Title
Community College Foundations: Increasing Philanthropic Success

Author
Razo, Bridget Frances

Publication Date
2022

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Community College Foundations:

Increasing Philanthropic Success

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Bridget Frances Razo

2022

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Community College Foundations:

Increasing Philanthropic Success

by

Bridget Frances Razo

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2022

Professor Robert Cooper, Chair

Community colleges educate nearly 50% of students who complete a degree at a four-year university. Yet, California community college funding remains lower than per student funding for the UC, CSU, and K-12 systems. Community college non-profit 501(c)3 foundations provide the opportunity to generate millions in support of their colleges, and yet they remain the least understood and largely underfunded entity across California community colleges. This research examines the California community college fundraising efforts, identifying challenges and opportunities for success. Using case study methodology, surveys were sent to 114 California community college executive directors to identify the current status of community college foundations in order to narrow down the choices for the case study interviews. From the survey responses and further website research, three colleges were selected for the case studies. Selection was based on regional location, foundation model in relation to the college, and revenue generated over five years based on survey responses. Three colleges participated in interviews with their foundation executive directors, superintendent/presidents, and foundation board of directors presidents. The responses provided confirmation of existing research, extended information on others, and some significant contradictions regarding presumed funding models and operations. It is hoped that this research will reframe the approach to California community college philanthropy efforts, reexamine the role and expectation of management structures and community interactions, and, in the aggregate, will provide support to greatly increase the level of philanthropy for the underfunded community colleges.

The dissertation of Bridget Frances Razo is approved.

Christina A. Christie

Mark Hansen

Cecilia Rios-Aguilar

Robert Cooper, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2022

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, James Johannesmeyer,
who supported my efforts and was an angel on my shoulder during this process;
your spirit is always with us.

I dedicate this to our daughter Grace Johannesmeyer,
who is the light of our lives and gives me the love and strength to be my best.

I also dedicate this to my Tia Camila Razo,
who raised me and always made sure my education was a priority.
As the first in my family to go to college, I would not be here without her love and support.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many people:

My dearest husband, Jim, who was unable to see this day but is always with us, our daughter Grace, who continues to be my inspiration, and my Tia Camila who raised me to believe I could do anything. Thank you for your unwavering love and support.

My tribe of friends, who have been by my side since our first educational experience at California State University, Northridge. You are my family of choice. I treasure your love and friendship, and I thank you all for being part of my life.

My colleagues along the way. We have dealt with good situations and bad, leadership and the lack thereof, but our shared allegiance and support made us a team that produced remarkable success, providing much needed support for our students. You will always be my work family.

My dissertation committee, who gave me the support and guidance to complete this work. My hope is that this contribution may help provide educational opportunities for an increasing number of students.

Dr. Lynn Kim-John, whose involvement, kindness, and faith in my capabilities ensured the completion of my degree.

And with great appreciation and affection, I thank our Weekend Writing Warriors, Dr. Helen Ligh and Dr. David Vakil, whose regular Zoom meetings, and encouragement got us all to the finish line.

Vita

EDUCATION

Master of Public Administration, Public Policy
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 1994

Bachelor of Arts, Fine arts, minor in Anthropology, Cum Laude
California State University, Northridge, 1980

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

South Antelope Valley Education Foundation, Palmdale, CA 2016
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Antelope Valley College, Lancaster, CA 2002 - 2015
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT AND FOUNDATION

The Anderson Graduate School of Management at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 1994 - 2002
DIRECTOR, ALUMNI RELATIONS

UCLA Alumni Association, Los Angeles, CA 1987 - 1994
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, ADVISORY AND SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

VOLUNTEER LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

Lakes & Valleys Art Guild President – 2019-present
Lancaster Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors – 2012 -2015
American Red Cross Board of Directors – 2010-2013
Lancaster Museum of Art and History Board of Directors – 2009-2012
Network for CA Community College Foundations Board of Directors – 2008-2013
CASE – National Community College Advisory Committee Founding Member – 2009-2011

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

More than 2.1 million students enrolled in the California Community College system in 2014-2015 (California Community College League of California, 2016). The Master Plan for Higher Education defines their mission as “providing coursework leading to an associate degree or enabling students to transfer to a four-year college or university; offering vocational and career technical education; supporting basic skills development (such as pre-college level math and English courses); and extending a variety of self-enrichment courses to the general adult community” (Bohn, Reyes & Johnson, 2013). Unpredictable state funding for public higher education (Katsinas, 2005; Lanning, 2008; Carter, 2010) makes it difficult for the state’s community college system to provide the education and skills needed to educate the increasing number of students and to produce the number of skilled workers required for California’s economy.

To help mitigate the shortfalls in state funding, non-profit 501(c)3 foundations were established to help raise private philanthropic contributions and apply for corporate and foundation grants. Foundations provide financial assistance for students through scholarships, support educational programs and initiatives, provide campus grants for various unfunded needs, and establish long-term financial assets to support the college in perpetuity.

Historically, California community colleges were funded by the state, student fees, and local support to meet their budgetary needs (Anderson, 2004/05; Keener, 1982; Miller, 1994). The first California community college foundation dates from 1922 at Long Beach City College (Schuyler, 1997). Foundation philanthropic efforts grew with additional colleges because of the 1965 Higher Education Act, which strengthened educational resources for colleges and universities and provided financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education.

It provided additional federal funding, created scholarships, provided low-interest loans for students, and established a National Teachers Corps. In California, the 1978 passage of Proposition 13 began depleting the tax base, and by the mid-1970s, more California community colleges began adopting philanthropic models as had four-year universities (Keener, 1984).

Newly created California community college foundations often began operations with limited or no staff, and little or no financial support from the colleges they served. They have been managed by part-time volunteers, retired college administrators, or a part-time college employee. Other colleges added duties to the responsibilities of an existing employee or may have hired a single full-time employee to manage the entire fundraising function alone.

Few of the early managers had sufficient training or experience in managing a philanthropic non-profit foundation. Professional organizations such as the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), founded in 1974, and the Network for California Community College Foundations (NCCCF), and the Foundation for California Community Colleges, both founded in 1998, provided additional resources in best practices, protocols, networking, and training to help strengthen the capabilities of these new and inexperienced community college foundations. With limited staffing and fundraising experience, many of the early philanthropic donations were unsolicited gifts, primarily earmarked for student scholarships (Akin, 2005). This passive fundraising, resulting from the lack of experienced staff and budget to support proactive donor solicitations and stewardship, prevented early financial growth for community college foundations, especially when compared with the dollars raised at four-year universities that were staffed with professional development officers and receive a robust budget from their schools. There is to this day a significant difference in the amount of funds and assets procured by community college foundations as compared with four-year universities.

This study examined the current experiences of California community college foundation leaders to identify both the challenges and successes they have encountered in their institutions' philanthropic efforts. My interest in this research stems from 28 years of experience working in advancement at both a high-ranking four-year university for 15 years, and as the executive director of advancement and foundation at a local community college for 13 years. The difference in how philanthropy efforts supporting education were perceived, supported, and invested in by the university and community college could not have more different. California community colleges, no longer fully supported by state and federal funding after the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, began to depend more and more on non-profit foundations for added revenue. Unfortunately, the ensuing 44 years have demonstrated slow-moving progress towards fulfilling the financial potential possible through their foundations. This research hopes to identify some of the underlying reasons for this disparity, and perhaps provide opportunities for further growth.

The data collection method consisted of an initial survey sent to every California Community College foundation executive director (or other representative title). The survey (Appendix I) collected basic demographics about the community college, the foundation, the relationship between the college and its foundation, and identified best practices and challenges faced by the foundation executive director.

Of the 114 surveys sent to each California community college foundation via SurveyMonkey in September of 2018; 35 valid surveys were received. To date, two additional community colleges were added to the system and are not included in this research. One is Calbright Community College which is completely online but is unaccredited and has no foundation, and Madera Community College which was established on July 20, 2020, and uses

Reedley College's Foundation for any donations received. Neither of these colleges are included in this research.

To make the data comparable, only the 28 colleges that had a dedicated foundation for their college were chosen for the research. While most were from single-college districts, I included colleges from multi-college districts as long as they had their own foundation. The surveys were reviewed and tabulated. Upon review of the survey data and searching additional data from the foundation websites, three community colleges were selected as case study sites.

The basis for selection included geographic region, varying foundation management models and how they related to their colleges, and the financial success of their foundations. To represent the breadth of California's geographic regions, a college was selected from northern, central, and southern California.

The second criterium looked at varying foundation models in relationship to their colleges. The first college was a completely independent foundation with a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) who reported directly to the foundation board of directors and not to the college president. The CEO was paid by the foundation itself. The college president and the CEO were peers who partnered together in support of the college philanthropy. The second college selected was an auxiliary foundation whose staff was completely funded by the college but was limited to three positions: the executive director, and administrative assistant II, and half the salary of the accounting assistant. The other half of the accounting assistant's salary was paid by the foundation. The executive director reported to the college president. The third selected college had a foundation that was part of a combined advancement and development office. The Vice President of Advancement and Development reported to the college president, their salary and their executive assistant's salary was paid for by the college, as were all college-related advancement staff and operational costs. The vice president also served as the executive director for the foundation, and any foundation personnel and operations were funded by the foundation itself.

Due to the shutdown resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, the original intent to include site-visits for each college was limited to web research and Zoom interviews. Each college involved in the case study provided one- to two-hour semi-structured interviews with the foundation executive directors (each had different titles), the foundation board of directors presidents, and the college superintendent/presidents. The interview questions were examined by former community college executive directors from single-campus districts for their input in order to elicit the most thorough responses. The inquiry examined the challenges each faced in their professional roles, and how each representative – executive director, foundation president, and superintendent/president - responded to these challenges. Their roles, examined through a political framework, identified potential causes for the difference philanthropic success within each college. This research provides information that may help to expand fundraising success to a greater number of community colleges across the state.

Background to the Problem

When the baby-boom generation went to college in the 1960s and 1970s, public education in California was well-supported by the state legislature (Tillery and Wattenbarger, 1985). During those years, private fundraising for community colleges was a peripheral activity (Keener, Carrier, and Meaders, 2002). The belief that community colleges were state-supported institutions with no need for additional funding prevailed (Katsinas, 2005).

The student protests in the late 1960s and early 1970s created a negative reaction among state legislators and governors resulting in a more distrustful relationship between state government and colleges, including community colleges. The percentage of state funding for community colleges continued to decrease through the years. When there was increased state spending, it was directed to federally matched programs such as health care and K-12 education, placing community colleges at a lower level of the state funding priorities.

The rise of the anti-tax movement, and specifically the passage of Proposition 13 in California, put additional pressure on state budgets during recessions. Proposition 13 resulted in the reduction of property tax rates on homes, businesses, and farms by about 57%, which resulted in a drastic decrease in tax revenue that could support state funding of public institutions. "Temporary tax increases are more difficult to institute quickly, causing recessions to be more severe because public higher education operating budgets are not protected from the ebbs and flows of the economy by temporarily raising taxes" (Katsinas, 2005).

The Great Recession, beginning in December of 2007, severely reduced funding for higher education in California. Community colleges received more than $1.5 billion (in 2011 dollars) in budget cuts from 2007 through 2012 (Bohn, Reyes & Johnson, 2013). Student fees have nearly doubled over the past decade, but they haven't compensated for the decline in state funding, resulting in a reduction in total per-student funding throughout the community college system.

This deficit resulted in cutting both staff and courses. These fluctuations in California community colleges' state funding have had a significant effect on students, from access to classes to their ability to complete their coursework. There has been sharp decline in student enrollment reaching a 20-year low in 2013. Not only are fewer students being served, but fewer services are being provided to enrolled students. While there was some restoration of state funding in the 2014-2015 state budget, the likelihood of full restoration is slim, and fluctuations in funding are certain to continue (Bohn, Reyes & Johnson, 2013).

The Need for Foundations

By 1987, 53% of community colleges across the nation had established foundations (Glass, Jr. & Jackson, 1998). In the early days of the community college fundraising, the foundations served as the entities to receive unsolicited donations to the college. With little time to devote to the fundraising processes, and little knowledge of what those processes entailed, many community college foundations were limited to raising, stewarding, and administering funds to support scholarships for students (Katsinas, 2005).

While private giving to four-year universities continues to grow, community colleges receive a disproportionately small fraction of private philanthropic gifts as well as corporate and foundation grant dollars given to higher education (Lanning, 2008). The reason for this lack of fundraising success may in part be due to it not being originally woven into the fabric of the original structure of community colleges. Nonetheless, as the need for fundraising became apparent, community colleges have still neglected to sufficiently acknowledge, support, and invest in their college's development efforts.

In 2011, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) established the Center for Community College Advancement to provide training and resources to help build and sustain effective fundraising, alumni relations, and communications and marketing programs (CASE, 2014). Even with this additional support, very few California community colleges have raised funds at levels comparable to four-year universities (CASE, 2014).

