumni of all ages dedicate their time, talents, and expertise in almost every area on campus and their efforts have moved out of the traditional roles associated with institutional advancement into mainstream campus life. Volunteers are advancing higher education by serving in various leadership roles including leadership as trustees, presidents of alumni associations or councils, and chairs of capital campaigns. Other ways alumni serve their alma mater include mentoring students, assisting faculty and student development staff with programming, chaperoning student travel programs, providing internship opportunities for current students, serving as hosts for regional alumni events, asking classmates to support the annual fund, and assisting faculty and staff with grant writing (Weerts & Ronca, 2007).

Volunteer management activities are managed, depending on institution, by institutional advancement staff or alumni leadership volunteers for the purpose of engaging alumni to their alma mater for a specific purpose like reunion planning,
mentoring or leadership on alumni associations, boards or advisory councils.

Furthermore, Harrison et al. (1995) suggested that an active and well-managed volunteer base increases financial support for a college’s Annual Fund, making another strong argument for engaging alumni at all giving levels and ages.

In the past four years, there have been 32 universities with very sophisticated capital campaigns with goals of more than one billion dollars, each using alumni volunteers to help them reach target goals (Lopez-Rivera, 2009). These campaigns have become more sophisticated over time and have led CAOs to become more strategic in their professional efforts. Having a dedicated and loyal group of alumni assisting in spreading the base of support is considered a key element toward reaching capital campaign goals.

Harrison’s et al. (1995) research indicated that institutions with the highest development expenditures raise the most money, spending time and money on alumni recognition activities increases giving, and the most powerful influence on giving is spending on alumni relations. Harrison et al. (1995) suggested that colleges do spend a great deal of resources, both human and financial, on recognizing volunteers.

Some colleges hit hard by the 2008 economic crisis had to resort to reducing spending, hiring freezes or, in some cases, laying off personnel (Blumenstyk, 2009). In many cases, the area in Advancement that receives reduced funding is travel to engage, steward, and cultivate alumni. Now more than ever higher education leaders, specifically CAOs, are in need of effective and well-managed volunteers. Alumni volunteers, if recruited, trained, and evaluated properly, can greatly advance universities and colleges with fundraising (Shaw & Taylor, 1995). Alumni volunteers can be used to augment the
work of alumni relations and development professionals. Using alumni volunteers is one way CAOs may maximize all available resources in order to keep productivity high and remain viable in the marketplace as the business of higher education becomes more competitive.

Missing from the literature in educational philanthropy is an understanding of CAO management practices and perception towards alumni volunteer efforts. Also lacking is sufficient research addressing the quantification of alumni volunteer efforts. There is no true standard national measure to quantify the relationship between alumni and their alma maters. van Nostrand (2003) suggested many professionals believe the relationship defies measurement. However, a group of professionals at 35 peer universities, Private Colleges & University Alumni Directors (PCUAD), created a general standard measurement, which measures the operational effectiveness of Alumni Relations programs. The instrument is titled Alumni Relations Assessment and Metrics Program (ARAMP). The instrument does not address in detail the value of volunteers, although there are some basic questions on volunteer management. Currently, there is a standard for fundraising professionals to define fundraising tasks such as fiscal year versus academic year, pledges and gifts, and is titled CASE Reporting Standards & Management Guidelines for Educational Fundraising (Taylor, 2009). There is yet to be a set of standards for alumni volunteer efforts.

Closely related to the field of educational philanthropy is the nonprofit field. Nonprofit organizations are driven by community objectives and organized to obtain and manage the financial resources necessary to accomplish those objectives (Bell & Schaffer, 2005). The most common nonprofits are museums and cultural organizations,
health and human services organizations, and animal and nature conservation organizations. Some in the nonprofit field have suggested that volunteer efforts are very valuable and should be given a monetary value, applying an hourly rate of approximately $20 for each hour contributed (Eisner et al. 2009; Hrywa, 2009; Independent Sector, 2010; Urban Institute, 2004).

Further research (Eisner et al. 2009; Hrywa, 2009; Independent Sector, Urban Institute, 2004) suggested that nonprofits lose millions of dollars in revenue when good volunteers do not return due to poor management. Eisner et al. (2009) suggested that nonprofits rely heavily on volunteers but they do not manage them well. Their research also suggested a more strategic approach to volunteer management must be created and volunteer tasks should be matched with volunteer experience. Hrywa (2009) also suggested a more strategic approach to volunteer management, including finding opportunities to intellectually challenge volunteers. Hrywa (2009) discussed matching volunteers with their area of expertise and the use of online matching websites to assist in this process.

Adopting the idea of placing a monetary value on the efforts of alumni in higher education would mean alumni volunteer efforts could be valued and measured similar to financial contributions, potentially making it easier to recognize, compare, and measure these efforts. Some colleges are already tracking alumni volunteer efforts as one of the major fundraising management software companies; Blackbaud has a software product called Raiser’s Edge. It is a fundraising management tool used for recording and tracking financial gifts. The software has a module that has the ability to assign an hourly figure to volunteer efforts.
However, universities may not track and record volunteer efforts in the same way that alumni financial gifts are due to financial gifts having tax implications overseen by the Internal Revenue Service (Taylor, 2009). Some volunteer efforts such as providing an in-kind gift or service do have tax implications. For the most part, these tax considerations are not used in higher education. The Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) (2009) suggested that certain volunteer time can be assigned a dollar value and be recorded on financial statements as long as the service is a specific and specialized skill and one that the organization would pay for, i.e. legal advice, public relations or graphic design. For example, if an alumnus was a public relations consultant and assisted in the creation and launch of a new marketing campaign for the Admissions area, the alumni could deduct the time spent on the project, as it is professional work they would normally be paid to complete. The talent of the alumni is being applied to a specific professional task.

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (see Appendix B) determined annual hourly rates for volunteer efforts by state (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2010). To date, few universities quantify and attach a monetary value to alumni volunteer efforts in public relations and marketing materials. Some institutions, however, are using this information to quantify student volunteer efforts. For instance, in Ohio, Wilmington College posted the efforts of volunteer as being valued at $307,940.00 on the College’s Center for Service and Civic Engagement website (The Value of a Volunteer, 2010). Another example, in what was called “an unyielding commitment to civic engagement”, The University of Scranton, a Jesuit University, suggested in 2010 that student volunteer efforts totaled $2,667,600 (Pride, Passion and Promise: Shaping our
Jesuit Tradition 2005-2006: A Year of Progress). The values of both assessments were based on the Independent Sector dollar value.

Broader nonprofit research (Eisner, Grimm Jr., Maynard & Washburn, 2009) suggested an expanded vision of volunteering by creating meaningful experiences for volunteers and by effectively managing volunteers. This is happening on many college and university campuses, but it requires a clear understanding of relationship building and a broader view of campus life than may have been traditionally thought in Advancement areas. Building a lifelong relationship with alumni and seeing the connection as constantly evolving speaks to lifespan development theory.

Nonprofit research (Eisner et al. 2009; Hrywa, 2009) suggested nonprofit organizations need the “new volunteer workforce” alumni with professional skills, talents, and expertise and these volunteers need to be managed accordingly. A study completed by the Urban Institute (2004) indicated that only 30% of nonprofit organizations measure the impact of volunteers, 35% recognize the contributions of volunteers, and only 45% match volunteers with tasks that match their talent and expertise. Research regarding the practices of nonprofit organizations indicates that nonprofit volunteers, in general, were twice as likely to donate; 78.2% of volunteers made a donation of at least $25 as compared to 38.5% of non-volunteers (Corporation for National and Community Service, 2009).

Brudney and Meijs (2009) suggested a new conceptualization of volunteerism. They proposed volunteerism is a natural resource and that volunteer energy is a renewable resource that can be grown and recycled and can be affected positively or negatively by poor management. Their research was guided by what they term two
provocative sets of research questions. First, how can governance be established and maintained to ensure the preservation and growth of volunteer energy? Secondly, what strategies can be used to enrich volunteer management to recycle and grow the volunteer resource? Although Brudney and Meijs’ study focused on nonprofits, its philosophy can be applied to higher education volunteers. The suggestion that volunteer energy can be recycled is similar to life span development theory which views the relationship with alumni as lifelong. The relationship alumni have with their alma mater may not always be active but can be sustained and recycled throughout the alumni’s lifetime. Further, that proper volunteer management and recording of volunteer efforts can make a difference in the growth of volunteers and the strengthening of the relationship between alma mater and alumni volunteers.

Gender

The role of women in philanthropy is not new. Historically, women have played an important role in philanthropy, dating back to the mid 1700s (Taylor & Shaw-Hardy, 2005). Although women’s efforts toward philanthropy in general have not been formally recognized until the last few decades, their efforts for the most part were in the realm as volunteers. Many wealthy women devoted their time, talents, and money trying to address the problems of society. For instance, Lerner (1992) found that Isabella Martha Graham, in 1797, joined 15 other women to organize the Society for Relief of Poor Widows with Small Children in New York City, as Graham was a widow herself and understood the challenges. By 1816, the Society supported 200 women with 500 children and grew to become a popular way for wealthy women to assist others. By the turn of the 20th century, many large towns had similar organizations (Lerner, 1992).
Women have been longtime supporters of education. Shaw-Hardy (2000) reported that Ann Richardson Harkness donated nearly $40 million dollars during her lifetime. She gave $6 million to Yale University and 22 acres of land valued at $4 million to Columbia University for the establishment of a medical school and hospital.

Many institutions of higher education have women to thank for their generosity. Harvard did not admit women until the early 20th century and only for graduate study. Amherst not until the mid 1970s, so in the early 1870s, Smith and Wellesley Colleges were opened (Boas, 1971). Both are still women’s colleges today, due in large part to the support and generosity of the women of past generations. Another institution of higher education that benefited from the support of women was the Emma Willard School, later named Russell Sage College, after Margaret Olivia Slocum Sage’s husband. A new campus for the vocations of women was created with the money Mrs. Sage donated in 1906 and, at that time, it was the largest private gift ever given (McHenry, 1980).

Issues of gender are important to explore especially since recent research suggested women are more likely to donate than men (Mesch, 2010). A study of single headed households was completed by the Women’s Philanthropy Institute at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University. The main research question was “are there differences in giving to charity between men and women across income levels?” The study looked at total giving including likelihood of giving and dollar amount given. Single headed households were used in the research. They were selected as the researchers felt it was the best way to isolate giving habits of women relative to men. The categories included the following singles: never married, divorced/separated, and
widows/widowers. The study found that women give more than men in all of the categories except for the widow/widower category. Income group was also a variable in the study. The income categories were; (1) ≤$23,509 or less, (2) >$23,509 and <$43,500, (3) >$43,500 and <$67,532, (4) >$67,532 and <$103,000, (5) >$103,000. The study found that women give more than men in all of the categories except the second income group.

Specifically, examining women’s giving and volunteer habits is important as today women make up 53% of the workforce and 1.6 million of the top wealth holders in the United States. According to Havens and Schervish (2003), women will manage most of the $41 to $136 trillion dollars which is estimated to transfer from generation to generation over the next 50 years.

In the higher education area, over the past decade, more women than men are attending college. In 2004, 9.9 million women compared to 7.4 million men attended the nation's accredited post secondary schools. Even more staggering is the fact that between 1970 and 2000, the overall number of women enrolled in postsecondary institutions grew 136%. Further, to illustrate the need for researching gender issues is that according to the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics, the number of women completing their college degrees at four year private and public universities is higher than men; 58% of women as opposed to 52% of men (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The data was completed on college students who enrolled in the 2001–2002 academic year.

Looking broadly at volunteerism, it is estimated that from September 2008 to September 2009, 63.4 million people volunteered at least one time in the United States,
including at educationally related organizations, a slight increase from the previous year (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). The study reported more women volunteered than men, 30.1% versus 23.3%. The task most reported to be performed was fundraising. According to the 2010 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, women were more likely to perform fundraising related tasks and men were more likely to perform general labor during volunteer activities.

Research around giving and gender issues has included general comparisons of women and men (Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001; Bolton & Katok, 1995; Brown & Rooney, 2008), married couples (Rooney, Brown, & Mesch, 2007) and singles, indicating women give more than men (Rooney, Mesch, Chin, & Steinberg, 2005). The studies make the case for understanding the economic power of women and to research their giving habits, motivations and intention for volunteering.

Brown and Rooney (2008) examined generational and gender differences in giving as well as identify differences in motivations for giving between females and males. The research findings were presented at The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University 20th Annual Symposium provided an overview of the relevant and most recent research available which indicated women are more likely to be donors than men.