The reason for this disparity in fundraising success by community colleges across the state of California is unclear. There is research examining the role of the president (Wenrich and Reid, 2003; Besikof, 2010, Bakhit, 2014), various fundraising practices (Ryan, 2003; Keener, Carrier & Meaders, 2002; Hall, 2002), and the need for adequate resources, both staffing and operational costs (Lanning, 2008; Patterson, Justice & Scott, 2012; Drummer & Marshburn, 2014) to support successful fundraising operations.

Independent and Auxiliary Institutionally Related Foundations (IRFs)

Non-profit foundations provide support to educational institutions by facilitating “the process of acquiring, receiving, and processing gifts, and managing and investing those charitable resources” (Holmes Jr., 2010). The institutionally related foundation (IRF) may be described as independent, interdependent, or dependent, subject to the relationship of the IRF to its parent institution. The CASE 2006 survey of IRFs showed that a high percentage of foundations are either independent or interdependent (auxiliary). These foundations actively pursue and carry the charge of serving the institution as its primary fundraising organization (Holmes Jr., 2010). Independent community college foundations are typically self-funded, and while supporting the community college they remain independent in their management and operations.

An auxiliary foundation is one that is partnered with an institution through a master agreement which defines the parameters of the relationship. Auxiliary foundations usually have office space within the college and operate as a college department (although independent organizations may also reside on their college campus), and the master agreement will specify the foundation’s budgetary responsibilities. According to the 2012 Foundation for California Community College’s Survey, out of 88 responses, 38% are auxiliary 501(c)3 organizations associated with a college district, 27% are auxiliaries associated with an individual college, and 35% are independent foundations.

Alumni Giving. Alumni, who are a major source of giving at the four-year universities, may not traditionally have been cultivated or asked to give by many California community colleges. At the community college level, there have been few resources directed to establishing and maintaining alumni relationships. Consistent and persistent communication, inculcating current students to their allegiance to and an ongoing relationship with their community college, engagement between alumni and the community college after they leave the campus, and continuously updated alumni databases are all elements required to turn alumni relationships into donor relationships. In addition to philanthropic efforts, staff time needed to establish and sustain relationships with alumni impact the already spare employee resources.

A predictive model of community college alumni giving "suggests that predictors are consistent with research at four-year institutions, with the likelihood of giving related to students' experience, age, wealth, and giving to other organizations. Other findings unique to community colleges conclude that alumni with an associate degree are twice as likely to give as those who did not, and alumni who gave to their four-year alma mater were nearly four times more likely to give to their two-year alma mater" (Skari, 2014).

Professional Staffing and Budgetary Needs. The relationship-building required to cultivate donors is dependent on professional fundraising staff to manage the organization's philanthropic initiatives and to integrate them within the college and its community. "Additional necessary resources have been identified as fundamental to success in this seeking of funds" (Gyllin, Miller, Morris & Grover, 2015). A financial commitment to support a professional fundraising staff, commitment of support from the college president, trustees, and foundation board of directors, and resources to support donor cultivation, programming, operations (including accounting and database management) and alumni outreach are necessary to develop the programming required to cultivate and communicate with prospective donors, alumni, grantors, and the community at large.

Research Questions

Community college foundations have the potential to raise private gifts and corporate and foundation grants to support students, educational programs, and other college and faculty initiatives. The following research questions will be used in this study to identify key factors, challenges, viable solutions, and best practiced experienced and developed by foundation executive directors so that it may expand the capacity for philanthropic giving within the statewide California community college system.

1. What challenges do California community college foundation executive directors face in their professional roles?

2. What elements do foundation executive directors say help them to be successful in their professional roles?

3. How do foundation executive directors collaborate with campus and community stakeholders to conduct their development work?

Overview of Research Design

A qualitative case study design was used for this research. A survey instrument with both quantitative and qualitative questions was used to narrow the site selection for the case studies that followed. The data collection method consisted of an initial survey sent to every California community college foundation executive director (or other representative title). The survey (Appendix 1) collected basic demographic information about the community college, the foundation, the relationship between the college superintendent/president and the foundation, and identified challenges, solutions, and best practices experienced and developed by the foundation executive directors.

Of the 114 surveys sent to each California community college foundation, 35 surveys were received. The surveys addressed five topics: 1) general background information, 2) foundation staffing, 3) budget and funding, 4) foundation board of directors and fundraising.

From the survey results and additional website research, three colleges with their own foundations were selected as case study sites. The case studies included in-depth, semi-structured interviews with foundation executive directors, foundation presidents, and their college superintendent/presidents. Through the interviews, this study investigated the roles, job preparation, expectations, organizational structures, and fundraising strategies used within each college. This examination provided information to help understand why and how some foundation executive directors have surpassed others in their fundraising efforts.

Site Selection Criteria

California has the largest system of community colleges in the nation, with 114 colleges serving more than 2.1 million students. Of those districts, 49 are single-campus districts. Not all may have foundations. Because multi-campus districts have more variety in how they structure their district foundation(s), the case studies focused on single-campus districts and multi-campus colleges that had their own foundations. This provided more consistent comparisons between the case studies.

The basis of the selection for the three case study sites included a representative college from northern, central, and southern California, varying foundation models in relation to the colleges they served, the amount of money raised in the last five years as answered in their survey responses. The case study required one- to two-hour semi-structured interviews with each of the executive directors, the foundation presidents, and the college superintendent/presidents from the three selected colleges. The interview questions were reviewed by former community college executive directors for their input to elicit the most thorough responses.

The purpose was to describe, understand, and interpret the organizational and functional interactions assuming that reality is "socially constructed" (Merriam, 2009). This focus on the case studies provided the opportunity to identify the organizational and relational behaviors that supported their successful philanthropic outcomes.

Significance

Many factors influence the philanthropic success of a college foundation. The human and financial resources available to the executive director, a strong and supportive partnership with a knowledgeable superintendent/president, managerial independence with a 501(c)3 non-profit organization, a willing and notable board of directors, the political and institutional support of the foundation by the college, and the relationships built with the college and the community all have impact on fundraising outcomes.

The college president's support and partnership with the foundation executive director is extremely important, as the president's involvement and influence are critical to securing large gifts. The strength of the executive director's relationships with both internal and external stakeholders and community members and the support of the community volunteers as members of the foundation board of directors have a vital impact on the foundation fundraising success.

It is important that the college governance systems involve the foundation executive director in pertinent institutional committees and decision-making in order to develop strategic partnerships to identify and support college needs. This study seeks to identify and explore the various challenges executive directors face within their districts and identify possible models for solutions and increased philanthropic success. Identifying how foundations have been effective in implementing successful fundraising strategies and overcoming some of the many challenges they face may provide a template for other college foundations struggling with their relevance within their institutions.

This study adds to the body of evidence supporting community college fundraising success, particularly in resource deprived community colleges. As state and federal funding for education continues to be unreliable, the focus on expanding the philanthropic capacity of California community college foundations will help to provide the increased resources needed to better support their students.

Public Engagement

The focus on the role, challenges, and opportunities faced by executive directors sheds additional light on the obstacles that prevent greater fundraising success. The nature and scope of these relational interactions may have a significant impact in expanding philanthropy in support of California community colleges.

The findings will be made available to professional organizations that support fundraising and advancement professionals, the California Community College system, and community college presidents and trustees. These organizations include the California Community College Chancellor's Office, the Foundation for California Community Colleges, the Network for California Community College Foundations (NCCCF), the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and the Council for the Aid to Education (CAE). The findings will also be made available to the Community College League of California (CCLC), including the two major organizations within the league that share the common mission of staff and fiscal resources: the California Community College Trustees (CCCT) and the Chief Executive Officers of the California Community Colleges (CEOCCC).

This research will identify additional best practices regarding the relationships between the college, the community, and the foundation, and their integrated support for philanthropic efforts on behalf of the college. As community college fundraising is still relatively new as compared with four-year university fundraising, presenting the findings to other practitioners, college leadership, and community leaders may enhance their ability to navigate the challenges and opportunities that are part of community college fundraising.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Few California community college foundations have been able to raise the level of private giving as compared with their four-year university counterparts. A discussion of the factors that may have influenced this outcome will be discussed in this chapter. The discussion begins with a brief history of community colleges, the growth and development of community colleges, changes in the community college mission, and state funding available for California community colleges. The unpredictable revenue stream has made it difficult to serve the needs of students seeking this entry to higher education (Lanning, 2008; Ryan, 2003; Glass & Jackson, 1998). As a result, most community colleges have turned to private giving through institutionally related foundations (IRFs) to generate additional revenue (Ryan, 2003).

This next topic examines fundraising in higher education and the key factors that support community college philanthropy. These including institutional support, organizational structure, foundation management, college and foundation interdependence and independence, fundraising methods, and donor cultivation and stewardship, including the role of community college alumni. The literature review concludes with an examination of the California community college fundraising efforts, including the varied organizational structures, the relationship with their respective community colleges, and established fundraising strategies. The leadership and organizational behavior of the foundation was examined using Bolman and Deal's (2008) political framework, particularly the relationship of the foundation executive directors to the college president, administration, and college community.

Community College History

To better understand the elements that contribute to private giving to educational institutions, it is helpful to understand the origins of community colleges and their role within higher education. A more recent addition to higher education opportunities in the United States, two-year junior colleges first developed in the early 20th century. In response to economic challenges, national and local leaders sought to provide opportunities to create a more skilled workforce. The growth in public high schools also provided an incentive to find new ways to provide educational opportunities for their communities. High schools commonly added teacher institutes, vocational education, or citizenship schools to their diploma programs (Gilroy, 2001).

Early community colleges were small, rarely enrolling more than 150 students. The oldest existing public two-year college was high school based. Developed at Central High School in Joliet, Illinois, Joliet Junior College was founded in 1901 (American Association of Community Colleges, 2016). William Raney Harper, president of the University of Chicago, was instrumental in the early beginnings of the national junior college movement. Harper proposed a national two-year system for students who were likely to complete their education and seek jobs as teachers or go into business pursuits.

California Community Colleges

California's first junior college began in 1910 when C. L. McLane, then superintendent of schools for the city of Fresno, helped to establish Fresno Junior College. The first class consisted of 20 students and three instructors (Fresno City College, Facts & History, 2016). By the mid-1920s, the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) defined junior colleges as including a broad scope of community and vocational education. In California, the junior college regulations of 1921 included a provision for "courses of instruction designed to prepare persons for agriculture, industry, commerce, home-making, and other vocations, and such other courses of instruction as they deemed necessary (Ricciardi, 1928).

In 1947, President Harry S. Truman commissioned a report on higher education. The report, the President's Commission on Higher Education, popularized the term community college, which described a college that would fit into the community as the high school had. The conversion of military-based industries to consumer goods after World War II provided new opportunities for skilled workers. The economic transformation that ensued, along with the GI Bill, generated the drive for additional options in higher education. The Truman Commission resulted in the proposed creation of a network of public-community based colleges to serve local needs.

California's junior colleges led the rest of the nation in developing career programs (Monroe, 1972, p.84). Pasadena and Los Angeles junior colleges were stated to be two of the most technical education-oriented colleges in the state. Pasadena's pioneering use of counseling and testing helped to appropriately place students unlikely to attain a bachelor's degree in other fitting terminal programs (Brint & Karabel, 1989, p. 60). Advisory boards, employer needs surveys, and cooperative education programs provided educational leadership for junior college student opportunities.

The Role of Community Colleges in the California Master Plan

In 1960, California's State Board of Education and the UC Regents appointed a survey team to develop the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Drafted during the administration of Governor Pat Brown, the plan established a coherent system for higher education, which defined roles for the existing colleges and universities (UC Office of the President, 2016). These included the University of California (UC), the California State College (CSC) system of senior colleges, which is now the California State University (CSU) system, and the California Community Colleges system (CCC). The Master Plan included a statutory framework to implement the plan, called the Donahoe Higher Education Act (Rainey, 2014).

The 1960 California Master Plan for Education identified the mission for California community colleges, which is to serve all adults that can benefit from instruction, made possible through unrestricted access and low fees (Brint & Karabel, 1989). UCs were to "select from" the top one-eighth (12.5 percent) of the high school graduating class and CSU was to “select from” the top one-third (33.3 percent) of the high school graduating class (Yamada, 2010). California community colleges were designed to admit any student capable of benefitting from instruction. Community colleges served multiple student needs: transfer education, remediation, vocational training, workforce development, English as a Second Language (ESL), basic skills and personal enrichment (Abrahamson, 2006). This support for public education was in keeping with California’s commitment to equitable access for all who qualified in the interest of the public good (Yamada, 2010).