Rooney, Brown, and Mesch’s (2007) study focused on married couples to determine whether and how much money to donate to educational institutions. The research used the Panel Study on Income Dynamics (PSID) along with the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study data about giving and volunteering. The PSID, established in 1968, was at the time of their research, the largest \((n = 8,000\) households) and longest-running panel study in the world. Starting in 2001, the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana
University developed and sponsored a philanthropy module within the PSID and respondents were asked about their giving and volunteering to various subsectors. They researched and analyzed whether husbands or wives were more likely to determine whether and how much money to donate to educational institutions. The study found women decision-makers are more likely to have a positive effect on both the likelihood of giving to education and the amounts given to education. Men had little or no influence on the decision to give to education at all or the amounts donated to education.

Rooney, Mesch, Chin, and Steinberg’s (2005) research focused on the effects of race and gender on philanthropy and interaction effects between race or gender and survey methodologies. Results indicated differences in philanthropic behaviors by gender but not by race. The findings indicated the difference in the giving habits of single people, specifically that single women are more likely to give than single men.

Addressing women’s giving influences and motivations specifically to institutions of higher education today are important to this study. Dent’s (2005) quantitative study of two groups, members of the Junior Leagues of Las Cruces, New Mexico, and San Antonio, Texas, addressed this issue. A survey designed by the researcher titled The Philanthropic Motivations of Female Donors Survey (FMD) was distributed to a random sample of over 1,100 of the members of the Junior Leagues of Las Cruces, New Mexico, and San Antonio, Texas. There were 144 members surveyed. The study examined six distinct factors that motivate women to donate: the desire to Change, Create, Connect, Commit, Collaborate, and Celebrate (Shaw-Hardy, 2000). Dent (2005) found Change, Connect, and Commit to be statistically significant. Change is defined as using financial power to effect change. Connect is defined as enjoying the connection with and to the
institution. Commit is defined as making a commitment to the mission of the institution. The other half create, collaborate and, celebrate were not statistically significant. Understanding from a practical perspective, these findings may assist in the overall philanthropic and management strategy of CAOs.

The motivations of women to give in Dent’s (2005) research are similar to the philosophy behind lifespan development theory, viewing alumni as lifelong partners with their alma mater. Women want to use their financial power to effect positive change while enjoying the connection and committing to the mission of their alma mater. Connection and commitment are important in building a lifelong relationship between alumni and their alma mater.

Summary

This chapter presented a review of the literature pertaining to the profile of the Advancement area and of CAOs, alumni giving, alumni volunteering, the relationship universities have with their alumni as well as an overview of gender differences in alumni giving and alumni volunteering. The theoretical framework of this study, lifespan development theory, was also presented.

There is limited scholarly research about the profile of CAOs and their overall management practices towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering. Research showed the analysis and the efficiencies of fundraising strategies and the relationship between alumni and their alma maters.

The review of the literature also presented an understanding and concentration on women as especially important. Women tend to give more money than men, whether married or single. The literature presented on this topic suggested that since women are
in a position of increased economic power and influence and because they currently have higher enrollment rates than men in universities it is beneficial to understand their giving and volunteer habits.

The theoretical framework of this study was also presented. Erikson’s final three stages of psychosocial development, Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood and Late Adulthood are used as the foundation to view the relationship with alumni. They are the ages that universities will be engaging and soliciting alumni. Using lifespan development theory as a foundation for practice allows universities to view the relationship with alumni as lifelong and one that grows, develops, and evolves as one ages, rather than being just about the immediate give and take of the relationship.

The third chapter presents the sample population, design, development and administration of questionnaire, data collection process, and a brief description of the statistical analysis of the data. The final two chapters will analyze and synthesize the research findings and make recommendations for future research.
Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction: General Perspective

This chapter describes the design and methodology of the study which examined the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) toward alumni giving and alumni volunteerism and how they view the relationship with alumni. The chapter presents sample population, design, development and administration of questionnaire, data collection process, and a brief description of the statistical analysis of the data.

This quantitative research study consisted of the creation of an electronic questionnaire designed by the researcher and administered to CAOs in the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education’s District II. The questionnaire was developed to examine the practices and perceptions of CAOs toward alumni giving and alumni volunteering as well as capture the views of the CAOs toward their relationship with alumni. The study included three phases.

Phase I was development and distribution of the electronic questionnaire to a volunteer panel of experts. Phase II was a distribution of the revised questionnaire to a pilot group consisting of a sample of CAOs from Council for the Advancement and Support of Education’s District I. Phase III was a convenience sample of CAOs in District II. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the findings of Phase III.

The practices and perceptions of CAOs were selected to be researched for several reasons. First, there is minimal research on the management practices and perceptions of CAOs towards alumni giving, alumni volunteering and how colleges and universities
perceive the relationship with alumni. There is also little scholarly research profiling those who serve in the role of CAO (Dean, 2007; Murray, 2007). An examination of the managerial practices and perceptions of CAOs is important as they are a key decision maker in university leadership.

**Research Context**

The questionnaire was designed to include questions relating to practices and perceptions of CAOs, questions relating to CAOs’ views on the relationship with alumni, and demographic information of the CAOs and their universities.

The questionnaire was designed based on the review of the literature and influenced by the researcher’s 15 years of experience working in several areas of higher education including academic advising, alumni relations and development, financial affairs, residence life and housing, and student activities. The researcher was part of an innovative academic advising team at a large, urban, private, Ivy League research institution where the academic advising and relevant programming for the undergraduate students was designed for each of the students’ four years in college, i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior. The researcher focused on seniors and the transitions of senior year and what it meant to be an active alumnus. This experience, along with six years of experience as a Director of Alumnae/i Relations, provided the researcher with a unique perspective on the relationship that universities have with alumni.

**Research Participants**

Phase I of the study consisted of a volunteer sample of 118 CAOs from American colleges and universities in District I (Appendix C). The response rate was 22% with 26 respondents starting the survey, 4 CAO vacancies and 92 non responders. Phase II was a
pilot study (Appendix D). The sample was American college and universities in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral District I colleges and universities. Phase III was a convenience sample of the total population of the American college and universities in the membership of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral District II (Appendix C) colleges and universities.

District II was selected as it represents one of the most diverse of the eight districts and has over 300 private and public Baccalaureate and Master’s and Doctoral institutions located in Delaware, District of Columbia, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ontario, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The district has urban and rural, small and large, liberal arts and research, religious, women’s and coeducational colleges and universities. The study participants included private and public colleges and universities awarding Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Doctoral level degrees. For profit, trade or community colleges were not included in the study. The CASE membership directory acquired through the membership office of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education was used to gain contact information, i.e. name, title, and business address of the study participants.

The membership directory provided by the CASE membership office was used to access the contact information of the study participants. The researcher had to sort and decipher the contact information for each of the CAOs. The researcher also needed to individually investigate the email addresses of the CAOs through the CASE online membership directory and the individual university websites, as it is CASE’s policy not to distribute email addresses electronically.
Research Instrument and Data Collection

This section describes the design of the survey instrument, data collection and the three phases of study in greater detail. The following sections present the analysis of the data.

Questionnaire development. There was a lack of research instruments that can be used in higher education to assess the perceptions and the management practices of Chief Advancement Officers and how they view the relationship with alumni. The researcher chose to design and administer an electronic questionnaire specifically focus on the management practices and perceptions of CAOs towards alumni giving, alumni volunteering and the relationship with alumni. Sections of the questionnaire were designed to elicit specific responses toward CAO management practices and perceptions.

The questionnaire was designed based on the review of the literature and the researcher’s 15 years of experience in higher education. In order to reach the largest possible sample of CAOs to better inform practice, one District in CASE’s membership was determined as the source for the sample. The study had three phases in order to establish content validity and reliability. The three phases are described in the following sections.

Phase I. Phase I began with the instrument design and distribution of the questionnaire (Appendix D) to a volunteer panel of experts (Appendix E) who reviewed the questionnaire for content and ease of reading in the summer of 2010. The volunteer panel of experts represented areas in alumni relations, athletic fundraising, communications and development currently working in higher education. There was one
professional expert from a private Baccalaureate level institution, two represented private Master’s level institutions, and one represented a private Doctoral level institution.

The original questionnaire consisted of the following sections: Perceptions on Why Alumni Donate and Volunteer, Resources and Operations, Gender, Value of Alumni Financial Gifts and Alumni Volunteer Efforts, and Demographics. The sections on management practices and perceptions, resources and operations of CAOs were designed based on the findings in the literature review and professional articles on best practices. The demographics section was designed to elicit key elements to illustrate a profile of CAOs and to better understand the universities for which they work.

In an attempt to define perception without tainting the research participants’ responses, a five point Likert-type scale responses “extremely important” to “not important” were used for the perceptions section and “describes completely” to “does not describe at all” for the management practices section. A Q sort was completed on the answer selections for questions in the Management Practices and Perceptions on Alumni Giving and Alumni Volunteering sections. The words and phrases related to the answers in these sections were placed on cards and sorted for relevance, similarity and context. The responses of the sort were grouped together and answer options were created.

Three ordinal open ended questions were created in the questionnaire to ascertain the subjects’ top three choices towards budget allocation to alumni giving, alumni volunteering and personnel.

The pilot study questionnaire was edited as a result of the feedback from the volunteer experts (Appendix E). The final questionnaire consisted of the following sections: Management Practices, Lifespan Development, Gender, Operations, Perceptions
of Alumni Giving and Alumni Volunteering, and lastly Demographics of the CAOs and their universities. Specific edits to the original questionnaire included:

1. Rearranging questions to enhance participation.
2. Adding a question asking for the definition of alumni for comparison purposes.
3. Adding a question in the demographics section asking ethnicity of respondents. Creating a rank order write in option rather than asking an open ended question related to CAOs’ perception of why alumni giving and volunteer.
4. Editing the format of the sections titled Resources and Staffing and Gender.
5. Editing the Operations section question responses to include predetermined responses rather than open ended questions. Specific response suggestions to the last question in the Operations section were changed.
6. Deleting a question in the Staffing section as it did not directly relate to the essential research questions of the study.
7. Modifying a demographics question related to whether the institution is coeducational or single sex, to ask whether the institution was previously a male or female single sex institution.
8. Editing a few of the responses for the demographic questions to reflect the method in which the Council for Advancement and Support of Education categorizes and maintains demographics.
9. Adding a direct question asking whether the CAO values “Alumni Financial Gifts”, “Alumni Volunteers Efforts” or “Both Equally”. This question directly relates to the essential research questions of the study.
10. Creating a section with specific questions related to Lifespan Development theory using Erikson’s stages of adulthood.

**Phase II.** Phase II was a pilot study with a sample of CAOs in District I of CASE, as District I is closely representative of the Phase III CAOs in District II. The CAOs in the pilot study were sent an email with an introductory message (Appendix F) and a link to the electronic questionnaire. Each survey participant had a unique identifier for tracking purposes. A reminder email was sent two weeks after the original email to those participants who did not respond. All relevant comments and feedback were incorporated in the final draft of the survey (Appendix F).

**Phase III.** Phase III began after the completion of Phase II. The electronic link with the edited and final version of the questionnaire with accompanying introduction message (Appendix G) was emailed to CASE District II CAOs acquired from the CASE membership office and directory. A unique identifier was used to track subjects. A reminder email, with a questionnaire link to participants who had yet to participate, was sent two weeks after the initial email and survey link was emailed. A third contact was necessary to obtain a higher number of participants. The researcher did targeted outreach to the CAOs at her alma mater and institutions previously employed. The researcher also investigated contact information for 20 returned emails to confirm the proper contact information. After this investigation, it was revealed that there were both position vacancies and no information listed for the CAO position at some institutions.

**Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis**

The data collected from Phase III was analyzed using quantitative methods. The surveymonkey.com software was used to obtain descriptive and inferential statistics from
the data. The descriptive analysis of the data begins in chapter four by reporting the number of possible survey participants, followed by the number of actual responses and key demographics, including public and private universities, Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Doctoral level universities, gender, and years of experience of the subjects. In addition, the average number of years of experience as Chief Advancement Officers at their institution, number of years in current position, and CAO ethnicity will be reported using appropriate charts and narrative.