The 1978 passage of Proposition 13, the anti-property tax initiative, began years of chronic underfunding of public education. Privatization and choice in the form of vouchers, charter schools, online education, and for-profit education corporations were thought to correct the failing, underfunded schools. The recession in 2008 produced more serious budget cuts that resulted in limited student admission to UC and CSU, sending large numbers of students to two-year institutions. Budget cuts and the increased demand by students deferred from four-year universities resulted in an aggressive program of cost-cutting and enrollment management to preserve as many classes as possible. Tuition was increased, faculty terminated, staff furloughed, and the notion of public education defined as a public good rather than a commodity was in jeopardy (Yamada, 2010).

As funding required to serve multiple student needs became more unreliable, non-profit foundations were established to support and enhance the mission of California community colleges. Campuses needed to support themselves by forming private ventures known as “auxiliaries,” resulting in a public-private organization (Yamada, 2010). Foundations who developed this interdependence are considered auxiliary foundations, whose exchange of goods and services is defined by the Master Agreement with the college. Foundations, whether auxiliary or independent, were, by necessity, developed within the majority of California community college districts. While the majority of California community colleges partner with their auxiliary foundation, some foundations remain independent, supporting their institution while being self-supporting and separate from the institution.

Recent reviews of the California Master Plan resulted in the state legislature granting the CSU system permission to award a Doctor of Education in 2006, and to allow certain community colleges to offer four-year degrees in 2014. The consideration of educational priorities has drawn increased scrutiny of the original Master Plan, with “hopes to reevaluate the master plan to bring the three systems closet together and put lowering tuition back on the table” (Rainey, 2014).

Fundraising in Higher Education

Fundraising for educational institutions began in the colonial era with a gift from John Harvard in 1638 to found Harvard College (Curti & Nash, 1965). This was the first private support for higher education. Community colleges, originally called “junior colleges,” were not established until 263 years later, in 1901 (American Association of Community Colleges, 2016). While the earliest community college foundation in California is estimated to be at Long Beach City College in 1910, there was little need for increased community college fundraising efforts and private giving in California until the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, which greatly reduced the tax revenue that provided funding for education.

University Fundraising

The traditional approach to fundraising for some of this country’s oldest private institutions began with private solicitations of the wealthy and of businessmen, much of which were sought privately and with discretion. The notion of philanthropy to include mass giving conducting annual solicitations and multiyear fundraising campaigns created a more democratized fundraising system (Kimball, 2012).

Yale established the first permanent alumni fund, the Yale Alumni Fund Association, in 1890 (Seymour, 1988), and the oldest independent but affiliated foundation created to aid a state institution with private resources is the University of Kansas Endowment Association established in 1893 (Luck & Tolle, 1978). The Yale Alumni Fund Association was separately incorporated in June 1890, and the Yale president appointed nine directors. Passive announcements for solicitations were followed by active annual solicitations, facilitated through a network of class agents (Kimball, 2012). The change in basic assumptions was that not only large gifts from the wealthy could support Yale, but alumni could also participate in giving even though they might not be able to give large gifts.

By 1899, Yale initiated a mass appeal to alumni in honor of its bicentennial in 1901, which raised nearly $2 million to fund new buildings and other projects (Kimball, 2012). In 1904, Harvard College created an alumni appeal that netted nearly $2.5 million for an endowment. The Harvard Endowment Fund (HEF) introduced the mass campaign into higher education between 1915 and 1925 (Kimball, 2012). Mass appeals were directed toward unrestricted endowment, which had previously been supported by wealthy donors, often as bequests. In this manner, the “HEF encouraged small givers to act even more like major donors” (Kimball, 2012, p. 182). These fundraising campaigns were managed by alumni workers and volunteers from the leading universities.

Support for public colleges and universities began in the early 1900s, when state resources were stretched thin, and funding was needed to build campus facilities. (Holmes, Jr., 2010). Institutionally related foundations (IRFs) were established to facilitate the process of managing private funds. Some foundations directed fundraising programs, while others focused on the oversight of funds management. With the establishment of IRFs, colleges and universities began to rely on charitable giving for “annual operational supplements, capital purposes, or endowed funds" (Holmes, 2010 p. 27). The inclusion of private giving created a tripod of funding for public institutions, which included tuition and fees, and grants.

While varying in emphasis during the century, this funding triad continued through the 20th century. Prior to the 1960s, public colleges and universities were described as "state-supported." Low tuition allowed access to a broader student population. As state funding became less dependable to cover costs, charitable giving became increasingly important to maintain access, support capital projects, and attract and retain faculty. The responsibility for funding higher education expanded to include state appropriations, tuition, grants and contracts, and private giving.

The need for philanthropic foundations grew during the twentieth century. Foundations, with their IRS designation as 501(c)3 organizations, can facilitate the process of managing private gifts to a greater advantage than their institutions. They maintain the confidentiality of donors' gifts and the appropriate stewardship of the same, and the board of directors serves as a fiduciary for the donor gifts. The relationship of the IRFs can be described as dependent, interdependent, or independent from the institutions they serve. Much of the relationship depends on the operational funding model and the formal agreements established between the foundation and its institution.

California Community College Foundations

Four-year universities have a much longer history of private giving than do community colleges. Community college and university foundations are "idiosyncratic, reflecting the peculiarities of individual institutional cultures, state and system contexts, and financial and political circumstances" (Bass, 2003). Regional and local community influences govern community colleges to a greater extent than universities, and student diversity is greater.

Until recently, California community colleges have not given priority to private giving, and alumni relations have been minimally addressed or nonexistent (Herbin, Dittman, Herbert, & Ebben, 2006). The historic lack of institutional support for fundraising at the community college level has resulted in fewer gifts to community colleges as compared with four-year universities, and alumni remain a large untapped pool of prospective community college donors (Skari, 2012).

The early community college foundations primarily served to receive unsolicited gifts to college, the majority of which were scholarship donations. These were managed by the institution itself rather than by an established fundraising office. Because community colleges were largely state supported, there was little need for private gifts for the general operations of the educational institution. There was limited fundraising efforts because there was little need for such.

Fundraising History

In California, the earliest available records indicate that Long Beach City College established a foundation in 1922, the year it was founded (Jenkins & Glass, 1999). However, the current Long Beach City College Foundation website states that the foundation was established in 1978, indicating that there was a period of dormancy prior to reestablishing the foundation. National records of community college affiliated foundations are sparse, so the growth and expansion are difficult to track (Jenkins and Glass, 1999). Vincennes University, a two-year college in Indiana, established a foundation in 1942, and Santa Monica College created a foundation in 1955 (Robinson, 1982). The financial instability felt by community colleges is relatively recent. The early 1960s to the early 1970s saw an expansion of community college facilities, enrollment, and growth. The priority of these institutions was to grant access and opportunity for students, and few sought to establish private giving through foundations (Smith, 1993).

The 1965 Higher Education Act and the federal funding opportunities it offered reduced the state contribution to California community colleges. The law increased federal money given to universities, created scholarships, created low-interest student loans, and established a National Teacher's Corps (Keener, 1984). "Community colleges began by tapping into the sources of external federal support offered through grant and contract competitions" (Schuyler, 1997). Nonetheless, public funding seemed sufficient to support the growth in community colleges during the early 1960s and 1970s, so trustees and college presidents did not feel the urgency to pursue private funding (Akin, 2005).

Private fundraising efforts have evolved since the 1960s. Economic swings and social changes, reactions against student protests and the desire for tax reductions during this decade set the stage for diminished state funding for higher education in the future. By the 1970s, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) encouraged community and junior colleges to initiate private fundraising efforts. The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education opened its membership to include community and junior colleges in 1974 (Glass, Jr. & Jackson, 1998).

In California, the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, a constitutional amendment limiting property taxes, resulted in decreased property taxes and began the reduction in tax funds to support community college education (Katsinas, 2005). Federal grants and matching funds were used to replace some of the shortfalls, but by 2004 Medicaid costs became the funding priority in the state (Katsinas, Palmer, and Tollefson, 2004). The fiscal turbulence continues to this day, further impacted by the increased demand for community college education.

The 1990s through the turn of the 21st century brought an increased focus on community college fundraising across the nation. Tidal Wave II, a significant increase in the nation's high school graduates, increased the need for community college access between 2000 and 2006 (Hardy, Katsinas, and Bush, 2007). The increased demand and the unreliable state funding created an untenable situation for the California community college. "Because community colleges are more dependent on state funds than other sectors of higher education (Hebel, 2003), reductions hurt more than they do at four-year colleges and other universities" (Katsinas, 2005).

Professional organizations such as the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) began offering targeted conferences specific to the needs of community college fundraising and advancement functions in the mid-2000s. In 2011, CASE strengthened its commitment to community colleges by establishing the Center for California Community College Advancement and partnered with the Network for California Community College Foundations (NCCCF). Training has been available for community college presidents and trustees to help inform them of successful fundraising practices. There have been some strides in fundraising success within California community colleges, however the dollars raised by most of the colleges continue to remain far below those of four-year universities.

Factors for Successful Fundraising

California community college foundation offices have operated with little standardization. The organizational structure, scope of responsibility, staffing levels, and district funding provided, vary from district to district. The purpose of community college foundations is to develop and implement fundraising programs and initiatives that generate private support for the college; fundraising priorities are determined by the college in partnership with the foundation itself. Because of the scarcity of funding, foundations were often established with little to no resources set aside by the college to support adequate staffing or operational budgets.

While a more mature foundation may raise enough revenue through private gifts to become partially self-supporting, newly created community college foundations frequently struggle without the necessary support to generate significant gifts.

Resource development, or development, is a term typically used at universities to describe the strategies and practices of fundraising, and fundraising offices may be called the development office. Development offices at universities are typically considered a department of the university. The term “advancement” defines a group of activities that advance the college within the community and include fundraising (development efforts and the management of institutionally related foundations), alumni relations, marketing, and communications, and public (media) relations. Advancement is sometimes mistakenly used to define fundraising practices alone, including the management of the institutionally related foundation. The advancement model is used to leverage each of these external relations components to create public-private partnerships between the college and its community (CASE, 2016; Bass, 2013). Frequently, development, advancement, and fundraising are terms that are used interchangeably.

The term foundation defines the non-profit 501(c)3 organization that receives, manages, and has the fiduciary responsibility for private gifts. Foundations are overseen by a volunteer board of directors. Fundraising offices are frequently mislabeled as foundation offices since they include fundraising operations and programs in addition to the management of the foundation board itself. However, the establishment of a non-profit foundation alone is not enough. A professional office with staff trained in the practices and requirements of fundraising management are needed to adequately support the foundation. The staff must oversee prospect identification and cultivation, fiduciary responsibilities, and donor stewardship. With the growth of the foundation, additional staff may be required to manage major gifts, corporate and foundation grants, annual giving, and planned giving. The operational staff includes at a minimum a database manager, gift processor and an accountant. An alumni relations staff member is needed as the focus on alumni identification and cultivation increases.

Institutionally Related Foundations (IRFs)

California community colleges established institutionally related foundations (IRFs) as IRS 501(c)3 non-profit organizations that facilitate the processes of receiving, processing, managing, stewarding, or investing charitable gifts (Holmes, Jr., 2010). Foundations are beneficial to public community colleges in that they can perform many of the needed functions without the constraints of requirements and restrictions that are placed on the colleges by the state.

An IRF may be dependent, interdependent, or independent from the college it serves. The type of relationship often depends on how the foundation is funded and its interrelationship with the college it serves. Independent community college foundations are typically self-funded, and while supporting the community college they remain independent in their operations. There is a collaboration with the college and fundraising priorities continue to be made in collaboration with the college.

Auxiliary foundations are more closely tied to the college as defined by a Master Agreement. Some or all the fundraising staff may be paid for the college in lieu of the added financial and external relations benefit the foundation provides for the college. Office space is often provided within the college free of charge to the foundation. Certain college functions, such as mail services, reprographics, research, and student services areas, including financial aid, may work in close coordination with the fundraising office and foundation management. This agreement defines the financial, operational, and human relations relationship for supporting fundraising efforts. (Holmes, Jr., 2012).

Foundation Board of Directors

Foundation management includes supporting the board of directors. These are community members whose board of directors’ responsibilities include assuring fiduciary conformance related to the administration of gifts and to engage in fundraising efforts. They are the conduit between the community college foundation and the community at large. Their role is to educate, advocate, and promote the college within the community, as well as identify questions, concerns, or needs that the community may share with them about the college (O’Connell, 2003).

The selection of board members is critical to ensure they have the skills, abilities, and requisite knowledge needed to effectively conduct their roles as board members and fundraisers (McDonald, J. G., 1995). The board acts as trustee of the organization's assets and ensures that the nonprofit is professionally managed and remains fiscally sound. In doing so, the board must exercise proper oversight of the organization's operations and maintain the legal and ethical accountability of its staff and volunteers (Foundation Center, 2015).

A Foundation governance committee usually manages the identification, recruitment, and training of board members. The committee of board members is responsible for developing or refining board position descriptions, evaluates the needs of the board, and develops a profile of individuals needed to fill vacancies. It works within the board to identify individuals to fill board positions, ensure diversity, help create and present new member board orientation, and is responsible for the ongoing education of the board (Lysakowski, 2004). Board members “must also be educated concerning their responsibilities, general principles of fundraising, and giving opportunities available through the foundation” (Patterson, Justice & Scott, 2012).

Fundraising Management. The staff member responsible for the foundation has many names throughout the California community college system. Some are directors, the majority are executive directors, and at this time a limited number are vice presidents or chief executive officers. This position, which will be referred to as executive director for consistency, is typically the primary fundraiser for the college, and their role within the college and the community is critical to fundraising success. The executive director may serve on a variety of college committees, thereby having access to grassroots planning and budgetary discussions and upcoming financial priorities. The executive director must collaborate with the superintendent/president or chancellor and the foundation board and may be evaluated by either or both. Additional duties may be assigned to the executive director, substantially reducing the amount of time available to his or her primary responsibility, raising money (Patterson, Justice, & Scott, 2012).

As stated in Patterson, Justice, and Scott's 2012 study, the most crucial factors in evaluating a community college foundation's operation as ranked by the foundation executive directors were "Number of repeat donors," an "Increase in individual giving." and "Total dollars raised." Four roles key to the foundation executive director's interactions with other institutional leaders have been identified: fundraiser, catalyst, manager, and leader (Worth & Asp, 1994). As fundraisers, the executive directors "form strong relationships with potential donors and inspire them to give" (p. 99). As catalysts, they organize development activities but do not participate in the solicitations, but rather prompt the president, board, faculty, and staff in supporting the acquisition of gifts. The manager role concentrates on the fundraising infrastructure, event planning, publications development and resource management. In the role of leader, the executive director plays a larger role in long-term strategic and institutional planning (Worth & Asp, 1994).

The college president and executive director's relationship in fundraising supports including the executive director as a member of the president's cabinet or executive committee. It is recommended that the presidents take steps to ensure that the executive directors are treated as equal members of the group to ensure their fundraising efforts are recognized by the institutions they serve (Patterson, Justice, & Scott, 2012). This study also supported literature from the past two decades emphasizing that the president must lead the way in fundraising. This fundraising structure is like that of four-year universities, although the more established universities with larger development staff use their president's time and influence judiciously, particularly to meet with the top donors, make key presentations, or final solicitations and negotiations for larger gifts.

Staffing the Fundraising Office. Compared with four-year universities, California community college foundations have traditionally been understaffed and underfunded (Lanning, 2008; Skari, 2014). Foundations that have a significant endowment and have the capacity to invest in their fundraising activities by hiring additional staff, increasing marketing and community outreach. More recently established foundations frequently do not have the level of endowment or net assets needed to provide sufficient operational budget or staffing to grow their programs and increase fundraising effectiveness. "The only element holding up success in securing charitable support is funding the cost of fundraising" (Holmes, Jr., 2010).

A study of California Community Colleges (CCC) was conducted over the course of nearly six months in early 2010. Supported by the Kreske Foundation, the study examined the capacity of the colleges' fundraising programs within the California community college system (Foundation for California Community Colleges, 2010). This study was conducted through a series of interviews, focus groups, and an online survey that included numerous community college perspectives. In this study, 88 foundation or advancement leaders participated in one-hour phone interviews, and 58 completed a supplemental online survey. Three key themes emerged throughout the study

- Respondents have a general sense of untapped capacity, with lack of staffing and resources for fundraising, along with a lack of adequate tools and training being noted frequently in the interviews and discussion groups.
- There is a “lack of integrated fund development planning into colleges’ overall strategies, as well as relevant data on the topic. Many foundation leaders and advancement professionals noted that the foundations are not engaged with college leadership in achieving the strategic goals of the college. This is exacerbated by the fact that data demonstrating the value or ROI on fund development practices is lacking or poorly designed which indicates there are limitations in the colleges’ ability to effectively communicate the value of this area.
- The CCC system is a highly decentralized and complex structure that limits action in key areas.” (p. 3).

The discussion of fundraising strategies touched on the need for staff and financial resources to create a robust fundraising program within California community college foundations. The 2012 California community college survey indicated that “the average amount of funds that community college foundations raised over the last five years increased in association with an increase of foundation staff members. Foundations with a staff of six or more members raised an average of $12,996,416, while foundations with one or less staff members raised an average of $2,568,916 over the last five years” (p. 13). In the same survey, 38% of the colleges responding had a staff of one full-time employee or less, 45% have between one and five full-time staff members, and 17% have six or more full time staff members. While these numbers are consistent with the pattern found in four-year universities, community colleges have remained hesitant to provide the necessary resources to ensure greater fundraising success.

Fundraising and Theoretical Frameworks

Community college fundraising practices have similarities to those of four-year universities; however, some practices are not immediately applicable. Alumni tend to be the largest group of donors supporting four-year universities. The nature of community colleges, with many transitional students attending more than one school, creates a unique challenge to establish the type of relationships with community college alumni that will support alumni giving. Instead, retirees who have taken continuing education and recreational classes can be a valuable source of private gifts (Bass, 2003). The success of community college fundraising must be viewed through a different frame than traditional university fundraising. Foundations and advancement efforts can play a vital role in this institutional evolution.

Integrated College Fundraising Efforts

Community colleges are uniquely positioned to provide support for the interest of external community constituents. They can respond to the needs of changing technology and innovation in businesses and provide training and educational support in these areas. Community colleges can align an ambitious and transformative vision with the eternal constituents including city, state, and federal governments along with local businesses and nonprofits (Sausner, 2003).

While California community colleges have been adept at partnering with community businesses and corporations to cultivate alternative revenue sources, they have not followed a uniform fundraising model. Four-year institutions and their development offices have professional staff overseeing alumni relations, planned giving, corporate and foundation relations, and marketing and communications; community colleges have typically had one or two staff members responsible for all development functions (Bass, 2003). The role of community college foundations has been to develop relationships between the institution, the community they serve, and the prospective donors that contribute to the foundations (Glass & Jackson, 1998). Their view is based upon “an open system in which the institutional advancement process as a form of negotiation between environmental demands and organizational needs” (p. 721).

Advancement Models

Development efforts as an integrated part of an advancement office include public relations, publications, alumni relations, and sometimes government relations in their scope of responsibilities. Advancement organizational structures leverage the external relations of the college to enhance fundraising efforts. “The integration of advancement as a core function of the institution, the inclusion of advancement officers within leadership teams, and the integration of advancement and strategic planning have allowed innovative community colleges to align revenue strategies with evolving institutional visions and roles in the community” (Bass, 2003, p. 21). Aligning institutional vision with donor interests and sophisticated integrated marketing can serve the community college fundraising efforts well.

Theoretical Framework. Bolman and Deal’s (2008) theory describes the use of distinctive “frames” through which people view the world. Their four-frame model examines organizations through varying lenses or foci, which may impact an organization’s operational effectiveness. The four frames -- structural, human resource, political and symbolic frames -- may be used as tools to enhance organizational relationships and effectiveness.

This study will examine the role, management structure, opportunities, and challenges experienced by foundation executive directors from colleges with their own foundations within the California Community College system. The nature and strength of the relationship between the fundraising office, the foundation board of directors, the college, and the community it serves may have an impact on effective fundraising efforts, and certainly on the college’s ability to rely on external revenue sources. Fundraising is most effective when it is an integrated function within today’s community colleges, including other private-public partnerships beyond fundraising, will be critical for the future strength of community colleges (Keener, Carrier and Meaders, 2002).

Conclusion

The literature demonstrates the growing importance of philanthropy in California community colleges. There are many factors involved in successful fundraising efforts, and this study will attempt to identify why some community colleges in California are more successful than others. Through semi-structured interviews with foundation executive directors, foundation board of directors presidents, and superintendent/presidents from single campus districts, this study attempted to identify the challenges, opportunities, and political and operational structures that impact their fundraising success. This study sought to identify the level of integration and strength of relationships between the development office, the foundation, their respective institutions, and their communities. The types of development strategies employed and the role the development efforts play in support of the college were examined. This qualitative study focusing on the foundation executive directors' experiences and perspectives will help identify common traits that could be further generalized to provide increased fundraising success to other community colleges.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to understand the changing role of California community college foundation executive directors and the leadership framework most effective in supporting their fundraising efforts. The insight gained through this research may provide additional strategies and processes to improve the philanthropic outcomes in support of their colleges. This study seeks to understand why some colleges raise millions of dollars annually, while others struggle to meet and exceed the $1 million annual fundraising milestone (CASE Survey of Community College Foundation, 2014). While many California community college foundations have experienced increasing fundraising success, the majority still fall short of their four-year university counterparts in their fundraising capacity (Craft and Guy, 2002; Lanning, 2008; Bellafante, 2014). The uncertainty of federal and state funding for public education compels community college foundations to become more effective in providing financial support to meet increasing educational needs.

This study examines the role of the foundation executive directors to identify both the challenges and opportunities they experience as California community college foundation managers. Through this research, the impact of these challenges and experiences are examined to determine how they have affected their fundraising success. How is their role structured within the framework of the community college administration? Are they responsible only for the college foundation with duties that target fundraising, or must they split their time with other administrative roles and responsibilities? Do they feel they have the support needed in terms of human and financial resources, support from the college superintendent/president, their foundation board of directors, and the community at large? What influences their response to these challenges, and what do they feel helps them to succeed in their roles?

Using Bolman and Deal's (2008) theories of leadership and organization, how the political frame impacts an executive director's ability to effectively raise private, corporate and foundation support for their institutions was examined. The political frame posits that organizations "are both arenas for internal politics and political agents with their own agendas, resources, and strategies" (Bolman and Deal, 2008). The limited availability of college funding and the political capacity of executive directors to impact both internal and external community stakeholders can make the political frame one of the most challenging to navigate. Managing the change in fundraising initiatives, creating support within the organization, and managing both up and down in the process of developing relationships with alumni and prospective donors as well as the college president, faculty, and staff can be precarious at best. By looking at the "potential for collaboration, the importance of long-term relationships, and, most important, their own values and ethical principles" (Bolman and Deal, 2008), the political arena navigated by the foundation executive director can impact the institution's fundraising success.

This research is informed my own 28-year experience in higher education advancement and development efforts. The familiarity with the subject matter allowed me to ask and understand the pertinent questions during the interviews. The case study interviews were conducted with the utmost objectivity. In addition, I have not worked in higher education for the past seven years, and my interest was in learning what has changed and what has remained the same.

Research Questions

This study will answer the following research questions:

1. What challenges do California community college foundation executive directors face in their professional roles?

2. What elements do foundation executive directors say help them to be successful in their professional roles?

3. How do foundation executive directors collaborate with campus and community stakeholders to conduct their development work?

Research Design

Merriam (2009) states that qualitative studies “search for meaning and understanding, the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection and analysis, an inductive investigative strategy, and the end-product being richly descriptive” (p. 39). This qualitative case study examined the experiential context of three California community college philanthropies. It provides an in depth understanding of the foundation executive directors’ current roles and experiences in managing community college philanthropies, as well as the roles of the college superintendent/president and the foundation board of directors president in support of those efforts.

Case study research allows one to examine, in depth, a complex social phenomenon in its real-life context (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2014). Quantitative studies provide data answering the questions of what, how many, and the relationships between the phenomena and events, and would not, for this research, provide the in depth understanding of the experiences of a development office. Qualitative methods are preferred when the inquiry answers “how” and “why” questions. The research is more explanatory, and the case study is the preferred research method (Yin, 2014).

A qualitative multi-site case study provided “a rich and holistic account of phenomenon” that could not be captured by a quantitative study using survey research alone. A multi-site case study provides more robust evidence than a sole case (Yin, 2014). As Merriam (2009) states, “Case study has been proven particularly useful for studying educational innovations, evaluating programs and informing policy” (p. 51).

The phenomenon under study was how community college foundation executive directors work to increase their non-profit foundation revenue in politically challenging and resource-deprived environments. The revenue refers to the funds generated through its primary operations, including contributions, fundraising activities, memberships, and service fees. This case study used multiple sources of evidence: organizational, document, and program analysis through foundation web sites, survey analysis to help narrow down the cases for the study, and interviews with the three selected college foundation executive directors (regardless of title), college presidents, and foundation board of directors' presidents. The original research design included campus site visits, but the onset of COVID-19 prevented those in-person visits. This research provides in depth insights into challenges the executive directors face in their positions at their institutions. The resulting research was examined through Bolman and Deal's (2008) political frame and examined how the executive directors work to overcome these challenges.

Sites and Participants

Site Selection

The survey information was compiled to identify the landscape of college demographics and foundation programs. The information provided the research needed to narrow down and select the three colleges for the case studies. Additional information on the foundation operations were gathered from the colleges' foundation websites. The basis of the selection for the three case study sites included a representative college from northern, central, and southern California, varying foundation models in relation to the colleges they served, and the amount of money raised in the last five years as answered in their survey responses.