**Database management.** The researcher created an online account with surveymonkey.com for the sole purpose of this study. Confidentiality and the anonymity of the participants were maintained by use of this private account. The researcher also used excel to create tables to be used in chapter four of the dissertation. To keep anonymity, only the researcher had access to the account. Relevant electronic analysis was kept using the secure online site. Any paper documents related to the study were locked in a file cabinet. Electronic files were stored on a computer in password protected files and will be destroyed after three years.

**Summary of Methodology**

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions and practices of Chief Advancement Officers and how they view the relationship with alumni. The study had three phases and was conducted with CAOs from private and public Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral level colleges and universities in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s District I and II. The research instrument is a self designed electronic questionnaire. The study is quantitative and descriptive, and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data.
The researcher maintained anonymity and confidentiality of study subjects by limiting access to paper and electronic files to the researcher and dissertation committee members. If requested, participants may have a summary of results upon completion of the dissertation defense. Documents relative to the study were locked in a cabinet and stored on a computer in password protected files. Documents will be destroyed after three years. The following two chapters will analyze and synthesize the research findings and make recommendations for future research study.
Chapter 4: Analysis

The purpose of this study was to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs), especially in the areas of alumni giving, alumni volunteering, and how CAOs view their relationship with alumni. CAOs have a complex set of responsibilities and understanding their management practices and their perceptions assists in further understanding the relationship between alumni and their alma mater. The investigation is also important, especially since the percentage of alumni financially supporting their alma maters was at its lowest rate in 50 years in 2009 (Council for Aid to Education, 2010).

The study is a regional investigation. An electronic questionnaire was created and disseminated to 258 CAOs in District II of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. From the 258 CAOs, 111 CAOs began the questionnaire and 70 completed it for a response rate of 29%. The responses of the 41 CAOs who started the questionnaire but did not complete the questionnaire were used where relevant.

To determine CAOs’ management practices and perceptions, the questionnaire was designed using the research gathered in a review of the literature, current best practices, and the researcher’s experience. In order to investigate lifespan development, questions were designed specifically using the stages of Erikson’s (1980) psychosocial development theory. Erikson (1980) suggested that there are eight life tasks or psychosocial crises from birth to death. This study focused on the final three of Erikson’s eight stages: Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood and Late Adulthood as they are the ages that universities will be engaging and soliciting alumni. This study investigates
whether CAOs are aware of and positively take advantage of the bonds formed during the developmental years of the final three stages of development.

The research also investigated gender; specifically, do universities target the giving and volunteer engagement strategies on the basis of the alumni’s gender. Questions were designed to elicit general management practices and perceptions.

The six essential questions guiding this study of Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral level institutions are as follows:

1. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni give financial gifts to their alma mater?
2. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni volunteer with their alma mater?
3. Is there a relationship between the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers related to alumni giving and alumni volunteerism?
4. Do Chief Advancement Officers place the same value on alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts?
5. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions related to building a lifelong relationship with alumni?
6. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions on alumni giving and alumni volunteerism on the basis of gender?

The chapter uses the research questions as a guide to present a profile of CAOs and the universities where they are employed. An analysis of the management practices and perceptions of CAOs towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering, lifespan and gender will also be presented.
Population and Response Rate

The following section describes the sample population and provides a demographic profile of the participants and their universities. Of the 258 surveys disseminated to CAOs in District II of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 111 CAOs began the questionnaire and 70 completed it for a response rate of 29%. The responses of the 41 CAOs who started but did not complete the questionnaire were used where relevant. There were four CAO responses from Virginia, outside District II, due to CAOs transitioning to other universities which are included in the data analysis. There were 13 universities where there were either vacant CAO positions and a search was being completed or there were bounce backs and no additional information could be found on the individual or the position, or CAOs had previously opted out of surveymonkey.com, reducing the number of possible CAOs to 245. There were 134 non respondents.

Of the 70 respondents who completed the questionnaire, 49 indicated they work at private institutions and 21 indicated employment at public institutions as illustrated in Figure 4.1. The majority of 70 respondents who finished the survey (Figure 4.2) were from either New York 34.3% (n=24) or Pennsylvania 31.4% (n=22). There were 8 respondents from both New Jersey (n=8) and Maryland 11.4% (n= 8).
Figure 4.1. CAO Institution Type: Public and Private.

Figure 4.2. Respondents by State.

The majority 51.4% (n=36) of CAOs responded (Figure 4.3) that the university they worked for was coeducational, next were institutions that were once single sex male with 28.6% (n=20), and followed by 21.4% (n=15) that responded they were once single sex female. No CAOs responded that they currently worked at a single sex institution.
**Figure 4.3.** Respondents by coeducational or single sex.

Followed by Figure 4.4 the CAOs were also asked how long their university had been coeducational. The highest response was 75 or more years 42% (n=70), next was 26-50 years 40% (n=28) followed by 11.4% (n=8) indicating the university they worked for was coeducational for 50-75 years. So, the majority of responding CAOs work at institutions that have been coeducational for at least 26 or more years.

**Figure 4.4.** Respondents by Years of Institution Type.
The majority of participants 44.3 % (n=33) who completed the questionnaire (n=70) responded (Figure 4.5) they work at institutions that have an undergraduate enrollment size between 1,000-3,000, followed by an enrollment size of 3,000-5,000 at 18.6% (n=13) and 5,000-10,000 with 14.3 % (n=10). In terms of graduate enrollment, the majority of CAOs (Figure 4.5) indicated 41.4% (n=29) they have an enrollment size less than 500 students, followed by 20% (n=14) indicating an enrollment size of 1,000-3,000 and 8.6% (n=6) indicating enrollments of 3,000-5,000 students.

Figure 4.5. Institution Enrollment.

The CAOs were asked about the size of their alumni community. The majority of CAOs indicated an alumni population between 15,000-50,000, (Figure 4.6). Forty three percent (n=30) of CAOs indicated they work for universities with a total alumni community between 15,000-25,000. Next was the 25,001-50,000 category with 26% (n=18), then 17% (n=12) indicating over 100,000, followed by 9% (n=6) indicating 50,001- 75,000 and lastly 6% (n=4) indicating 75,001-100,000.
The CAOs were asked to report on the numeric total of addressable alumni, basically those alumni for whom the university had a valid address (Figure 4.6). The total number of addressable alumni for the 70 institutions that completed the survey found a majority of respondents indicating between 1-50,000 addressable alumni. The majority of CAOs, 30% (n=21) responded to the 1-15,000 option, next was 24.3% (n=17) indicating 15,001-25,000, followed by 20% (n=14) indicating 25,001-50,000, 12.9% (n=9) indicated 100,000 or above, 7.1% (n=5) indicated 75,001-100,000 and lastly 5.7% (n=4) indicated 50,001-75,000 addressable alumni.

![Figure 4.6. Number of Addressable Alumni and Number of Total Alumni Community.](image)

Since the definition of what constitutes alumni varies greatly, the researcher asked the participants for their universities’ definition, providing an opportunity to make proper comparisons. There were varying definitions of alumni from the 70 respondents who completed the survey (Figure 4.7). Of the predetermined question choices, 44.3% (n=31) indicated an alumnus was defined by having had his/her degree conferred by the institution, 35.7% or (n=24) had taken one class at the institution, and 20% (n=14) had earned enough credits to be within one year of graduation. There were 19 “other” write
in responses; seven CAOs indicated alumni is defined as having completed one semester of study at the university, six defined alumni as having completed one year at the university. The various responses indicated the complexities when trying to speak generally about alumni giving and alumni volunteer efforts as some institutions define alumni as people who completed one semester and others define as people whose degree was actually conferred by the university. This adds to the complexities when reviewing data across different universities.

The data by public and private universities (Figure 4.7) indicated more private universities 51% defined alumni as having his/her degree conferred by the university. CAOs of public universities indicated 28.6%. Forty two percent of CAOs at public universities define an alumnus as someone who has taken at least one class at the university, 10% more than private universities.

![Figure 4.7. Definition of Alumni by Public and Private Distinction.](image-url)
The researcher surveyed CAOs about the functions of alumni giving and alumni relations and whether the functions were separate or combined (Figure 4.8). Of the 70 CAOs who completed the entire survey, 75.7% (n=53) indicated the operations of annual giving and alumni relations were separate as opposed to 24.3% (n=17) who responded that there was no separation between the two departments. Figure 4.8 illustrates the distinction between public and private universities which had fairly similar responses.

*Figure 4.8. Separate function of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving by University Type.*

The survey participants were asked to indicate what their university considers a major gift. Of those who completed the survey, the highest percentage was 66% (n=46) of CAOs indicating a major gift level of $10,000-$25,000, followed by 17% (n=12) indicating $1,000-$5,000. Nine percent (n=6) indicated $50,000 or greater, 7.14% (n=5) indicated $100,000 or greater, and one indicated a major gift level $500,000 or above.

**Individual Demographics of CAOs**

To gain a deeper understanding of the individual profile of CAOs, several personal demographic questions were incorporated into the questionnaire. Sixty four percent (n=45) of the questionnaire participants indicated their gender as male and
35.7% (n=25) indicated female. In terms of ethnicity, 94.3% (n=66) of the respondents indicated Caucasian. Three indicated Hispanic, one African American, one Iranian American and one Arab American.

CAOs were asked to list their current titles. Eight nine percent (n=62) indicated a Vice President title, two indicated the title of Interim Vice President, one indicated Associate Vice President, one indicated Vice Chancellor Institutional Advancement, one indicated Chief Advancement Officer, one indicated Chief Development Officer, Executive Director of the College Foundation, one indicated Assistant Vice President, Advancement & Alumni, and one indicated Executive Director of Institutional Advancement. As for extended titles, 17 CAOs indicated a variation of responsibilities. Four CAOs indicated serving in a leadership capacity to the College/University Foundation, five indicated some form of University Advancement, University or Public Relations, three indicated External or College Relations, three indicated Alumni Relations, one indicated Alumni and Parent Relations, and one indicated Marketing. The variation in titles illustrates the enormity of responsibility of the CAO position and speaks to the various stakeholders in any given university setting. One survey participant was not able to fill out the entire survey as his/her university dealt more often with community members than alumni.

Further, 64 of the 70 CAOs who completed the survey indicated they report directly to the College/University President. One CAO reports to the Sr. VP for External Relations, one indicated Executive Vice President, one indicated Chancellor of the University, one indicated COO/Executive Vice President, one indicated Acting Vice
President, Advancement & External Affairs, and one indicated Senior Vice President for External Affairs.

The CAOs were asked to share the number of years worked at their current institution. The CAOs responded in the following ways: 30% (n=21) indicated less than three years, 18.6% (n=13) responded 3-5 years, 15.7% (n=11) responded 6-10 years, 20% (n=14) responded 11-15 years, 15.7% (n=11) responded 16-24 years (Figure 4.9).

CAOs were also asked to share the number of year in their current position. The respondents answered as follows: 35.7% (n=25) indicated three years or less, 24.3% (n=17) reported 3-5 years, 18.6% (n=13) reported 6-10 years, 12.9% (n=9) reported 11-15, 5.7% (n=4) reported 16-24 years and 2.9% (n=2) indicated 25 plus years in their current position (Figure 4.10).

![Years at University](image)

*Figure 4.9. Years Employed at Current University.*
Research Question One

What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni give financial gifts to their alma mater?

CAOs were asked several questions about their management practices and perceptions towards alumni giving. This section will begin with an analysis of management practices related to operations. It will then focus on the overall management practices and conclude with perceptions towards alumni giving.

The following paragraphs illustrate the most relevant responses related to CAOs’ operational management practices. A likert-type five point scale was used with the answer options of Describes Completely, Describes to a Large Extent, Describes Somewhat, Hardly Describes and Does Not Describe at All. A majority of CAOs, 81% (n=81), use some type of database to manage alumni data and records. Ninety eight percent of CAOs indicated that it “describes completely” their operational practice of using a database to record gifts. When asked to describe the use of the database related to the giving habits of alumni only 16.2% (n=16) of CAOs indicated it “describes

Figure 4.10. Years Employed in Current Position.
completely” their practices towards tracking the reasons why alumni give, 15.2% (15) indicated “describes to a large extent” and 52.5% (52) indicated a “describes somewhat” response.

CAOs were asked to describe the operational practice of analyzing the giving habits of alumni. Thirty three percent (n=33) responded it “describes completely” their practice. Thirty three percent indicated a “describes to a large extent”, 22% indicated “describes somewhat” and 12% indicated the “hardly describes at all” response (Figure 4.11). No CAO responded to the “does not describe at all” response which indicated all survey participants do some form of analysis on the giving habits of alumni. On the contrary, when CAOs were asked about whether they believed alumni give to receive a tax break 48.8% (n=41) responded “does not describe at all”.

*Figure 4.11. Operational Function: Database Usage.*
To ascertain CAOs’ management practices towards alumni giving in a deeper way, the questionnaire asked CAOs to rank order their top three factors when allocating financial resources to alumni giving. This question was a free write option. The researcher combined and sorted the responses into several themes. The top three factors related to allocating financial resources to alumni giving, when categorized into themes, were return on investment (42%), donor potential and achievement of mission and goals (32%), and alumni engagement (24%). The second category included similar responses such as donor potential, achievement of mission and goals, gift capacity, cultivation purposes, effectiveness of solicitation strategy, constituency targets, and goal attainment. The third category of alumni engagement included similar responses such as alumni engagement and participation, relationship building and retaining alumni.

In order to more deeply understand practice, CAOs were also asked to describe the extent to which they believed alumni make financial contributions to their alma mater. Again, a five point likert-type scale was used with the answer options of Describes Completely, Describes to a Large Extent, Describes Somewhat, Hardly Describes and Does Not Describe at All. The following paragraphs describe the CAOs’ responses. When asked to describe the extent to which CAOs felt alumni make financial gifts to their alma mater, 57.6% (n=49) of CAOs responded to a large extent alumni make financial gifts “as a result of connections made with advancement staff” and 48.8% (n=41) to a large extent “as a result of connections made at university events and activities”. Fifty percent of the CAOs (n=42) felt to a large extent, alumni make financial contributions “to give back to alma mater” and 45.2% (n=38) responded “as a result of meetings with a student/s”. On the other end of the scale, 67.1% (n=55) of CAOs felt
that alumni did not donate money to gain access to the alumni association. Further, 25.3% (n=21) of CAOs felt alumni donated money “to gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni” and 14.3% (n=12) of CAOs responded “to compete with classmates” as the reasons why alumni donate money.

The Perceptions of Alumni Giving and Volunteering section of the research questionnaire was designed to ascertain CAOs’ perceptions towards why alumni make financial gifts to their university. This was done by using five point likert-type scale questions based on a degree of importance scaled from Extremely Important to Not Important. CAOs were asked to respond, using 16 different answer options, in their perception of why alumni make financial gifts, how important the reasons were why alumni make financial gifts to their alma mater (Figure 4.12). A “very important” response was indicated by 56.5% (n=48) of CAOs “as a result of connections made with advancement staff” and 41.2% (n=35) responded as “very important” to the response “as a result of connections made at university events and activities”. CAOs indicated 49.4% (n=42) as “very important” to the answer option “to give back to their alma mater”. On the contrary 65.5% (n=55) of CAOs responded to the “not important” response “to the gain access in the alumni association” answer option and 15.5% (n=13) “to compete with classmates option”.

There were results relating to students, interestingly CAOs perceived that alumni make financial gifts to their alma mater because of students. Forty six percent (n=39) of CAOs indicated a “very important” response “to provide financial support to students through scholarship” and 45.9% (n=39) indicated a “very important” response to the answer option “as a result of meetings with a student/s”.
Research Question Two

What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni volunteer with their alma mater?

Just as CAOs were asked about their management practices and perceptions towards alumni giving, they also were asked about alumni volunteering. CAOs were asked to what extent they feel describes the reasons why their alumni volunteer with their alma mater. As previously reported, 81% of CAOs reported using a database to record alumni data and records. The following paragraphs describe the CAOs’ responses. Again, a five point likert-type scale was used with the answer options of Describes Completely, Describes to a Large Extent, Describes Somewhat, Hardly Describes and Does Not Describe at All. When asked to describe the use of the database to track alumni volunteer efforts, 8.1% (n=8) of CAOs indicated it “completely describes”, 15.2% (n=15) indicated “describes to a large extent” and 52.5% (n=52) indicated the “describes somewhat” option to their practices towards tracking why alumni volunteer. Thirteen percent (n=13) of CAOs stated their practice of analyzing volunteer efforts as “describes completely”, 10% (n=10) indicated “describes to a large extent” and the majority of CAOs 44% (n=44) indicated the option “describes somewhat” (Figure 4.13).
Figure 4.12. CAO Perception of Why Alumni Make Financial Gifts to Alma Mater.
To ascertain CAOs’ management practices towards alumni volunteering in a deeper way, the questionnaire asked CAOs to rank order their top three factors when allocating financial resources to alumni volunteer efforts and programs. This question was a free write option. The researcher combined and sorted the responses into several themes. The top three themes were alumni engagement (63%), donor potential and achievement of mission and goals (57%), and return on investment (48%). The alumni engagement response includes similar responses such as relationship building, stewardship, participation and providing a good and valued experience for alumni. The donor potential theme included similar responses such as achievement of goals, mission, strategy, and alignment with strategic objectives.

The Perceptions of Alumni Giving and Volunteering section of the research questionnaire asked CAOs, in their perception, the extent to which their alumni volunteer with their alma mater. Forty seven percent (n=39) of CAOs, when describing the reasons...
why alumni volunteer, felt it was to a large extent “to support the college” and 41.7% (n=35) “as a result of meetings with student/s”. When asked whether CAOs assigned a monetary value to volunteer time, 51.5% (n=51) of CAOs indicated that this “does not describe at all” their practice. In contrast, 45.8% (n=38) of CAOs indicated “to gain access in the alumni association” and 39.8% (n=33) indicated “to gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni” to the “does not describe at all” option.

CAOs were also asked to give their responses to how important they believed it was why alumni volunteer with their alma mater. This question used a five point likert-type scale with questions scaled based on the degree of importance ranging from Extremely Important to Not Important. Fifty two percent (n=44) of CAOs indicated it was very important “to support the college” and 45.9% (n=39) to “as a result of connections made at the university events and activities response”. Forty two percent (n=36) of CAOs indicated “alumni give as a result of volunteer experiences at the university” as a very important reason why they volunteer with alma mater.

**Research Question Three**

Is there a relationship between the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers related to alumni financial giving and alumni volunteerism?

CAOs were asked about operational practices toward alumni giving and alumni volunteer efforts, specifically allocating budgetary resources, recognition and recording of alumni giving and alumni volunteering efforts within and outside the Advancement area, database usage, as well as analyzing the giving habits and volunteer efforts of alumni.
The following paragraphs present the findings on CAOs’ management practices towards operational advancement tasks. A five point likert-type scale was used with the answer options of Describes Completely, Describes to a Large Extent, Describes Somewhat, Hardly Describes and Does Not Describe at All. CAOs were asked whether they record all financial gifts. Ninety six percent (n=96) responded to the “describes completely” option, 2% (n=2) “describes to a large extent” and 1% (n=1) for the remaining answer options. They were also asked to describe whether they collected data on gifts made outside the Advancement area. Forty nine percent (n=48) felt this “described completely” their practice, 21.4% (n=21) indicated “describes to a large extent”, 17.3% (n=17) indicated “describes somewhat”, 7.1% (n=7) indicated “does not describe at all”. Most the participating CAOs believe their Advancement area collects data on financial gifts to the university regardless of which department receives the gift.

CAOs were also asked whether they had a practice of collecting data on alumni volunteer efforts in other areas of the institution, i.e. Athletics, Campus Ministry, and Career Services. Twenty two percent (n=22) responded to the “describes completely” and the “describes to a large extent” options, 24.2% (n=24) to “describes somewhat” and 23.2% (n=23) indicated “hardly describes at all” and 8.1% (n=8) indicated “does not describe at all”. It is clear from the responses that collecting data on gifts secured outside the advancement area is more widely practiced than collecting data on alumni volunteer efforts completed outside the advancement area.

Management practices related to database usage for tracking alumni giving and alumni volunteering were similar. Fifty three percent (n=52) of CAOs reported that using a database to track the reasons why alumni give money somewhat describes their
practices. Similarly, 47.5% (n=47) of CAOs reported using a database to track the reasons why alumni volunteer their time. Sixteen percent (n=16) of CAOs felt the practice of tracking the reasons why alumni give as “describes completely” as opposed to 8.1% (n=8) of CAOs who track the reasons why alumni volunteer with their alma mater.

The data shows a close relationship between the management practices and perceptions of CAOs in the area of operations towards the recognition of alumni giving and alumni volunteering. CAOs were asked by what methods alumni giving is recognized at their university. The most common response was a letter from the Advancement Office (97.3%), President, and Vice President, Dean or faculty (95.5%) as Figure 4.14 details. This is similar to the responses to the question about how alumni volunteer efforts are recognized. The CAOs’ top two responses were awards (86%) and letter from Advancement Office (80%) as Figure 4.15 details.
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*Figure 4.14. Management Practices: Gift Recognition Methods.*
Figure 4.15. Management Practices: Alumni Volunteering.

Figure 4.16 illustrates the findings for the practice question, “To what extent do the following items describe why your alumni make financial contribution/volunteer with your institution?” and the perception question “How important do you believe each of the following reasons are why alumni make financial gifts/volunteer with our institution?” The top two answer options “describes completely” and “describes to a large extent” were combined for a single percentage. While most answer options did describe their practices well, CAOs felt the following were not the main reasons why alumni give and volunteer: “to compete with classmates”, “to be publically recognized in the Annual Report or other publication”, and “to receive a tax break” (Figure 4.16).
**Research Question Four**

Do Chief Advancement Officers place the same value on alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts?

Addressing the fourth research area, CAOs were asked a series of questions. First, CAOs were asked whether they allocate a dollar amount to alumni volunteer efforts; 96% (n=96) responded no. CAOs were then asked if their current university was to allocate a dollar amount to volunteer efforts would it be more than minimum wage, the state hourly rate, or no per hour rate. Forty six percent (n=46) of CAOs indicated they would pay volunteers more than minimum wage, while 33% (n=33) indicated no per hour rate, 17% (n=17) indicated the state hourly rate, and 6% (n=6) indicated minimum wage. There

---

*Figure 4.16 CAO Practice and Perception Towards Alumni Giving and Volunteering.*
was one write in option of $20. This could mean either that the majority of CAOs believe there may not be a price to allocate for alumni volunteer efforts or that volunteer efforts should not be equated to a dollar amount.

CAOs were also asked what they valued most alumni financial gifts, alumni volunteer efforts or both equally; 63% (n=54) responded alumni financial gifts, 36% (n=31) responded both equally and 1% (n=1) indicated alumni volunteer efforts. Looking at the data by public and private universities (Figure 4.17), there are some differences. CAOs at private universities were 17% more likely than CAOs at public universities to value alumni financial gifts. Further, CAOs at public universities indicated they value both alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts 17% more than CAOs at private universities.

![Figure 4.17. CAO Value Preference of Alumni Financial Gifts or Alumni Volunteer Efforts.](image)

Figure 4.17. CAO Value Preference of Alumni Financial Gifts or Alumni Volunteer Efforts.
The questionnaire asked CAOs to select one of the following three options in terms of what they value most: alumni financial gifts, alumni volunteer efforts, or both equally. When looking at the data by gender of CAOs there was a difference in responses. Seventy two percent (n=31) of male CAOs responded to valuing alumni financial gifts compared to 56.6% (n=10) of women. As for those who indicated they value both alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts equally, 44.4% (n=10) of women CAOs indicated both equally and 27.9% (n=12) of men responded both equally. The one CAO who responded valuing alumni volunteer efforts more was a male.

**Research Question Five**

What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions related to building a lifelong relationship with alumni?

The following section details the findings to address research question five, specifically whether CAOs target alumni for giving or volunteering based on age, and if so, what generational ages do they target. Management practices towards students will also be addressed.

CAOs were asked in the Management Practices and Lifespan Development section of the questionnaire about programs and activities offered to alumni at their universities. Specifically, CAOs were asked whether they target alumni by age and if so what generational age group or groups do they offer these programs and activities. The CAOs chose answer options based on generational age starting from prospective student to retired and elderly alumni. It appears, displayed sequentially in Figure 4.18, that the CAOs surveyed believe they offer programs for alumni in every generation. The majority of CAOs responded to offering programs most for recent alumni 96.4%
(n=107), then middle career alumni 89.2% (n=99), followed by peak career alumni 86.5% (n=96). This is consistent with CAOs’ responses when asked whether they strategically target alumni based on age; 88.9% (n=96) responded yes and 11.1% (n=12) responded no. It also appears from the findings that private universities are more likely to offer programs to all groups except recent alumni and peak career alumni. CAOs from public universities indicated they are slightly more likely to offer family and children’s programming.