Due to the campus shutdowns during the COVID pandemic, the site visits planned for the case study research had to be eliminated. Instead, three in depth, semi-structured interviews of the foundation executive director, college superintendent/president, and foundation board of directors president were completed via Zoom.

The California community college system is the largest of any state in the nation. While it would be impossible to represent all the diversity represented across the state, this research sought to select colleges that most closely represent the breadth of California's geographic regions. To that end, a college was selected from northern, central, and southern California.

The second criterion looked at varying foundation models in relationship to their colleges. One was a completely independent foundation with a chief executive officer who reported directly to the foundation board of directors and not to the college president. The second was an auxiliary foundation whose staff was completely funded by the college but were limited to three positions: the executive director, and administrative assistant II, and half the salary of the accounting assistant. The executive director reported to the college president. The third selected college had a foundation that was part of a combined advancement and foundation office. The vice president of advancement and development reported to the college president, their salary and their confidential executive assistant's salary were paid for by the college, as were all college-related advancement staff and operational costs. The vice president also served as the executive director for the foundation, and any foundation personnel and operations were funded by the foundation itself. It is worth noting that the vice president of advancement and development was paid a higher salary than the other vice presidents due to the significant revenue and community partnerships they provided to the college.

The third criterion was the dollar amount raised within the past five years as indicated on the survey responses. Two of the selected colleges (those with significantly more staff) raised upward of $20 million dollars. The third college selected had a staff of three, and they raised between $3 and $5 million during the previous five years.

Participants Interviewed

The focus of this research was California community college foundation executive directors and included their most significant partners at the college: the superintendent/president and the foundation board of directors president. A qualitative multi-site case study of three selected colleges was completed using semi-structured interviews with California community college foundation executive directors, superintendent/presidents, and foundation board of directors presidents. These interviews provided “a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon” that could not be captured by a quantitative study that relied on survey research or experimental approaches alone (Merriam, 2009, p.51). The interviews investigated the roles, job preparation, expectations, organizational structure, and fundraising strategies to understand why and how some foundation executive directors have surpassed others in their fundraising efforts. According to Seidman (2013), qualitative research using interviews “is a powerful way to gain insight into educational and other important social issues through understanding the experience of the individuals whose lives reflect those issues.” While the role of community college presidents in fundraising has been explored, there is little research available using interviews from the perspective of the foundation executive directors. The insight gained through this research may improve the philanthropic outcomes in support of their colleges.

The role of a foundation executive director and the challenges and opportunities that help them succeed in fundraising were examined through Bolman and Deal’s political frame. The purpose is to describe, understand, and interpret the organizational and functional interactions assuming that reality is “socially constructed” (Merriam, 2009). This type of focus was chosen because of the need to identify the organizational and relational behaviors in the selected sites that support effective fundraising outcomes (Craft and Guy, 2002; Carter, 2010, Glass Jr. and Jackson, 1998). While there is research examining effective fundraising practices (Carlson, 2003;

Besikof, 2010; Worth, 2012), there is variation in fundraising models and practices used across California community college foundations resulting in uneven fundraising success across the state (CASE Survey of Community College Foundations, 2014). The most often cited challenge is the lack of development staffing to create a robust fundraising program. This is a particular challenge for more recently established foundations who have had no professional, experienced staff and as a result, limited fundraising success.

This research elicited the participants' experience and views of fundraising and their other responsibilities within the college and the community. The political framework was used to examine the foundations' fundraising success, the organizational model used in the foundations' relation to the college, the number of foundation staff and who is responsible for their salaries and benefits, the relationship and support by the college superintendent/president and administration, and the external community. These relationships have a strong political grounding, the navigation of which may provide challenges and/or opportunities to the foundation executive director. This qualitative, exploratory study will help the field of community college philanthropy because little research has been conducted examining the roles and challenges faced by community college foundation executive directors as examined through Bolman and Deal's (2008) the political frame.

Research Methods

Data Collection Methods

To get the most holistic view of each college's case study, multiple sources of data collection were used to allow the researcher to establish converging lines of evidence, making the findings more robust (Yin, 2004). The data collection methods used in this study were: surveys, website analysis, and case study interviews. Due to limitations imposed during the

COVID-19 pandemic, the anticipated site visits of the three community colleges used for the interviews were canceled. Instead, the nine persons were interviewed via a Zoom call.

Survey of Foundation Executive Directors

The research began with an initial demographic survey (Appendix IV) regarding their foundations sent to all 114 community colleges in September 2018 via SurveyMonkey. Of the 114 surveys sent, 35 valid surveys were received. To make the data comparable, only the 28 colleges that had a dedicated foundation for their college were chosen for this research. While most were from single-college districts, I included colleges from multi-college districts as long as they had their own foundation. The surveys were reviewed and tabulated, and from the responses, three community colleges were selected for the case study interviews.

The California community college system is the largest in the nation. Out of the 114 California community colleges at the time of the initial survey, 102 had institutionally related foundations. To date, two additional community colleges were added to the system and are not included in this research. One is Calbright Community College, which is completely online and is unaccredited and has no foundation, and Madera Community College, which was established on July 20, 2020 and uses Reedley College's Foundation for any donations. Multi-campus districts may have a foundation for each individual community college, or they may share one foundation for the entire district.

There are 49 single-campus community college districts within California. Because California community colleges share the same state and federal funding sources, they share similar financial challenges resulting in the need for their foundations to augment their financial resources. By limiting this research to California community colleges, we can identify the challenges faced by foundation executive directors who are operating within the same statewide budgetary framework.

The purpose of the survey was to assess the college demographics and foundation background in order to select the three colleges for the case study interviews. The surveys were addressed to the individual whose role was to oversee the college foundation, regardless of title. The survey included questions regarding population, number of students, single- or multi-campus districts, but also solicited responses regarding the college and foundation support of philanthropic efforts, the understanding of the role of the foundation by the college itself, greatest challenges, and greatest successes. This provided data on a variety of foundations, both in size, age, and community. The study solicited information from rural, urban, and suburban community colleges in the research, which shed light on the challenges faced by many regions of the state. By assessing the responses from foundation executive directors in this range of colleges, comparisons were made that provided information for foundation development within a number of communities.

In addition to having worked at a four-year university and at a community college, I have ties to this research population through the Network of California Community College Foundations (NCCCF) and the CASE Center for Community College Advancement and my own 28-year experience in educational advancement and development. The Network of California Community College Foundations is a professional organization supporting California community college foundation executive directors. As a former member of the Board of Directors of NCCCF as well as a former member of CASE, including serving on the advisory board for the creation of CASE's Center for Community College Advancement, I used my past relationships and the potential benefit of this research for these organizations' members to enlist their support.

Website Analysis. In conjunction with the analysis of the 28 survey interviews, the websites of the colleges that were among those considered for selection were also reviewed. This search identified the extent of their development programs (annual giving, scholarships, giving circles, planned giving), their communication tools (newsletter, letters to donors), organizational structure, number of staff, additional responsibilities (solely foundation or including other college related duties). Annual reports from the website provided additional information of the gifts received, number of donors, and any special programming the development office chose to highlight. The currency of the website as well as the breadth of relevant content gave an indication as to their experience and capacity as a development office. This additional research was considered in the final site selections for the case studies.

Case Study Interviews. This research consisted of a qualitative data collection method consisting of a semi-structured one- to two-hour interview with individual executive directors, foundation board of director presidents, and college superintendent/presidents. The interview was first piloted using four recently retired California community college foundation executive directors. The interview protocol included open ended questions and prompts to encourage participants to expand on their answers. This process allowed me to gather additional data that is relevant to the research questions. The participants and their institutions were given pseudonyms to maintain confidentiality in the interview portion of the study.

Once the college selection was made, the interview participants were contacted by email, and interview dates and times were set up throughout October 2021. The interviews were confidential, and the participants were informed that their name and their college would remain anonymous in the document. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews took place using Zoom and were recorded, with permission, using Zoom and an iPhone recorder to ensure the information was completely documented. Notes were made by the interviewer during the interview process in order to expand the interview to more than a transcription and reflect how the issues raised relate to larger theoretical, methodological, and substantive issues. The participants were encouraged to speak candidly about the challenges they face in their role, again with the assurance of confidentiality. The semi-structured interview model allowed me to ask clarifying questions to gain additional data. This qualitative data collection provided rich information to answer the research questions from the perspective of foundation executive directors. This study allowed me to identify the organizational structure used between the foundation and its respective college, how foundation executive directors are supported both financially and administratively, and how they collaborate with others to manage their responsibilities.

Data Analysis Methods

The interview data were analyzed as the interviews took place to pursue specific leads in subsequent data-collection sessions (Merriam, 2009). “Collection and analysis should be a simultaneous process in qualitative research” (p.169). The open-ended questions, including follow-up interview prompts, were analyzed by categories of responses.

In reviewing the interview notes and transcriptions, the similarities, and differences between each of the three colleges and the three positions held by each of the colleges’ interviewees were tallied. The themes and findings will be discussed in the next chapter. Each of the college presidents were supportive of the foundation executive director, though each responded differently due to the politics operating within each college and the depth of experience of their work with other foundations. The foundation board of directors presidents were equally supportive, though some had a more limited understanding of the operations and needs of the foundation. One foundation board of directors president was a professional development executive and had worked with many foundations and as a development consultant. That foundation president’s depth of understanding provided a much more strategic and intellectually robust understanding of the foundation’s needs, and therefore engaged the entire board of directors to a much greater extent.

The foundation executive directors were extremely positive and managed their development (and advancement) responsibilities with great conviction and optimism. Their commonalities included tenacity, a strong community orientation, profound respect from both the college and foundation presidents, and the ability to navigate the college during uncertain times and less than capable college leadership. And, above all, they had the endurance to persevere in the challenging times as well as the exceptional times.

Broad categories were constructed through identifying phrases, ideas, and notions by reading the interview transcripts. These broad categories were narrowed down using deductive analysis based on Bolman and Deal’s theoretical framework. The analysis included examining the various sources of power described by several social scientists (Baldridge, 1971; French and Raven, 1959; Kanter, 1977; Pfeffer, 1981, 1992; Russ, 1994). These included position power (authority), control of rewards, coercive power, information and expertise, reputation, personal power, alliances and networks, access and control of agendas, control of meaning and symbols (Bolman and Deal, 2008).

The data was coded by assigning shorthand designations to easily retrieve specific pieces of data. I looked at codes for the various data sets to begin to identify similar themes and recurring patterns. The data was then sorted into categories by theme as reflected in Bolman and Deal’s political framework. An open coding technique was used to remain open to emerging themes or categories that might not fit my research questions (Merriam, 2009). Sorting the evidence refined the categories and the data that go with them. In this process, categories became more precise, and some categories became sub-categories. Through this process, the categories were named to reflect the data and the findings within them. Using Merriam’s (2009) analysis, the categories were “responsive to the purpose of the research,” “be exhaustive” by placing all important data in a category or subcategory, “ be mutually exclusive” meaning that any unit of data should fit only into one category, “be sensitizing” by naming the category with sensitivity to what is in the data, and “be conceptually congruent” by using the same level of abstraction to “characterize all categories at the same level” (p. 185-186). First, the frequency that a topic is mentioned indicated an important dimension to examine. The perspective of the research subjects provided a second level, determining what is important from their perspective. Categories that stood out because of their distinctiveness were also retained. Responses that revealed areas on inquiry that have not been otherwise identified provided another dimension Once the categories were identified, the data was examined to identify the inferences that could be made about the data. The categories were limited as to be manageable, and I “reduce(d) and combine(d) them into five or six themes that I used to write my narrative” (Creswell 2007, p. 152).

Ethical Considerations

It is essential that confidentiality be maintained with regards to the identity of the interviewees. Confidentiality is important because of the politically sensitive nature of the data to be collected. As responses to the interviews may include names or other confidential institutional information, codes, or pseudonyms for names of the institutions were used. I used pseudonyms for each participant and the college itself before the interviews were transcribed. The individuals’ identities and institutional affiliations were not described in the findings of the study.

The overview of the study was verbally conveyed, and a verbal consent was received using an Institutional Review Board format that included the research goals for the survey and for the interviews. Providing information about the purpose and scope of the study was an important ethical consideration. The confidentiality of their responses was assured as part of the consent, and the protocols for managing the data were conveyed. The consent was part of the introduction of the interview questionnaire, and stressed that participation was voluntary, and that no personal identifying data would be included in the study.

Throughout the data collection and analysis process, the data -- all audio and transcription files --were saved to the desktop at my home and were password protected. A summary of the findings will be provided to interested participants while maintaining confidentiality.