Figure 4.18. Advancement Office Programming by Generation and University Category.

When comparing the responses to the question whether giving strategies and alumni volunteer efforts are implemented for Erikson’s (1980) final three stages of psychosocial development, Young Adult: 18-35, Middle Adulthood: 35-65, Late Adulthood: 66 and older were used as answer selections as they are the ages that universities will be engaging and soliciting students and alumni. It appears to be consistent with the other responses related to lifespan.
In terms of targeting stages for giving (Figure 4.19), Late Adulthood: 66 and older was the top response of CAOs with 80.6% (n=87). Next was the Young Adult: 18-35 category with 78.7% (n=85), followed by Middle Adulthood: 35-65 with 69.4% (n=75). There was an “other” option for this question and one of the responses was “we recognize the need to segment these populations in the future” and another was “we have less than 4,000 alumni and are first starting an age-segmented strategy”. It appears from the responses that the majority of CAOs, 88.9% participating in the questionnaire, deems and recognizes age segmentation or lifespan as important in their fundraising strategies.
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**Figure 4.19. CAO Management Practices: Giving Strategies by Lifespan.**

CAOs were asked to indicate which development stage they program for again using Erikson’s life stages (Erikson, 1980), Young Adult: 18-35, Middle Adulthood: 35-65, Late Adulthood: 66 and older. When CAOs were asked whether their Advancement offices implement targeted strategies for programming activities (Figure 4.20), the Young Adulthood: 18 to 35 83.3% (n=90) was the majority response, closely followed by
Middle Adulthood: 36 to 65 with 75.9% (n=82) and Late Adulthood: 66 and older with 75.0% (n=81) responses. Only 17.6% (n=19) respondents indicated age is not a factor in their programming. Judging from these statistics, CAOs believe that age is an important factor in the giving and engagement strategy. It appears the overall fundraising strategy is to engage volunteers while they are younger and building their families and careers, and then concentrate on giving strategies in Late Adulthood possibly when alumni potentially have accumulated some wealth. There was minimal difference in percentages between public and private universities.

![Figure 4.20. CAO Management Practices: Programming by Lifespan.](image)

CAOs were also asked about their management practices towards including students in their strategies (Figure 4.21), specifically building a culture of philanthropy, soliciting students to give to their alma mater and volunteer with alumni events and activities. CAOs were asked whether they build a culture of philanthropy with students through their programming efforts. Twenty seven percent of CAOs felt this “described
completely” and “describes to a large extent”, and 26% (n=26) indicated “describes somewhat” as their practice. When asked whether they solicit students to donate to support the institution, 32% of CAOs felt this “described completely”, 24% (n=24) “describes to a large extent”, and 25% “describes somewhat” their perception of their management practices. As for how CAOs would describe their practices toward engaging students to connect and volunteer with alumni events and activities, i.e. student alumni association, mentoring and regional programs, 31.3% (n=31) responded “describes completely”, 34.3% (n=34) of CAOs felt “described to a large extent” their practices and 19.2 % (n=19) indicated “describes somewhat”.

**Figure 4.21.** Student Involvement With Alumni Giving and Alumni Volunteering.
Research Question Six

What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions on alumni giving and alumni volunteerism on the basis of gender?

To address the sixth research question, CAOs were asked about their management practices related to alumni giving and alumni volunteering, and whether they specifically target men and women differently. CAOs were also asked if they targeted specific giving practices towards men or women including solicitation, cultivation, stewardship, engagement, volunteer recruitment and volunteer training. The responses included “men”, “women”, “no difference” and “not sure” options. The majority of responses were that CAOs targeted both men and women for all answer options; 79% (n=83) cultivation, 81% (n=85), stewardship 79% (n=82), engagement 80% (n=83), volunteer recruitment 75% (n=79), and volunteer training 72% (n=73). Figure 4.22 details the responses in greater detail, but it appears that the CAOs participating in this study believe they target their fundraising and engagement strategy to both men and women. Some CAOs responded in slightly greater percentages to targeting cultivation, stewardship, volunteer recruitment and training to women.
When CAOs were asked about their perceptions on which gender had the highest percentage of certain giving and volunteer habits, there were slight differences between men and women according to the CAOs’ perception. When asked whether men or women had the higher percentage of participation in university events and activities, 56.2% (n=59) of CAOs indicated little difference between the men and women (Figure 4.23).
Figure 4.23. CAO Perceptions of Alumni Volunteering Habits by Gender.

But, CAOs felt men 48% (n=50) had the highest percentage of financial giving as opposed to 21% (n=22) of women. CAOs also estimated that men had the highest percentage of making the largest financial (dollar amount) gifts 62% (n=65) and making major gifts 61% (n=64). Figure 4.24 illustrates specific percentages. This is contradictory to the review of the literature which found women tended to give more than men. With regard to perception of consistent giving, CAOs perceived women as being more likely to have consistent giving, 32% (n=33), followed by the “not sure” answer option 24.3% (n=25).

There were some interesting findings from the Gender section of the questionnaire when reviewing by the gender of the CAO. First, the researcher found that female CAOs were more likely to select “not sure” to the question (Figure 4.24) asking which gender had the higher percentage of certain alumni giving and volunteering habits. The answer options were men, women, both and not sure. Next, the male CAOs were more likely to select the “male” option for each of the giving responses except consistent giving, for every answer option (Figure 4.25).
Figure 4.24. CAO Perceptions of Alumni Giving Habits by Gender.
The findings of the research questionnaire towards CAOs’ perceptions on women’s giving habits were not consistent with the current literature which indicates women have a higher percentage of giving and volunteering than men (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010; Mesch, 2010). This may be due to the fact that the data gathered through the questionnaire is the perception of the CAO and not based on actual fact. The responses are interesting as the majority of CAOs target both genders and there are only slightly higher percentages for women to have consistent giving. Further exploration of
this area is important for building the scholarly research for the emerging profession of educational philanthropy.

**Conclusion**

This chapter provided an analysis of the research and explanation of the findings. The sections of the chapter were presented in the same sequence as the research questions. The research findings were similar to results with regards to the demographic profile of CAOs to other studies specifically gender of CAO (Dean, 2007; Murray, 2007).

A remarkable finding was that although the majority of CAOs (81%) responded to using a database to manage alumni data and records as a practice that “describes completely” and “describes to a large extent”, CAOs did not indicate the same high percentages when asked about tracking and analyzing alumni giving and alumni volunteering habits of alumni.

In terms of the operational task of recognizing alumni gifts and alumni volunteer efforts, there were similar responses to the types of recognition. The majority of alumni giving recognition is by a letter from advancement. The majority of recognition for alumni volunteer efforts was reported by CAOs as awards.

The most interesting findings of research question four relate to CAOs’ value towards alumni giving and alumni volunteers efforts. CAOs were asked what they valued most-alumni financial gifts, alumni volunteer efforts or both equally; 63.5% (n=54) responded alumni financial gifts, 36.5% (n=31) responded both equally and 1.2% (n=1) indicated alumni volunteer efforts. Even more interesting was that there was a difference between CAOs working at public and private universities. CAOs at private universities were 17% more likely than CAOs at public universities to value alumni
financial gifts. Further, CAOs at public universities indicated they equally value both alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts 17% more than CAOs at private universities.

Research question five also had interesting findings. CAOs were asked whether they strategically target alumni based on age. The majority of CAOs, 88.9% (n=96) responded yes and 11.1% (n=12) responded no. This was consistent with the responses to the question about what generational age groups they offer programs and activities for at their university. The categories were selected based on generational age starting from prospective student to retired and elderly alumni. It appears (Figure 4.16) that the CAOs surveyed believe they offer programs for alumni in every generation. The majority of CAOs responded to offering programs most for recent alumni 96.4% (n=107), then middle career alumni 89.2% (n=99), followed by peak career alumni 86.5% (n=96).

CAOs were also asked about their management practices towards including students into their strategies (Figure 4.18), specifically building a culture of philanthropy, soliciting students to give to their alma mater and volunteer with alumni events and activities. The responses for building a culture of philanthropy and soliciting students to support the university were when compared fairly similar with slightly higher percentages for soliciting students.

The findings of research question six dealt with issues of gender. CAOs were asked about their management practices related to alumni giving and alumni volunteering, and whether they specifically target men and women differently. CAOs were also asked if they targeted specific giving practices towards men or women including solicitation, cultivation, stewardship, engagement, volunteer recruitment and
volunteer training. The responses when compared were fairly similar that there was no difference in practice among the answer options. The difference was slightly increased to favor women in the areas of cultivation, stewardship, volunteer recruitment and training.

CAOs were asked for their perception of which gender had the highest percentage of specific giving and volunteering habits. CAOs said men 48% (n=50) had the highest percentage of financial giving as opposed to 21% (n=22) of women. CAOs also estimated that men had the highest percentage of making the largest financial (dollar amount) gifts 62% (n=65) and making major gifts 61% (n=64). These findings are different than the findings in the review of literature.

In summary, this chapter presented an analysis of the research and expanded on the research findings. The following and final chapter presents the implications and limitations of the study as well as makes recommendations for further research.
Chapter 5: Findings

Introduction

The final chapter restates the purpose of the study and reviews the methodology used. The major sections of this chapter summarize the results and discuss their implications and recommendations for further research. Research delimitations and limitations are also presented.

The purpose of this study is to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) and how they view the relationship with alumni. There were three phases of the study. Phase I was the creation of a survey instrument and review by a panel of experts. Phase II was editing of the survey instrument and electronic questionnaire distribution to a pilot group of CAOs from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s (CASE) District I. Phase III of the study was distribution of the final questionnaire to CAOs from CASE’s District II. There were six essential research questions guiding this study:

1. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni give financial gifts to their alma mater?

2. What are the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers on why alumni volunteer with their alma mater?

3. Is there a relationship between the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers related to alumni giving and alumni volunteerism?

4. Do Chief Advancement Officers place the same value on alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts?
5. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions related to building a lifelong relationship with alumni?

6. What are the Chief Advancement Officers’ management practices and perceptions on alumni giving and alumni volunteerism on the basis of gender?

Implications of Findings

The following section presents the implications of the research findings and provides further analysis by themes including Advancement operations, profile and viewpoints of CAOs, gender, lifespan, and the need for additional scholarly investigation of the relationship between alumni and alma mater.

**Advancement operations.** The first theme, Advancement operations, relates to the overall operations of Advancement, specifically the use of a database to manage alumni data and records. There are many practices and procedures set in place to manage the Advancement operation. What do the expenditures of Institutional Advancement programs in higher education tell us? One would assume that budget allocations are an indication of institutional priority and value. Therefore, further research should focus on whether budgets are properly allocated between the functions of alumni giving and alumni volunteering to fully maximize financial support for institutions.

One of the most important practices in Advancement is the use of a database, which assists in managing alumni data and records. This study found that all of the CAO respondents utilized a database to manage alumni data and records as well as to record financial gifts made by alumni.
CAOs were asked about the practice of tracking the reasons why alumni give and volunteer. It was surprising not to see higher percentages regarding the tracking of both alumni giving and alumni volunteering.

The majority response (52.5%) for tracking the reasons why alumni financially give was the “describes somewhat” category, the midpoint of a five point scale. The majority response (47.5%) for whether CAOs track the reasons why alumni volunteer their time was also at the midpoint of the scale as “describes somewhat”.

Further, CAOs were asked to describe whether they used a database to track either alumni giving habits or alumni volunteer efforts. Only 16.2% (n=16) of CAOs indicated it “completely describes” their practices towards tracking the reasons why alumni give and only 8.1% (n=8) of CAOs indicated it “completely describes” their practices towards tracking why alumni volunteer.

It was affirming to see CAOs respond in greater numbers to analyzing the giving habits of alumni. This response was at the top end of the five point scale; 33% (n=33) of CAOs responded as “describes completely” to analyzing the giving habits of alumni. Only 13% (n=13) of CAOs responded to using the database to analyze volunteer efforts. This was a bit surprising but not alarming as 44% (n=44) indicated the midpoint response of “describes somewhat”. This may be a result of there not being a procedural need to record volunteer efforts as there is for financial gifts which have to be recorded for IRS purposes (Taylor, 2009). The larger concern is that the percentages of tracking and analyzing alumni giving and alumni volunteering were not generally higher. Conceivably, as the continued and more sophisticated use and presence of technology in
the Advancement area becomes more common, the level of tracking and analysis on alumni giving and alumni volunteering habits will increase.

As previously stated, the percentage of CAOs who regularly track and analyze both alumni giving and alumni volunteering were, in the opinion of this researcher, low. More CAOs should embrace the use of technology to track and analyze alumni giving and volunteer efforts as it will be a worthwhile investment of resources and time. If CAOs truly appreciated the lifelong relationship with alumni, there would be more regular and consistent electronic tracking and analysis of alumni giving and alumni volunteering habits. The current percentages could also be a result of CAOs’ complex set of responsibilities. It is easier for some CAOs to steer away from strategic plans and prospect management research in an attempt to meet end of year goals by setting up practices more closely aligned with a relationship fundraising. CAO management practices and perception need to be further investigated as the findings of this study indicated that CAOs value alumni giving more than volunteer efforts and this is evident by their practices towards tracking and analyzing alumni gifts more than alumni volunteer efforts.

**Profile and viewpoints of chief advancement officers (CAO).** The second theme presented relates to the profile and viewpoints of CAOs. Understanding the CAOs’ complex set of job responsibilities is important as it sets the priorities for their practices, thus setting some consistency for comparison purposes. It appears from the research findings that the CAO position has several different tasks depending on the leadership structure at each university. It appears there is no one set of uniform set of responsibilities. For instance, some institutions combine fundraising and
communications tasks together, others combine fundraising and marketing tasks, while others combine with the college relations tasks. These differences make it challenging to fully gather an adequate profile of CAOs. It may be possible that some CAOs are not on the front lines of advancement work doing solicitation and cultivation of alumni donors and alumni volunteers. It is conceivable to consider the level of participation is partially due to CAOs having an increased responsibility to non-alumni, such as community members, corporations and foundations.

A suggestion for further research is to focus on the operational practices of the Advancement area. This may provide more of a uniform framework for comparison purposes as the CAO is the leader of the Advancement area, overseeing other functions, but the actual Advancement tasks of engagement, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship still take place through the Advancement staff.

When reviewing the profile of the CAOs in terms of diversity it appears this study’s findings are similar to those already completed (Murray 2007; Dean 2007; Netherton, 2002) with regard to the ethnicity and gender of CAOs. Given increasing diversity among today’s college student population, having a diverse advancement staff assists in outreaching to these diverse groups of alumni (Scully, 2008). As the population shifts it is important for there to be a better representation of diversity in advancement leaders, especially with gender and ethnicity.

With regard to CAO length of service in their current position, this research found that the majority 35.7% (n=25) of CAOs had three or less years of service. The next highest was 24.3% (n=17) of CAOs reporting between three and five years of service, followed by 18.6% (n=13) indicating between six and ten years of service. The two
smallest percentages were for the most years of service. CAOs reported 5.7% (n=4) to having between 16 and 24 years of service and lastly, 2.9% (n=2) indicating 25 or more years of service.

These findings were fairly consistent with other research findings including Murray (2007). Murray (2007) found that 61% (n=50) of CAOs had four or less years in their current positions. Three percent (n=3) indicated between 15-19 years and one percent indicated more than 20 years of service. Dean’s research provided a division between men and women. Women CAOs indicated a mean score of 4.9 (N=63) years of service in their current position and men indicated a mean score of 5.9 (N=100) years of service in current position.

In regard to CAO viewpoints, it was clear from the fourth research question’s findings which related to the value CAOs place on alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts that CAOs valued financial gifts more than volunteer efforts. It was surprising that not more CAOs responded to valuing both; 63.5% (n=54) responded to valuing alumni financial gifts, 36.5% (n=31) responded both equally and 1.2% (n=1) indicated alumni volunteer efforts. It was also interesting to see the distinction between CAOs at public and private universities. CAOs at private universities responded to valuing alumni financial gifts at a rate of 69.4% (n=34) and both equally at a rate of 30.6% (n=15). Fifty two percent of CAOs at public universities responded to valuing alumni gifts and 47.6% (n=10) to valuing both equally. CAOs at private universities indicated 17% more than public university CAOs to valuing alumni financial gifts. CAOs at public universities indicated they value both alumni financial gifts and alumni volunteer efforts 17% more than private universities. The differing percentages between
CAOs at public and private universities are interesting and suggest cause for further exploration.

**Gender.** The following section presents the third theme of gender. Gender is explored in several ways in this section. First, the CAO perception of gender towards alumni giving and alumni volunteering is presented. Then is followed by a presentation of how the CAOs’ gender may have an impact on the habits and perceptions of alumni. The most surprising finding relates to research question six, which investigates the CAOs’ management practices and perceptions on alumni giving and alumni volunteering on the basis of gender. When CAOs were asked about their perceptions about which gender had the highest percentage of certain giving and volunteer habits, there were slight differences between men and women according to the CAOs’ perception. When asked whether men or women had the higher percentage of participation in university events and activities, 56.2% (n=59) of CAOs indicated no difference between the men and women (Figure 4.23). But, CAOs felt men 48% (n=50) had the highest percentage of financial giving as opposed to 21% (n=22) of women alumni. CAOs also estimated that men had the highest percentage of making the largest financial (dollar amount) gifts 62% (n=65) opposed to 17.1% (n=18) of women. CAOs also felt men were more likely to make major gifts, 61% (n=64) as opposed to 12.4% (n=13) of women. Figure 4.22 illustrates the specific percentages. With regards to CAO perception of which gender gives more consistently, CAOs were more likely to select women 32% (n=33) and the not sure answer option 24.3% (n=25). These results appear to differ with those in the literature. It is important to obtain recorded statistics and investigate actual practices
rather than just perceptions so it is recommended the actual practices be examined to determine if there are gender differences in alumni giving and volunteer efforts.

Current literature around giving and gender issues includes general comparisons of women and men (Andreoni & Vesterlund, 2001; Brown & Rooney, 2008), married couples (Rooney, Brown, & Mesch, 2007) and singles, all indicating women give more than men (Rooney, Mesch, Chin, & Steinberg, 2005). In this study, the responses from CAOs indicated they perceived that men were more likely to be major donors and contributors of large dollar amount gifts. The results of this study contradict existing research. Is it because existing research focuses mainly on nonprofit giving and not specifically on giving to higher education? Further exploration is needed to determine this. These findings also make the case for more scholarly research on philanthropic habits specifically in higher education.

There were some interesting and unexplained findings in this study. The findings indicated there are different results to certain questions based on the gender of the CAO. This study found female CAOs had higher rates to the “not sure” option in the Gender section of the questionnaire, when asked for their estimation of whether there are gender differences with certain alumni giving and alumni volunteering habits. When CAOs were asked which gender they felt had certain giving and volunteering habits, female CAOs were more likely to select the “not sure” option. Male CAOs were more likely to select the “male” response for each of the answer options.

It is important to point out that this study was a self reported questionnaire that attempted to ascertain CAOs’ management practices and perceptions. Perhaps the CAOs’ responses to questions are simply their perceptions and not based upon fact. For
example, the question of which gender donates more money may have been answered by the CAO based upon personal belief instead of concrete data. A future study could explore the differences between CAOs’ perceptions and realities in key Advancement area. It would require a more in depth investigation to decide if CAO perceptions were accurate.

The review of the literature on women’s giving suggested (Rooney, Mesch, Chin, & Steinberg, 2005) that more CAOs would be specifically targeting women for financial giving and volunteer activities. This study suggested that management practices and perceptions of CAOs may be different based on their gender. Perhaps, alumni respond differently based on gender of CAO. The majority of questionnaire respondents were men and a reasonable assumption could be made that the management practices and strategies appeal more towards men. Perhaps male CAOs subconsciously do not place as much importance on strategies for women. Additional research on the management practices of men and women is needed to determine if CAO gender does make a difference.

**Lifespan development.** The following section presents the findings around the fourth theme of lifespan development theory. Research question five specifically addressed CAOs’ management practices and perceptions related to building a lifelong relationship with alumni. In general, the Alumni Relations and Development functions provide activities and services in the hopes that alumni will remain connected, continue to have positive feelings, and will want to give money and volunteer time to their alma mater in return. This study makes the case for truly valuing a lifelong relationship with alumni and ensuring that all alumni including alumni volunteers are engaged, managed
and stewarded appropriately and are adequately recognized for their efforts, dedication and loyalty. If a lifelong relationship with alumni is truly what CAOs view as important, then the organizational structure and programmatic offering and practices of Institutional Advancement should reflect this.

Other interesting results related to the lifespan questions surround alumni programming. CAOs were asked in terms of programming if they target specific groups of alumni on the basis of age and if so which generational ages. The majority 89.9% (n=96) of CAOs responded yes they target age. Further, CAOs had healthy responses across all the generations starting from student to late life alumni. CAOs were specifically asked about targeting alumni giving and alumni programming efforts according to Erikson’s (1980) final three life stages: Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood and Late Adulthood. In terms of programming offerings, most CAOs 83.3% (n=90) responded to offering programming for the Young Adulthood category. CAOs were asked about which age they targeting alumni giving; Late Adulthood had the majority 80.6% (n=85). These findings suggest that offering programs and services to more recent alumni will keep them connected to the university, with the intention that as alumni age they will be capable of making more considerable gifts. If this belief is true it speaks to an understanding of lifespan development theory and viewing the relationship with alumni as lifelong.

An understanding of the development stages and growth that takes place during each of the stages can be a guide for CAOs and their teams to assist in determining giving and engagement strategies. For example it is during Young Adulthood that relationships and connecting to other people are prevalent. This is a perfect time for universities to be
establishing relationships with students and providing them an illustration that their relationship with the university, as a student, is only the beginning. It is a relationship that lasts a lifetime. During Middle Adulthood individuals look to make worthwhile connections to society whether through personal or professional endeavors. Universities can embrace the development by ensuring there are ample opportunities for connection with their alma mater, whether through offering mentoring opportunities, connections to classmates and faculty, or even through giving opportunities that benefit current students. Lastly, during Late Adulthood individuals look back on their lifetime and their accomplishments. Universities could embrace this by ensuring giving opportunities are easy to find and are connected to this sense of reflective thinking. Providing opportunities for alumni during this stage to connect to younger alumni and students allows them to pass on their life wisdom. Lifespan development theory truly does provide CAOs a theoretical framework to maximize resources for fundraising success.

Further research with respect to specific strategies and practices toward alumni giving and alumni volunteering by age is needed. The questions asked in this research study need to be analyzed on a more granular level in order to more adequately instruct and impact current practice. The CAOs reported offering programming to all generational ages from student to late life alumni, but is this done strategically or because CAOs believe it is an appropriate practice.

**Additional scholarly investigation of the management practices of the Advancement area.** The fifth theme is the need for more scholarly research on the management practices of the Advancement area. A deduction can be made from the review of the literature that it is important to understand the history, role and evolving
duties of the CAO as they have a set of very complicated responsibilities. With the low
percentage of alumni financial giving, competitive marketplace, current unpredictable
economy, and less government, corporate and foundation support to higher education,
further investigation of not only the CAO role but also the relationship between alumni
and their alma mater is recommended. One area of investigation is to survey alumni
about their perceptions of the CAO and practices in general. An exploration of these
issues may help explain why giving is lowest in 50 years.

**Delimitations**

A delimitation of the study was the selection of Baccalaureate, Master’s and
Doctoral level institutions. For profit, trade or community colleges were not included in
the study. Baccalaureate, Master’s and Doctoral level institutions are less complex to
compare. For profit and trade colleges are too specific in their individual mission and too
complex for comparison purposes.

**Limitations**

The limitations specific to this research study are presented in the following
section. The first limitation includes the membership data accessed from the CASE
membership office. It was not updated in real time; further it is the responsibility of
individual CAOs to notify CASE of changes. In some cases, this was not done and the
researcher needed to do additional investigation to find the CAOs’ contact information.
The next limitation of the study was the lack of comprehensive research for comparison
purposes on the eight districts of the Council for the Advancement and Support of
Education membership.
The final limitation is that the role, responsibilities, and leadership structure of the CAO position varies greatly. Each university has its own leadership structure and differing set of responsibilities making general comparisons about the CAO role difficult.

Recommendations

This section presents recommendations for further investigation based on the research findings. It is followed by the final research conclusion.

First it is recommended that more scholarly research be conducted on several different areas including further exploration of CAOs’ management practices, operational practices and perceptions. The findings, in this study make the case for investigating further the perceptions and the actual operational practices of some advancement functions, for example, targeting alumni fundraising and engagement strategies by age and gender.