The interviewees knew of my professional background both at a major four-year university and at California community college. I was briefly acquainted with two of the interviewed executive directors from my professional tenure more than eight years ago. That acquaintance was limited to foundation information sharing and meeting at conferences. The interviews were conducted with candor, discretion, and objectivity to ensure that there would be no ethical concerns.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

With nearly 30 years of experience in various advancement roles, including 13 years as a California community college foundation executive director, I monitored my own personal biases throughout this research project. My experiences and assumptions were that community college foundation executive directors dealt with many challenges in their roles, which are sometimes split between other non-foundation management activities. Additionally, because of my experiences, I believed that the institutional stakeholders may not always fully understand or support the fundraising function, with regards to financial resources, staffing resources, or both. I also believed that a “young” foundation may not have the financial resources from private donations to support, from foundation funds, the operational costs needed to raise money for the institution. Specific fundraising software and other operational needs, staff to manage the necessary functions as donor stewardship, gift processing, foundation accounting, and support from the college president or the institution itself may not be available to some executive directors. I currently do not serve as an executive director for a community college foundation, but my knowledge and experience of fundraising issues helped strengthen the development of my data collection instruments.

Four former California community college foundation executive directors reviewed my questionnaire and interview protocol. Their experience as executive directors provided credibility to my study by checking my biases. Their knowledge provided feedback to improve the questions in both the questionnaire and interview protocols.

Merriam (2009) refers to validity that the research findings match reality. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) list four factors that lend support of high internal validity. a) living among participants to collect data for prolonged periods, b) phrasing the data in the empirical categories of participants, c) participant observation in a natural setting, and d) continual reflection, introspection and self-monitoring incorporated in the data analysis. To support the validity of this study, these four factors in addition to peer review were used. I enlisted the assistance of a former community college foundation executive director that is now a consultant and is not a part of my study to review the data collection process and emerging themes.

Summary

This qualitative study used surveys of California community college foundation executive directors to help narrow down the colleges selected for the case studies. Three case studies used semi-structured individual interviews lasting between one to two hours each to examine the challenges and experiences of foundation executive directors in California community colleges. The study identified the organizational structures, roles and expectations, professional backgrounds, and competencies of foundation executive directors. This research identified the executive directors’ responses to the challenges they face, and the collaborations that they utilized both internally within their institutions and externally with the college community and their statewide community college network. This study explored the strategies used by foundation executive directors to successfully generate private and corporate gifts and grants for their educational institutions. By using the survey instrument, website data analysis, and the case study interviews, I was able to gain a better understanding of both the challenges and opportunities for success faced by California community college foundation executive directors. The following chapter details the findings within and across the case study sites.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

This study explored the relationship and expectations between California community colleges and their respective foundations. The research explored the level of institutional commitment and support for the development and fundraising efforts within their campuses. It examined how the community colleges partner with the development office and the executive director and staff they enlist to execute their fundraising strategies. Community college foundations have the potential to raise significant private donations and corporate and foundation grants to support students, educational programs, and college initiatives. This study sought to identify the key findings that impact their success.

This chapter details the results of the data analysis and reports themes and findings in relation to the research questions for this study. Data were collected from survey responses, foundation websites, and nine case study interviews from the three selected colleges. The foundation executive director, college superintendent/president, and foundation board of directors' president from each of the selected colleges participated in one- to two-hour interviews. This research provided rich data regarding the current challenges and successes experienced by foundation executive directors and brought light to the perspectives of the other significant partners in the development efforts – the college president and the foundation board president. My approach was used to better understand the current roles, management structures, and relationships between these three partners and how they might be better leveraged to provide greater financial and community support for community colleges and their students.

The research questions were used to identify key factors, challenges, and viable solutions experienced by foundation executive directors in their role at the college. They formed the basis for the case study survey instruments. The following research questions formed the basis for the survey questions (Appendix 1):

1. What challenges do California community college foundation executive directors face in their professional roles?

2. What elements do foundation executive directors say help them to be successful in their professional roles?

3. How do foundation executive directors collaborate with campus and community stakeholders to conduct their development work?

This chapter describes the results of this dissertation research. Five themes were identified from the collective data, and within these themes 12 findings were identified. In a more comprehensive approach, the findings will be presented within the framework of the themes, including some excerpts of the interview statements that best elucidate the actual experiences provided through this research. Finally, a summary of my findings in relation to the research questions will be discussed.

Themes and Findings

To more fully understand the dynamics that help to create successful philanthropic outcomes, not only in money raised but also relationships stewarded in support of the college, three community colleges were selected for case studies. Three individuals were interviewed from each of the selected colleges: the college superintendent/president, the foundation executive director, and the volunteer foundation board of directors president. Factors considered included the relationship between the college and the foundation office, the amount of money raised, opportunities for involvement with the community, the background and experience of the executive directors, and the political capital provided by the college superintendent/president in support of this function.

Case Study Site Selection

The survey and website data provided background information pertinent to the case study site selection and aided in narrowing down the selection to the three chosen sites. Since

California community colleges are the largest community college system in the nation, it was important to represent at least one college each from northern, central, and southern California.

The three colleges represent three successful but different models of community college foundation management and relationships with the college they support. One foundation is an auxiliary with a Memo of Understanding (MOU) with the college, one foundation is an auxiliary without a MOU, and the last is operates independently from the college it serves. They provide different perspectives on the relationships between the college foundation, the college administration, and the surrounding community. Three different organizational models were examined to identify any similarities or challenges shared in their organizational structure, relationship to the college, and how they approached their fundraising efforts.

Finally, "successful" community colleges, as defined by dollars raised were chosen based on their survey responses. Two of the selected college foundations with between eight and 15 development staff had raised more than $20 million over five years. The college foundation with three staff members raised between $3 and $5 million during that time. These criteria were used to examine any shared qualities responsible for their successes, or more divergent, creative opportunities that might be shared for greater successes among community colleges. The shared challenges were also examined, as they focused on the points of potential change for the betterment of the college and their foundations.

Summary of Key Themes and Findings

During the month of October, 2021 nine persons were interviewed for this research. The interviews lasted between one- to two-hours each. The respondents included two interim and one established superintendent/president, three foundation board of directors' presidents, and one foundation executive director, one vice president of advancement and development, and one foundation chief executive officer, each responsible for their respective college foundations.

Their interviews were thoughtful and generous, candid, and each was eager participate in this research with expectations that the shared challenges and elements for success would provide insights into transformational changes that could help to improve the development efforts to support community colleges and their students.

Figure 1. Themes and Findings

Theme 1: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

- The Role of the Superintendent/President
- Creating Closer Relationships with the College Organization
- Insufficient Marketing and Visibility to the Community

Theme 2: DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

- The Executive Director's Education, Experience, and Qualifications
- Minimum Staffing Requirements and Proposition for Growth
- Scope of Duties Beyond Development

Theme 3: FOUNDATION MANAGEMENT

- Foundation Board and Community Relations Critical to Success
- Alignment of College and Foundation Strategic Goals

Theme 4: INTEGRAL OR INDEPENDENT FOUNDATIONS

- Inclusion in the College Organizaational Structure
- Independent and Closely Partnered

Theme 5: FUNDRAISING

- It Takes Staff

Theme One: Institutional Support is Critical to Philanthropic Success

One of the challenges for community college foundations has been that few understand fully its role within the college. Rather than seeing the development office as a financial boon to the college faculty, programs, and students, it is frequently seen as an opportunity cost requiring college resources that could be otherwise spent on academic and student programs. Community colleges are smaller and have limited resources that are rarely applied to support their development function. This section focuses on the theme of institutional support, which includes the role of the superintendent/president, college relations, and marketing and visibility.

Findings: The Role of the Superintendent/President

The role of the college superintendent/president and their relation to the foundation is critical to philanthropic success, regardless of whether the college is an auxiliary or independent. The majority of foundation executive directors report to the president, and on rare occasion they may instead report to a college vice president or other administrator. The chief executive officer of the self-funded independent foundation did not report to the college president, but instead reported to and was evaluated by the foundation board of directors.

Those superintendent/presidents who have a greater understanding of and experience in community college philanthropy efforts seemed to provide more support for their development offices with staffing and budget. They more vigorously promoted the benefits of the foundation both within the college and to the external community and seemed to spend a greater percentage of their time (as much as 25%) cultivating and thanking donors, writing notes, taking them to lunches, or having meetings with them and the foundation board members. The time, attention, and constructive support by the superintendent/president is a partnership with and investment in their foundation that provides even greater returns.

This research will address three findings related to the position of superintendent/president. The first finding is the lack of stability in the president's tenure and capabilities. The second finding related to the position of superintendent/president addresses the education and experience needed to successfully lead a community college and philanthropy efforts. The third finding related to the position of superintendent/president addresses the challenges of the executive director only reporting to the president and not to the foundation board of directors.

Finding 1: Instability in the Tenure of the Superintendent/President

All of the colleges interviewed have had periods of time with short-term, insupportable presidents. It is a challenge when there is instability and unsuccessful leadership in the president's position because of the executive director's need to understand the relationship and renegotiate it constantly. One interviewee stated, "I'm really lucky. I had three presidents plus the 'eight-monther' one, I don't even count her anymore. But the other ones were so supportive. One I had for seven years; we had a lot of fun, and we raised a lot of money." Another interviewee stated, "I strongly believe that jobs like the presidents, like mine, you know you only really get useful after you've been here for a couple of years." They also stated that,

> "Presidents that are trained up in the system, and in California they mostly stay in the California system, and their primary experience with foundations are these very small foundations, their perspective is 'you're not all that helpful to me.' And they're not wrong, it's true, if you have a $100K a year foundation that's raising scholarships, that's great, it's not a bad thing, but the president logically doesn't see that as a major tool that they have to work with."

Every case study participant indicated that a major problem for both the college and the philanthropy efforts was the instability in the superintendent/president position. Every executive director express concern about past presidents who were released from their contracts, and one executive director stated that they have "been in this seat only six and a half years, and I'm now working with the seventh president I've worked alongside." According to this interviewee from an independent, self-funding foundation:

> "College leadership in the community colleges does not understand philanthropy by and large. And I will tell you I have no shyness about saying that that's one of the cultural challenges in academia is that what makes you a really good teacher has nothing to do with whether you understand anything about the community, about philanthropy, about organizational management or leadership, about institutional politics. So, there's these funny disconnects all over the place, and I will say, loud and proud, that our independence

> is why we're successful. If we were buried in the instruction four layers down, we would not be the effective organization we are today."

Finding 2: Potentially Insufficient Education and Experience Needed for Presidency

Some of the other issues raised include the importance of presidential experience and education. According to the California Community College's website, the minimum qualifications for an Educational Administrator, which is the position of community college presidents, is as follows:

> For educational administrators, the minimum qualifications are a master's degree (in any discipline), and one year of formal training, internship, or leadership experience reasonably related to the administrative assignment.
>
> All public California community districts have hiring authority and must adhere to the minimum qualifications when establishing hiring criteria and/or determining hiring eligibility. The districts may include additional criteria over and above the minimums but can never hire below the minimums.

This minimal qualification for an expansive community college program is one plausible reason for the lack of knowledge or understanding of philanthropy programs in higher education. The interviews demonstrated that the most successful and effective community college presidents were those that have significant background and experience as community college presidents and have a strong understanding of foundation needs and capabilities and provide commensurate support and leadership. All the interviewed superintendent/presidents had advanced degrees beyond the required master's degree and one year of related leadership experience. In addition, they had numerous years' experience as former community college superintendent/presidents, one had been a chancellor at a multi-college district, and therefore all had significant past experience working with foundations. As one executive director interviewed stated, "I've been very fortunate in the last nine years working with a superintendent/president who really understands the role of the foundation, and our relationship has been very productive and collaborative and supportive."

Most district superintendent/president job descriptions do not include "experience and knowledge of fundraising." Their trustees do not evaluate the presidents on their fundraising capabilities and partnership with their foundation. This can be especially serious if the college president does not understand or want to comply with the non-profit laws regarding the unauthorized use of foundation money for personal benefit or other inappropriate reasons. The college president does not have the sole authority to spend foundation funds without the foundation board of directors' explicit approval. As stated by one of the interviewees,

> "College leadership in the community colleges does not understand philanthropy by and large. And I will tell you I have no shyness about saying that that's one of the cultural challenges in academia is that what makes you a really good teacher has nothing to do with whether you understand anything about the community, about philanthropy, about organizational management or leadership, about institutional politics."

Attempts continue to be made within community college networking organization to help inform community college presidents regarding development efforts and foundations. For some presidents, it does not seem to be an investment of time that they are willing to make. Stated one executive director,

> "I've long tried to get us at the table to educate the college presidents. The funny thing that happens there is from their perspective their job is to tell us how we should do what we should do. My analysis, and most of my colleagues' analysis, is that you don't even understand what we do. We need to educate you in a way that doesn't hurt your ego."