As an example, CAOs stated they target their fundraising strategies and programming by age, but are they actually using a well thought out, targeted and strategic approaches or is it based on instinct? Secondly, are the operational practices and strategies truly related to gender? CAOs stated their strategies targeted both men and women, but do they really have two separate strategies, one for men and one for women in actual practice? Are these strategies based on statistical analysis or have some theoretical foundation?

Further, these findings present a case for having a theoretical underpinning for the work of Advancement as educational philanthropy is an emerging field and industry. A theoretical foundation can only assist Advancement leaders to focus on more of the statistics behind the work they do rather than rely on instinct. This theoretical foundation
can serve as a guide for strategic planning, priority setting, and be a guiding framework for the institution’s operational planning to maximize priorities.

It is suggested that lifespan development theory be considered as the framework. Lifespan development theory, when applied to the philanthropic efforts of higher education, sets psychosocial development stages as the foundation for the relationship, not just age, making this theoretical framework applicable not only to traditional college aged alumni but to nontraditional and even distance learning alumni as well.

Another recommendation is to further explore and define the role of the CAO. This study’s findings illustrate the differences among CAO responsibilities and perhaps universities should consider this as they move into this next decade. One particular area of the CAO position that needs further investigation is why there is a lack of ethnic diversity among those serving in the CAO position. A specific investigation of the recruitment practices of the CAO as well as the availability of qualified diverse candidates at middle and executive leader levels is suggested. As was stated earlier, diverse representation of advancement staff assists in engaging alumni (Scully, 2008). The demographic population shift in America will undoubtedly impact higher education; therefore, it is important to understand the reasons why there is not a higher percentage of diverse CAOs.

Additional research should be conducted on issues surrounding gender. As stated previously in the review of the literature, women have higher rates of giving than men. But the perceptions of CAOs seem to differ from these findings. The first recommendation is to conduct more research from the CAOs’ perspective towards gender issues and alumni giving and volunteer habits. Secondly, more research should be
conducted according to CAO gender and how they view alumni giving and alumni volunteering based on gender. An investigation of the actual practices of CAOs, segmented by gender to determine if men and women have different approaches to fundraising and engagement of men and women, is recommended. It is also recommended that additional exploration from the perspective of the alumni on how they view CAOs is needed. It would also be interesting to compare whether alumni respond differently to CAOs based on gender. Further, research on actual alumni giving and alumni volunteering rates is needed to compare perceptions of the CAOs with fact.

Distributing the questionnaire to other CASE Districts is the last recommendation. Obtaining a larger sample size can determine if the management practices and perceptions of CASE, District II CAOs are comparable to CAOs in other districts, thus broadening understanding by incorporating greater geographic diversity in the respondent pool.

This study’s research findings begin to illustrate CAOs’ management practices and perceptions towards alumni giving, alumni volunteering and their relationship with alumni. It is illustrated through the findings that CAOs place a higher value towards alumni giving and this is evident by their responses to tracking and analyzing alumni giving habits more than alumni volunteer efforts. Volunteer efforts are an important way to connect with alumni and should be seen in a more strategic way. Alumni volunteers are very connected to the university and in turn make viable prospects. They connect with their alma mater by providing their service and in many cases this services is on campus, close to the Advancement staff. Monitoring these volunteer efforts provides the
opportunity for alumni to truly understand their value and connection to their alma mater, and help cultivate these volunteers to make financial gifts in the future.

Lifespan development theory as a theoretical framework for the Advancement area values the partnership between alumni giving and alumni volunteering. Since educational philanthropy is still an emerging field, lifespan development theory could provide a theoretical grounding by which to align strategy and resources.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented an overview of this study’s purpose, methodology, limitations, delimitations, findings and recommendations for future research. The purpose of this study was to examine the management practices and perceptions of Chief Advancement Officers (CAOs) and how they view the relationship with alumni. This study used survey research; an electronic questionnaire was designed and distributed first to a pilot group of CAOs from CASE’s District I. The final questionnaire was distributed to CAOs from CASE’s District II. In terms of management practices, all CAOs responded to using a database to record gifts and alumni data. CAOs indicated they were more likely to track and analyze alumni giving habits than alumni volunteer efforts. When asked to indicate whether they valued alumni gifts, alumni volunteer efforts or both, the majority of CAOs indicated alumni financial gifts.

In relation to lifespan, the majority of CAOs reported to targeting alumni based on age. This is consistent with findings when asked more specifically about whether they target alumni based on the final three stages of Erikson’s psychosocial development theory. The CAOs surveyed believe they offered programs for alumni in every
generation. Further investigation is needed as to whether the strategy is based on statistical data or instinct.

The findings surrounding gender issues of alumni giving contradicted current literature that reports women were more likely to be donors and give large gift amounts. CAOs in this study estimated that men had the highest percentage of making the largest financial (dollar amount) gifts and of making major gifts. Further investigation is needed to determine if the CAOs’ perspective is accurate and if so why is this different than the findings currently found in the literature. An investigation of CAO management practices and perceptions based on CAO gender is also recommended as it appears male CAOs are more likely to perceive men as more likely to give larger gift amounts and be major donors.

A deduction can be made from the review of the literature and the findings from this study that it is important to understand the history, role and evolving duties of the CAO as they have a set of very complicated responsibilities. Further investigation of the actual management and operational practices and perceptions of CAOs is recommended. With the low percentage of alumni financial giving, competitive marketplace, current unpredictable economy, and less government, corporate and foundation support to higher education, CAOs should look at alumni stakeholders in new ways to ensure they are maximizing all possible funding sources. Integrating alumni into the life of the college, in new and relevant ways to fully maximize alumni time, talent and expertise requires a theoretical framework like lifespan development theory, which views the alumni relationship as lifelong.
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Appendix A

Erikson’s Psychosocial Stages Summary Chart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Basic Conflict</th>
<th>Important Events</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Young Adulthood</strong></td>
<td>Intimacy vs. Isolation</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>Young adults need to form intimate, loving relationships with other people. Success leads to strong relationships, while failure results in loneliness and isolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19 to 40 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Adulthood</strong></td>
<td>Generativity vs. Stagnation</td>
<td>Work and Parenthood</td>
<td>Adults need to create or nurture things that will outlast them, often by having children or creating a positive change that benefits other people. Success leads to feelings of usefulness and accomplishment, while failure results in shallow involvement in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40 to 65 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maturity</strong></td>
<td>Ego Integrity vs. Despair</td>
<td>Reflection on Life</td>
<td>Older adults need to look back on life and feel a sense of fulfillment. Success at this stage leads to feelings of wisdom, while failure results in regret, bitterness, and despair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65 to death)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(http://psychology.about.com/library/bl_psychosocial_summary.htm)
Appendix B

Dollar Value of a Volunteer Hour, by State: 2009 (Independent Sector, 2009)
**Dollar Value of a Volunteer Hour, by State: 2009**

*Please note that 2009 is the latest year for which state-by-state numbers are available. There is a lag of almost one year in the government's release of state level data which explains why the state volunteering values are one year behind the national value.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$17.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$20.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$19.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>$16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>$23.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>$26.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>$21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>$32.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>$19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>$17.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$22.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$16.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>$17.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>$18.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$22.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$26.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$19.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$15.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>$18.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>$20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$25.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$27.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>$16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$18.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>$17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$18.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$20.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>$19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>$16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$15.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$18.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$21.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$17.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>$17.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$22.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>$16.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>$18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>$11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>$15.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Council and Advancement and Support of Education District Map
(www.case.org)
Appendix D

Pilot survey
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey

1. Survey on the Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers

This Pilot Survey will focus on Chief Advancement Officers at Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Doctoral Institutions in District I of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

The survey is in fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College, New Rochelle Campus. The survey has been reviewed by IRB.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

If you are interested in the results, please indicate your desire at the end of the survey; otherwise all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

Again, many thanks for your time and consideration.
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey

2. Management Practices

1. The Advancement Office where I work offers programs/activities for the following groups (check all that apply)

- Prospective students
- Newly admitted students
- Freshman and Sophomore Students
- Junior and Senior Students
- Recent alumni
- Middle career alumni
- Peak career alumni
- Career changing alumni
- Out of work alumni
- Family/children's programming
- Alumni parent and child
- Retired alumni
- Elderly alumni

2. The Advancement Office at the college/university where I work recognizes alumni financial gifts in the following ways (check all that apply)

- Awards
- Email
- Letter from advancement office
- Letter from the president, e.g., donor letter
- Phone call
- Recognition event
- University print/publication
- University website

Other (please specify)
3. The Advancement Office at the college/university where I work recognizes alumni volunteer efforts in the following ways (check all that apply)

- Awards
- Email
- Letter from the advancement office
- Letter from the president, e.g., dean/faculty
- Phone call
- Recognition event
- University print/publication
- University website

Other (please specify):
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey

3. Life Span Development

1. The Advancement Office where I work strategically targets alumni based on age.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Not sure

2. The Advancement Office where I work implements giving strategies for the following age groups (check all that apply)
   - [ ] Young adulthood 18 to 35
   - [ ] Middle adulthood 36 to 65
   - [ ] Late adulthood 66 and older
   - [ ] Age is not a factor in our giving strategy.
   - Other (please specify):

3. The Advancement Office where I work offers programs and activities for the following age groups (check all that apply)
   - [ ] Young adulthood 18 to 35
   - [ ] Middle adulthood 36 to 65
   - [ ] Late adulthood 66 and older
   - [ ] Age is not a factor in our programming.
   - Other (please specify):
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey

4. Gender

Please respond to the following statements.

1. Thinking about your institution, in your best estimation, who has the highest percentage of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>financial giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who give to the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncentered giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who make major gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those making the largest contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time spent volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent service as leader or key volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who participate in university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Listed below are 6 management practices. Please indicate the gender or genders for whom these practices are targeted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey

5. Operations

1. Thinking about your institution, the Advancement Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describe to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describe Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly describes at all</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to manage alumni data and records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks the reasons why alumni contribute money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks the reason why alumni volunteer their time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to record gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records all alumni financial gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects data on gifts outside the advancement area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes giving habits of alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to track volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects data on alumni volunteer efforts in other areas within the institution (i.e. Athletics, Campus Ministry, Career Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches volunteers to tasks based upon their skills, expertise and talents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses a monetary value to volunteer time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds a culture of philanthropy with students through program offerings, services and activities such as career mentoring, alumni/ student networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits students to donate to funds that support the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages students to connect volunteer with alumni events and activities (i.e. student alumni association, mentoring, regional programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Do you allocate a dollar amount to the volunteer efforts of alumni?

- Yes
- No

3. If you do or were to allocate a dollar amount to the volunteer efforts of alumni, what would you assign the per hour rate?

- $1
- Minimum Wage
- More than Minimum Wage
- An hourly figure designated by the state
- Other (please specify)
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#### 6. Perceptions on Alumni Giving and Volunteering

Using the scale provided, please respond to the following statements.

1. **How important do you believe each of the following reasons are to why alumni make financial gifts to your institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Hardly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of volunteer experiences at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to financially give rather than time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide financial support to students through scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to their alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build the institution's reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association (Dues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2. To what extent do the following items describe why your alumni make financial contributions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Describes Completely</th>
<th>Describes to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describes Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describes at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of volunteer experiences at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with a student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to financially give rather than time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide financial support to students through scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to their alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build the institution’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association (Dues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**3. How important do you believe each of the following reasons are to why alumni volunteer with your alma mater?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Hardly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of gifts given to the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the institution's reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to volunteer than give a financial gift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**4. To what extent do the following items describe why your alumni volunteer with your institution?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describe to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describe Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describes at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of gifts given to the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with a student(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the institution’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to volunteer than give a financial gift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. As the Chief Advancement Officer at your current institution what do you value more?**

- [ ] Alumni Financial Gifts
- [ ] Alumni Volunteer Efforts
- [ ] Both Equally
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#### 7. Management Practices

1. To what extent do the following items describe your Advancement Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describe to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describe Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describe at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to solicit alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to solicit alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to steward alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to steward alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to staff alumni volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to staff alumni volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to engage alumni in volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to engage alumni in volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to effectively recruit, train and evaluate alumni volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to effectively recruit, train and evaluate alumni volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focuses giving on alumni major donor prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values students as future participating alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values engaging students throughout their academic experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are the three top factors you consider when allocating financial resources to alumni giving?

1.
2.
3.