Presidents hired from outside the community can be problematic because they lack local community knowledge of their district. This can have a delaying, if not negative, impact on the development strong community relationships and support a successful philanthropic endeavor. In addition, the lack of understanding of development processes and a minimal willingness to spend time in assisting with strategic donor identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship creates other significant challenges. As one executive director stated,

> "Another challenge is that presidents that are trained up in the system don't have much experience with larger, more robust foundations. Because California community colleges

> have relatively small foundations, their perspective is "you're not all that helpful to me." They stated that "As we all grow our asset base and our impact and our power to do good things for the college, we will in turn get seen as a critical piece of the infrastructure to do good things for the college."

Having stated the challenges, the interviewees also had many good things to say about their current presidents. One stated, "I've had tremendous support over the years, so I feel like that's definitely helped position the foundation, and you know the foundation board really loves him and the community loves him."

Finding 3: Discordant Reporting Structure for Executive Directors. The importance of the relationship with the superintendent/president or whomever they're reporting to was expressed by all the interviewees. The majority, but not all, of the auxiliary foundations have executive directors that report to the superintendent/president. If the president is a knowledgeable and supportive partner to the foundation executive director, the reporting structure can provide a significant champion for the development efforts and credibility and respect for the foundation executive director both within the college community and in the community at large. Being a supporter is not enough; being a champion of the development efforts is critical. As one executive director stated,

> "I think it's really good that I report to the president and that I am part of cabinet, because I can report out to my vice president colleagues, I get them involved when I have to. I coach them, most of a lot of roles we have at the Cabinet level and with president is coaching in philanthropy and introducing them to the right people and helping them build connections. It's very good to have that reporting like because we'll be aligned with our goals. My goals should support the president's goals and the institutional goals, the strategic plan of the college. We align all of the fundraising efforts, and I should send you this, Bridget, we have a President's Task Force funding plan.

The importance of the relationship was exacerbated during the times when there was tumultuous presidential leadership within the college itself, resulting in a great deal of turnover. One interviewee stated that,

> “They need to make sure that that person, whomever they report to, understands that their job, the foundation director’s job, is to make them look good. If community relations aren’t their thing, you need to sort of try and help them position themselves in a way that they can at least get some visibility. So, your job is not to fight with them, your job is to help them do their job better.”

The trend for the financing of auxiliary foundations reporting to the president is that the college pays for the executive director, and possibly an administrative assistant, and any development staff are paid, as possible, by the foundation. It is uncertain why executive directors completely funded by their foundations would report to and be evaluated by the superintendent/president rather than to the foundation board of directors. An executive director needs to have a close partnership with the superintendent/president, but not necessarily a sole reporting relationship. Ultimately, the executive director might be best served if they report to both the superintendent and the foundation board of directors to create a balance of power and avoid potential abuse by an untenable superintendent/president. The alternative would be to establish a completely separate foundation in which the executive director funded by the foundation and is a separate but equal partner to the president, which safeguards the foundation during tumultuous times within the college or with the president.

Findings: Creating Closer Relationships with the College Organization

The relationship between the college and its institutionally related foundation (IRF) can be, at its best, both complicated and challenging. Some of the tension between the institution and the philanthropy function may be attributed to community colleges being sufficiently funded at their inception. The growing need for additional philanthropic gifts to augment and stabilize the college budgetary needs have not yet been accepted or supported.

Both the survey respondents and interviewees indicated that the support from their colleges is varied. Much depends on the superintendent/presidents’ leadership, experience and knowledge of foundations, and willingness to promote the value of the philanthropy efforts within the college community. One interviewee stated,

> "Community colleges are much later to the game in philanthropy because frankly, they didn't need it as much early on. But with all the changes in what we are asked to do, and the roles we need to play, philanthropy has to be central, absolutely central, and that's really hard for a lot of academics to swallow. And I say, well your academic planning team, that's every bit as valuable as my philanthropic planning team. And they laugh, and they think, well, yes, we're important but you, I don't know what you do over there, and there's presidents all over the system that look at philanthropy anywhere from confused to outright hostile. They just don't understand how this all works together."

Finding 1: Acknowledging Development as a College Partner

Much of the foundation's success is enhanced by the acceptance and support received by the college, its administration, and trustees. As stated by one executive director,

> "I would say it's important that the institution, that the foundation and the college, and the partnership between the college and the foundation is very much a harmonious one and supportive, and a partnership, it's got to be a partnership."

National records of community college affiliated foundations are sparse, so the growth and expansion are difficult to track (Jenkins and Glass, 1999). Some college constituencies feel that the foundation should be self-funding and give budgetary preference to the academic and student affairs' needs. For more recently established foundations that are smaller and may be seriously understaffed, the return on investment (ROI) from the foundation may be insufficient to sustain self-funding of both development staff and operations. This section examines key areas of institutional support and challenges and opportunities found with each.

Executive directors spend time trying to educate and create support from within the community college by being on numerous committees and participating in events that may have little or nothing to do specifically with development efforts. That is an opportunity cost, especially when staffing is so limited.

There is a lot of competition for limited resources, and faculty and classified unions put pressure on the decisions, and the development efforts are not usually funded. Unfortunately, there is lack of understanding that a small investment in the salary of a development officer can bring in four to five times the financial return on investment (ROI) through their fundraising efforts. As one president stated,

> "For each of us as presidents you get, as you well know, all these pressures from all of these different directions, and there are limited resources. And there are limited political battles that you wish to engage in in order to remain the leader and successful. And it does come down to is it a new assistant dean of workforce development with career education being a major part of our curriculum or is it to put an associate director for capital development under the foundation. And, I think almost every time, even though that other person may bring in a million dollars of grants and workforce development, the foundation person might be able to bring $3 million, but that's not the way we end up tending to look at it, and we connect more directly to the curriculum and direct student services as we play our weighing of the interests. And I think you've said it very straightforwardly, there are very few colleges, community colleges, where the foundation will win out if there are three administrative positions to be filled, the two are going to go to student services and instruction, and the one that drops out is going to be the foundation, even if people believe it's integral."

Time with the college and external community must be balanced to create relationships and identify prospective donors. However, there have been occasions when the executive director has been criticized for not being in the campus office more frequently. This demonstrates the lack of understanding of the need for the executive director to be out in the community to increase the visibility and support for the foundation and the college. There is also, to some degree, a fear of the development office becoming too powerful. According to one executive director, there is a "need to educate, communicate, build trust and respect."

Findings: Insufficient Marketing and Visibility to the Community

Significant in the challenges indicated in both the surveys and the interviews were the limited marketing needed for both the college and the development efforts. To be successful in fundraising, the college need to raise the awareness in the community that the college exists, what opportunities are available to the community and the students it serves, and provide outreach to former, current, and prospective students. In the survey responses, some colleges indicated that they have little or no marketing strategy, and unless there is staff within the development office, minimal marketing and communications opportunities are available for the philanthropic efforts. As the interviews indicated, the college not only educates students, but provides future employees to the business community, medical community, and various technology fields. The community must be aware of the college, what it does, and the benefits the college provides to businesses and the community at large.

Some colleges combine their marketing and advancement efforts with their development executive, which puts a strain on both programs if they are understaffed. The colleges interviewed were in various stages of developing and implementing their marketing strategies. The independent foundation, which has a staff of 15, has the ability to develop and implement their own marketing strategy since they are self-reliant.

Theme Two: The Development Office Organizational Structure

There is little consistency across California community college development efforts in their organizational structure, the background and experience of executive directors, staffing, and duties and responsibilities. Some have little to no professional development staff in order to support fundraising tactics such as annual giving, corporate and foundation grants, major gifts, planned giving, alumni relations, and donor stewardship. Operational needs such database management, foundation accounting services, marketing capabilities, a confidential administrative assistant for the executive director, and additional assistants as programming grows are usually unfilled. Finally, the duties and responsibilities are varied, with a limited number of development staff working exclusively on fundraising efforts. Other foundations indicated they either had all or part of the college advancement functions as part of their job responsibilities, with one survey respondent indicating that they were the vice president of student affairs, spending only 10% of their time on fundraising efforts. This theme of organizational models expands with three findings: the importance of the executive director's background and experience, managing staffing and resource needs, and the variability of the duties and responsibilities within advancement and development offices.

Finding 1: The Executive Director's Education, Experience, and Qualifications

The qualifications needed to manage a community college foundation have evolved over time. In many colleges, the responsibilities for the college's foundation were added to an existing employee, such as the college president's executive assistant or a vice president. As community college development efforts have matured over time, there are more experienced, professionally trained development officers hired at the colleges. The challenges faced by today's executive directors are varied, depending on the level of support and partnership with the college.

In both the survey responses and interviews, almost every executive director (used as a generic title for this research) has had some experience working in non-profits, some more extensive than others. Some had educational non-profit experience from K-12 schools, four-year universities, or other community colleges. Others had extensive community foundation, healthcare, and other non-profit backgrounds. The successful executive directors are the "consummate generalists" and believe in innovation in the non-profit sector. One interviewee worked in a community foundation model led by activist organizers and people doing the work on the ground. This is a change from past research, in which more of the individuals in the foundation executive director position had little to no experience with philanthropy and were learning on the job.

Executive directors are titled and salaried quite differently from one another as well. Position titles include Vice President of Advancement and Development, Chief Executive

Officer (independent foundation executive reporting to the Board of Directors), Dean of Advancement, Executive Director of Foundation and Advancement, Executive Director of College Foundation, and more. Many but not all are members of the president's cabinet, depriving them of the stature and visibility as the other vice presidents and of the opportunity to both inform other cabinet members and be informed by them about the latest campus issues. This speaks to the unequal view of the stature and importance of the development efforts within each college.

All of the executive directors interviewed talked about the value they have received by networking with their California community college colleagues. All three of the interviewees have been or are members on the board of the Network for California Community College Foundations (NCCCF). The executive director who had never worked in education philanthropy engaged the NCCCF during their first week on the job, seeking their assistance in understanding the community college culture and navigating what a college foundation director was supposed to do. In addition, each indicated that they also attended conferences, workshops, and networking opportunities put on by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). Those two organizations were cited as being extremely helpful in supporting the executive directors in their roles on campus.

With regard to non-profit fundraising in a community college, it is important for executive directors to have the knowledge of IRS laws for non-profit organizations and the authority to enforce them. In addition, they must have a thorough knowledge of the college and its offerings, an awareness of the community at large, and the ability to elicit the connections between prospective donors' interests and clearly communicate the needs of the students and the outcome of their support. Depending on the level of maturity of the foundation, developing a database, having an accountant, and accounting system, and developing basic fundraising functions such as annual giving, corporate and foundation grants, major gifts, and an early focus on planned giving would provide a robust philanthropic structure. In addition to donor cultivation and solicitation, donor recognition and stewardship are critically important. The relationship is ongoing.

Finding 2: Minimum Staffing Requirements and Proposition for Growth

Both the survey and the interviews indicated that the lack of human and financial resources was the greatest challenge executive directors face in their jobs. The data from both demonstrated that development offices with more professional development staff have a greater capacity to generate millions of dollars in donations. It is not a surprise that the independent foundation with 15 staff members boasts net assets of $90 million for their foundation. When asked if they have sufficient resources, one executive director stated the following,

> "I feel that no, I think the will, the commitment to the students from the entire team, and the support we have from our president – we've been very lucky to have a very good president – it all is a lot of willful energy and that's what makes it succeed. But I think of something you said, and I completely agree, and I've been outspoken about it too, is the investment that is made from the institution to philanthropy or to the foundation is very little. If we had more resources, if we had adequate resources, we could provide a lot more support to the college."

Small development offices with one or two staff members have a more challenging time in getting that return on investment. In addition, a newer development office doesn't have the capacity to hire its own development staff because they typically have fewer net assets and have had less time to grow the investment income.

One executive director used consultants to help fill the operational gaps. Their staff consists of the executive director and administrative assistant II (funded by the college) and an accounting assistant (funded half by the college and half by the foundation). They have successfully utilized consultants to provide support for the unstaffed needs. They stated,

> ”It’s not an easy thing to get additional staff, which is why I strongly recommend using outside consultants. What I have been able to hire, I have been able to hire much higher-level people at a much lower cost than I could have afforded if they had been full-time staff people. I’ve been working with a team of consultants for the last, I’d say 10 years.”

> “Because our IT department basically couldn’t really support us, so we had Blackbaud supporting us. We have a database analyst who works remotely and has done so for the last decade. I have a consultant that helps me with board development, and peer review, and helping me with the annual appeals, developing the strategy for annual appeals, helping to craft who gets what letter, because we do a very complicated annual appeal. It’s not just one letter; it goes to many different segments. I also have a legacy team of people who help me with building a legacy program and I’ve been working with them for several years. Those are our consultants basically.”