3. What are the three top factors you consider when allocating financial resources to volunteer efforts/programs?

1.
2.
3.

4. What are the top three factors you consider when allocating budgetary resources to personnel?

1.
2.
3.
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8. Demographics

1. What is your current title?

2. What is the title of the person to whom you report?

3. Please indicate your gender
   - Female
   - Male

4. Please indicate your ethnicity
   - African American
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic/Latino
   - Native American
   - Other (please specify)

5. Based on the college/university where you currently work, please complete the following demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Enroll Size</th>
<th>Graduate Enroll Size</th>
<th>Number of Addressable Alumni</th>
<th>Total Alumni Community</th>
<th>Years at Current Institution</th>
<th>Years in Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Drop down menu

6. The institution where I currently work is

- Private
- Public
7. The university/college where I currently work

- [ ] has always been coeducational
- [ ] was once single-sex - female
- [ ] was once single-sex - male
- [ ] is single sex - female
- [ ] is single sex - male
- [ ] Other (please specify) ________________________________

8. The college/university has been coeducational for

- [ ] 1-25 years
- [ ] 26-50 years
- [ ] 51-75 years
- [ ] 75+ years

9. In what state is your university/college located?

- [ ] Connecticut
- [ ] Maine
- [ ] Massachusetts
- [ ] New Hampshire
- [ ] Rhode Island
- [ ] Vermont
- [ ] Delaware
- [ ] District of Columbia
- [ ] Maryland
- [ ] New Jersey
- [ ] New York
- [ ] Pennsylvania
- [ ] Puerto Rico
- [ ] U.S. Virgin Islands
- [ ] West Virginia
10. The Advancement office has separated the functions of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving
   [ ] Yes
   [ ] No

11. Alumna and Alumnus is defined at my institution as someone who
   [ ] has taken one class at our institution
   [ ] has earned enough credits to be within one year of graduation
   [ ] has had higher degree conferred by the institution
   Other (please specify): __________________________

12. What giving level does your institution consider a major gift?
9. Interested in the Results

1. I am interested in receiving the survey findings.
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

2. If you would like to learn about the results of this research, please fill in your contact information. Again, all survey responses will remain confidential.
   Thank you for your interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College/University:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Province:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for participating in this survey and adding to the field of scholarly research.

It is the researchers' hope that the results of this study will assist all those whose tirelessly advance institutions of higher education.
Appendix E

Questionnaire to Volunteer Panel of Experts
Jose R. Gonzalez
Vice President for Institutional Advancement
Manhattanville College, Purchase, NY

Ainsley Lamberton
Director, Alumni Communications
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA

Patrick Lyons
Former Director of Athletics
Iona College, New Rochelle, NY

Megan Mericer
Associate Director of Alumni Affairs & College Events
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, NY

Meghan Radosh
Associate Director, Alumni Engagement
Wiedner University, Chester, PA
Appendix F

Introduction Message Phase I
Doctoral Research Assistance

Dear [FirstName],

I hope you will participate in this brief questionnaire that investigates the perceptions and practices of Chief Advancement Officers (CAO). I am interested in the responses of CAOs as they are key decision makers.

Your participation, as a CAO in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s (CASE) District I, will greatly assist me in conducting a Pilot Study.

The final questionnaire will focus on American college and university CAOs at Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Doctoral institutions in CASE’s District II, my home district.

The questionnaire is in fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College’s New Rochelle campus.

Your participation is greatly appreciated. The survey should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete.

If you are interested in the results, please feel free to indicate your desire at the end of the survey; otherwise all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

Many thanks for your time and participation.

Kelly Brennan

Director of Alumnae/i Relations

The College of New Rochelle

(914) 654-5294

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
Appendix G

Introduction Message and Final Questionnaire
Dear [FirstName],

I hope you will participate in this brief questionnaire that investigates the perceptions and practices of Chief Advancement Officers (CAO). I am interested in the responses of CAOs as they are key decision makers.

Your participation, as a CAO in the Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s (CASE) District II, will greatly assist me in conducting this research which focuses on American college and university CAOs at Baccalaureate, Master’s, and Doctoral institutions.

The questionnaire is in fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College’s New Rochelle campus. The questionnaire has been reviewed by IRB.

Your participation is greatly appreciated. The survey should take no longer than 15 minutes to complete.

If you are interested in the results, please feel free to indicate your desire at the end of the survey; otherwise all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

Many thanks for your time and participation.

Kelly Brennan
Director of Alumnae/i Relations
The College of New Rochelle
(914) 654-5294

Here is a link to the survey:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx

This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

Please note: If you do not wish to receive further emails from us, please click the link below, and you will be automatically removed from our mailing list.
http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx
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1. Survey on the Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers

This survey will focus on Chief Advancement Officers at Baccalaureate, Masters', and Doctoral Institutions in District II of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

The survey is in fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Executive Leadership at St. John Fisher College, New Rochelle Campus. The survey has been reviewed by IRB.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

If you are interested in the results, please indicate your desire at the end of the survey; otherwise all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

Again, many thanks for your time and consideration.
2. Management Practices

1. The Advancement Office where I work offers programs/activities for the following groups (check all that apply)

- Prospective students
- Newly admitted students
- Freshman and Sophomore Students
- Junior and Senior Students
- Recent alumni
- Middle career alumni
- Peak career alumni
- Career changing alumni
- Out of work alumni
- Family/friends programming
- Alumni parent and child
- Retired alumni
- Elderly alumni

2. The Advancement Office at the college/university where I work recognizes alumni financial gifts in the following ways (check all that apply)

- Awards
- Email
- Letter from advancement office
- Letter from the president, e.g., dean/vice president
- Phone call
- Recognition event
- University print publication
- University website

Other (please specify):
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey, CASE.

3. The Advancement Office at the college/university where I work recognizes alumni volunteer efforts in the following ways (check all that apply)

- Awards
- Email
- Letter from the advancement office
- Letter from the president, e.g., dean/faculty
- Phone call
- Recognition event
- University print/publication
- University website

Other (please specify):
Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey, CASE,

3. Life Span Development

1. The Advancement Office where I work strategically targets alumni based on age.
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

2. The Advancement Office where I work implements giving strategies for the following age groups (check all that apply)
   - Young adulthood: 18 to 35
   - Middle adulthood: 36 to 65
   - Late adulthood: 66 and older
   - Age is not a factor in our giving strategy.
   - Other (please specify)

3. The Advancement Office where I work offers programs and activities for the following age groups (check all that apply)
   - Young adulthood: 18 to 35
   - Middle adulthood: 36 to 65
   - Late adulthood: 66 and older
   - Age is not a factor in our programming.
   - Other (please specify)
**Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey, CASE,**

### 4. Gender

Please respond to the following statements.

1. Thinking about your institution, in your best estimation, who has the highest percentage of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>financial giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who give to the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inconsistent giving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who make major gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those making the largest contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time spent volunteering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent service as leader or key volunteer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those who participate in university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Listed below are 6 management practices. Please indicate the gender or genders for whom these practices are targeted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Practice</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5. Operations

**1. Thinking about your institution, the Advancement Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describes to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describes Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly describes at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to manage alumni data and records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks the reasons why alumni contribute money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracks the reasons why alumni volunteer their time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to record gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records all alumni financial gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects data on gifts made outside of the advancement area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzes giving habits of alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a database to track volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collects data on alumni volunteer efforts in other areas within the institution i.e. Athletics, Campus Ministry, Career Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches volunteers to tasks based upon their skills, expertise and talents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assesses a monetary value to volunteer time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds a culture of philanthropy with students through program offerings, services and activities such as career mentoring, alumni/student networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicits students to donate to funds that support the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages students to connect/volunteer with alumni events and activities i.e. student alumni association, mentoring, regional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Do you allocate a dollar amount to the volunteer efforts of alumni?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**3. If you do or were to allocate a dollar amount to the volunteer efforts of alumni, what would you assign the per hour rate?**

- [ ] $1
- [ ] Minimum Wage
- [ ] More than Minimum Wage
- [ ] Hourly figure designated by the state

Other (please specify):
6. Perceptions on Alumni Giving and Volunteering

Using the scale provided, please respond to the following statements.

1. How important do you believe each of the following reasons are to why alumni make financial gifts to your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Hardly Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of volunteer experiences at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with a student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to financially give rather than time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide financial support to students through scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to their alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build the institution's reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association (Dues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. To what extent do the following items describe why your alumni make financial contributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describes Completely</th>
<th>Describes to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describes Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describes at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of volunteer experiences at the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with a student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to financially give rather than time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide financial support to students through scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to their alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build the institution’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the Annual Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access in the alumni association (Dues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perceptions and Practices of Chief Advancement Officers Survey, CASE,

**Q3. How important do you believe each of the following reasons are to why alumni volunteer with your alma mater?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Hardy Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of gifts given to the institution</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with students</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the institution’s reputation</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to volunteer than give a financial gift</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the College</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to the alumni association</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to alma mater</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact with students</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. To what extent do the following items describe why your alumni volunteer with your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describe to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describe Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describes at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made with advancement staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections made at university events and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of gifts given to the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of meetings with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of relationships with faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of connections to athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the institution’s reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to volunteer than give a financial gift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To compete with classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be publicly recognized in the Annual Report (print or electronic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support the college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To receive a tax break/incentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to benefits and services offered to alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gain access to the alumni association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give back to alma mater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To interact with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. As the Chief Advancement Officer at your current institution, what do you value more?

- Alumni Financial Gifts
- Alumni Volunteer Efforts
- Both Equally
7. Management Practices

1. To what extent do the following items describe your Advancement Office:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Describe Completely</th>
<th>Describe to a Large Extent</th>
<th>Describe Somewhat</th>
<th>Hardly Describe at All</th>
<th>Does Not Describe at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to solicit alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to solicit alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to steward alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to steward alumni donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to staff alumni volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to staff alumni volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to engage alumni in volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to engage alumni in volunteer efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate personnel resources to effectively recruit, train and evaluate alumni volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has adequate financial resources to effectively recruit, train and evaluate alumni volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focuses giving on alumni major donor prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values students as future participating alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values engaging students throughout their academic experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are the three top factors you consider when allocating financial resources to alumni giving?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

3. What are the three top factors you consider when allocating financial resources to volunteer efforts/programs?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

4. What are the top three factors you consider when allocating budgetary resources to personnel?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
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8. Demographics

1. What is your current title?

2. What is the title of the person to whom you report?

3. Please indicate your gender
   - Female
   - Male

4. Please indicate your ethnicity
   - African American
   - Asian/Pacific Islander
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic/Latino/a
   - Native American
   - Other (please specify)

5. Based on the college/university where you currently work, please complete the following demographic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Enrollment Size</th>
<th>Graduate Enrollment Size</th>
<th>Number of Addressable Alumni</th>
<th>Total Alumni</th>
<th>Years at Current Institution</th>
<th>Years in Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop down menu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The institution where I currently work is

   - Private
   - Public
7. The university/college where I currently work
   - has always been coeducational
   - was once single-sex - female
   - was once single-sex - male
   - is single sex - female
   - is single sex - male
   Other (please specify)

8. The college/university has been coeducational for
   - 0-25 years
   - 25-50 years
   - 50-75 years
   - 75+ years

9. In what state is your university/college located?
   - Delaware
   - District of Columbia
   - Maryland
   - New Jersey
   - New York
   - Pennsylvania
   - Puerto Rico
   - U.S. Virgin Islands
   - Virginia
   - West Virginia

10. The advancement office has separated the functions of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving
    - Yes
    - No
11. Alumna and Alumnus is defined at my institution as someone who

- [ ] has taken one class at our institution
- [ ] has earned enough credits to be within one year of graduation
- [ ] has had his/her degree conferred by the institution

Other (please specify):

-----------

12. What giving level does your institution consider a major gift?
9. Interested in the Results

1. I am interested in receiving the survey findings.
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

2. If you would like to learn about the results of this research, please fill in your contact information. Again, all survey responses will remain confidential.
   Thank you for your interest.

   Name: ____________________________
   College/University: ____________________________
   Address 1: ____________________________
   Address 2: ____________________________
   City/Town: ____________________________
   State/Province: ____________________________
   ZIP/Postal Code: ____________________________
   Country: ____________________________
   Email Address: ____________________________
   Phone Number: ____________________________
10. Thank You

Thank you for participating in this survey and adding to the field of scholarly research.

It is the researcher's hope that the results of this study will assist all those whose tirelessly advance institutions of higher education.