There is little to no standardization on how development offices are structured or funded. There were no duplicate staffing structures among the 28 survey respondents, some were supported by a complicated patchwork of funding sources for each their staff members. This demonstrates the lack of consistent organizational frameworks supporting the philanthropy or advancement efforts. The survey responses indicated that fifteen executive directors were paid by their colleges, and four were paid by their foundations. Seven executive directors were paid in various percentages by the college and the foundation, and usually had additional college duties; one was a vice president of student affairs that spent 10% of their time overseeing the foundation. One foundation contributed $75,000 to the college towards a staff of three (including the executive director).

Because of the shared governance processes, getting staff approved through the college is difficult, and can take more than a decade. There is a lot of competition for limited resources, and faculty and classified unions put pressure on those decisions, and the development office usually is not funded. Another challenge is that appropriate development job descriptions may not be available at the colleges. This can result in job descriptions being artificially forced into existing, often lower, classifications. Hiring committees have been reluctant to approve new, more appropriate classifications due to the possible expense, and occasionally jealousy, involved. Another interviewee stated,

> "So, I think that's always a challenge for foundations because we're not necessarily the highest on the totem pole. Because unless there's something happening that absolutely needs the foundation, like if they're in the middle of a bond measure campaign and they need the foundation to help, or a capital campaign and they need the foundation to help."

Unfortunately, the college entities do not seem to understand that a small investment in the salary of a development officer can bring in four to five times the financial returns on investment through their fundraising efforts. Bolman and Deal's "political frame views authority as only one among many forms of power. It recognizes the importance of individual (and group) needs but emphasizes that scarce resources and incompatible preferences cause needs to collide" (Bolman and Deal, p.201). As one executive director stated,

> "It's an iterative process and a relationship building process, so the Academic Senate, you know they have the full-time hiring committee, and we have the task force plan which is more about looking into the future, and we believe that the college doesn't have general funds for, and the full-time faculty hiring committee is more about looking backwards and kind of going here are the classes and the student demands that we need to fulfill. So, they're looking more of supply/demand, looking at data from the past. And we're looking at community scans and industry needs and going forward. So, I met with the Academic Senate President, and I said we are misaligned because we're not looking at it from the same lens, and but we never try to circumvent you we'd never do that. It's not a purposeful thing but they perceive that."

The pressure on the superintendent/president is to prioritize faculty and academic needs as above funding a professional development staff. As stated by one of the interviewed presidents,

> "For each of us as presidents you get, as you well know, all these pressures from all of these different directions, and there are limited resources. And there are limited political battles that you wish to engage in in order to remain the leader and successful. And it does come down to is it a new assistant dean of workforce development with career education being a major part of our curriculum or is it to put an associate director for capital development under the foundation. And, I think almost every time, even though that other person may bring in a million dollars of grants and workforce development, the foundation person might be able to bring three million, but that's not the way we end up tending to look at it, and we connect more directly to the curriculum and direct student services as we play our weighing of the interests. And I think you've said it very straightforwardly, there are very few colleges, community colleges, where the foundation will win out if there are three

> administrative positions to be filled, the two are going to go to student services and instruction, and the one that drops out is going to be the foundation, even if people believe it's integral."

Another president interviewed stated, "The paradigm can definitely be changed, and it depends on how patient we are." There is some consideration that the pressure for hiring results from the fact that community colleges were never intended to fundraise for their budgetary needs; they were supported by state and federal funds. It has been 44 years since Proposition 13 passed, many colleges have created their foundations and ancillary staff, and yet the progress remains slow. Some executive directors have waited more than a decade for an administrative assistant or end up leaving their positions for better opportunities elsewhere. In response to the challenge of hiring development staff, one president interviewed recommended the following,

> " I think if you put together a good strategic plan that shows the return on investment, you know it's just like at (previous college) I finally funded a developer there, because the executive director was able to show me, ok this is the return on investment if we do this and we do this right. So, I think it's selling the story, showing the numbers, and following up and showing that it it's actually working, because the credibility is there, that you can go to people and say look, yeah, we spent $100s if not $1,000s of dollars on this, and see what we got for it? And I think that's the part that is really important is really assessing it to show the effectiveness of what you do. What I always try to do is try to show the effectiveness of the investment of the college in the foundation. More presidents and executive directors could benefit from this recommendation.

Finding 3: Scope of Duties Beyond Development. The survey indicated that only six of the 28 respondents had only development duties. Of the remaining responses, 22 executive directors stated that 10 to 90% of their time was spent on non-development (college) responsibilities. The respondent with 90% of other college duties was also the vice president of student services.

The executive directors with added college responsibilities frequently include institutional advancement efforts. The advancement model is used to leverage each of these external relations components to create public-private partnerships between the college and its community (CASE, 2016; Bass, 2013). The four functional areas of institutional advancement are public relations, publications, alumni relations, and development. Each of these areas require a manager and assistant(s), depending on the size and scope of the organization's needs. The advancement duties may be included with the development office or may be stand-alone offices. Balancing the additional duties of advancement with development without sufficient personnel and budget makes the job of the executive director even more difficult. Lack of staff results in lack of time for identification, cultivation, and stewardship of donors. In addition, the development office is unable to focus on alumni relations due to lack of staffing and operations such as an alumni database.

Some foundations manage their scholarships programs within the development office, which is an added programmatic responsibility. Others manage the intake of funds through the foundation, but the adjudication process with the students, scholarship committee members (often donors), interviews, and awarding are managed through other offices, such as the financial aid office or another student services department. Problems have arisen when the financial aid office has no understanding of the requirement to ensure that the scholarships go to the type of student intended. For example, a science scholarship meant for engineering students (donated by Lockheed Martin) was awarded to a pre-med student because math, science and engineering were in one division, and the financial aid office limited the selection to the division and not the discipline. In those instances, the fiduciary responsibility to honor the donors intentions might require the development office to adjudicate the awards properly, which would then require additional staff to manage that program.

Theme Three: Managing the Community College Non-Profit Foundation

Navigating community college culture and politics can be challenging for foundation executive directors. This research found many statements by executive directors regarding the need to educate the superintendent/presidents and the college community about the how development efforts through their institutionally related foundations can provide much needed financial support and community ties for the college and its students.

This research affirmed that need. However, it also identified perhaps the more important need of creating relationships with the external community. This section will discuss the need for strengthened community relationships, the role of the foundation president and board of directors, and the alignment of strategic college and foundation short- and long-term goals.

Finding 1: Foundation Board and Community Relations Critical to Success

Through these interviews, the external community relations have more relevance to a foundation's ability to raise funds than the acknowledgement of the campus community. The frequent turmoil within a community college makes it difficult to inculcate the college to have allegiance beyond their own departments or programs. Unless they feel directly impacted by being a beneficiary of foundation funding, their attention is primarily turned to their own responsibilities. To that end, one of the most important roles of the foundation board of directors must include outreach to various community stakeholders who would benefit from their ties to the foundation and community college.

Foundations need a strong president and board of directors who understand the college, understand the foundation's fiduciary responsibilities, are connected to the community, and are willing to make introductions, ask people for money, and of course, donate themselves. Their role is to educate, advocate, and promote the college within the community, as well as identify questions, concerns, or needs that the community may share with them about the college (O'Connell, 2003). In order for the foundations to be effective, they must select board members who know and support the college mission and have effective communication with and support for their fellow board members. One executive director stated that,

> “the biggest challenge is having them engaged and involved, because we only meet quarterly, and so unless they’re on a committee it’s easy for them to sort of drift away and not really get that engaged. And since there’s only one of me to kind of help to get them engaged, it would be helpful if there was more staff…”

Most foundations ask their members to be donors as a condition of their membership, generally becoming a member of the President’s Circle giving level. A President’s Circle is typically a gift of $1,000 annually to the unrestricted fund. One of the executive directors interviewed stated that they also require a gift but ask for a meaningful donation from their board members rather than a specific amount. The motivation for this strategy is to be able to get strong board members regardless of their financial capacity, as long as they make a gift that is meaningful for them. This has resulted in a few smaller gifts, but some much larger than the $1,000 annual President’s Circle request.

Two of the three colleges interviewed had a strong focus on community relations by the executive directors. This focus has resulted in robust college-community partnerships and major donors. However, strong community outreach also requires support to be successful. One interviewee stated,

> “I think it’s got a lot of advantages actually, because you can really see and leverage all the community relations and you associate a lot of the different things that you’re doing to build a lot of momentum for the institution. I feel like it is more of a benefit than a challenge it’s more of a good thing. However, the resources behind it, like support for the different things that you’re doing sometimes have to be patched up. So, if I’m part of an initiative like economic development on with California Forward, I rely on either pulling from my foundation people or pulling from something that’s already existing, or I’ve got to find funding to stand up a position for that, right. Somebody’s going to sort of back me up because really, yeah, because, you know how it is. You can do a lot of things at the surface level but to really do the work you need staff support.”

This interviewee’s efforts not only identify prospective donors but also creates a pipeline of community and business partnerships that will inform the college of community needs to integrate into their strategic plans. They stated,

> "I've taken on a role that is about partnerships with industry and with community-based organizations, and also oversee the public grants. Government and anything that's public grants. I do resource development efforts at the college whether it's on the philanthropy side or on the government side I oversee as well."

Because of the instability and short tenure of some college presidents, one community was connected to the stability and longevity of the foundation rather than the college. One interviewee stated, "I should say…what I needed to do was to build a system where the foundation was insulated from the college so that we were the trusted partner in the community, regardless of what was happening at the college." This interviewee's time was better spent collaborating with the external community and strengthening relationships there, and the connection to the college was primarily through the superintendent/president, who was an equal partner, not a supervisor. All other connections to the college were made as needed.

Finding 2: Alignment of College and Foundation Strategic Goals

College and foundation goals reflect the central idea of Bolman and Deal's "political frame: goals emerge out of a bargain process among coalition members" (Bolman and Deal, p.200). Some foundations established annual goals, some were in the process of establishing goals, and others had none at all. Some foundation goals were established loosely by the foundation with little or no input from the superintendent/president.

Responses from the survey indicated that 12 colleges had annual fundraising goals of less than $1million, 13 had goals of more than $1 million, and three had no goals set at all. One interviewee stated that "it hasn't really been set by us, it has been set by the people who came before us, and we've just carried the torch for them." The involvement of presidents in setting fundraising goals is at minimum as an ex officio member of the foundation board of directors. Some presidents are much more hands off regarding goals, which can result in the most noticeable problems are the ones most likely to get attention.

Others only provide requests for funding when there is a significant need, such as a capital campaign, bond funding, or other special projects. The additional challenge with these occasional, large requests is that unless there has been a pipeline of donor identification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship, it is more challenging to be able fulfill the larger fundraising needs.

One of the interviewees established a stakeholder involved President's Task Force that specifically aligned the foundation goals with the institutional priorities:

> "It's a five-year funding plan that we create every five years, and that plan comes right after the college concludes their strategic planning efforts. We'll come right behind it, we do a six-month planning process with the college where we survey the college in terms of innovative ideas, projects and programs and things, initiatives, which will help get to the strategic plan that the college just laid out. And so that's how we align the fundraising with the institutional priorities."

This research identified the President's Task Force as one of the most inclusive plans for creating short- and long-term strategic funding plans. This plan, led by the executive director, begins with a survey to the college to get feedback "in terms of innovative ideas, projects and programs and things, initiatives, which will help get to the strategic plan that the college just laid out." That information is then used with in the six-month planning process which brings together the college president and about five to six members of the college leadership, a trustee or two, about 30 community leaders, foundation donors and prospective donors, and community leaders and community-based organizations. They work together to develop a fundraising strategy that is aligned with the college's strategic plan. One of the benefits of this process is that those business leaders that need trained employees that the college can provide often become major donors that help fund the initiatives that will support their businesses.

> "They come to the table because it's a President's Task Force, and so he's a part of it, and there's a group of about five or six college people aside from the president. We also include a trustee or two, I can't remember, and then like, I don't know, 30 community leaders and philanthropists, foundation people, some of the investors that we're going to go to, and

> then some community thinkers and some community leaders, community-based organizations that are in the space where we're trying to make a difference. For example, Basic Needs was one of the things that (the superintendent/president), he was brand new when we were starting the President's Task Force, so when he got there, he was trying to sort of tell me, ok, are we going to be ready for this, and then he jumped in. He was able to contribute that very effectively. He said, you know, I like all these things we're investing in, but I don't see basic needs in there as in depth as it should be. So, he actually chimed in right away and was very assertive, you know, because that's a very powerful group of people to come into and say hey, I see that you're missing something, so that was good of him. So yes, he does have, every step of the way, he's involved. The other thing is the instrument, the survey that goes out to the institution, is presented to Cabinet and the president and to the shared governance people before sending out, so the whole process is presented to shared governance before we launch it."

This process involves internal and external stakeholders in connecting the needs of the community, including business training, with the development of the funding plan. It is a significant endeavor on behalf of the philanthropy office to reach out to the campus and the community and requires staff support to orchestrate and communicate with all involved. The final plan benefits all participants in the President's Task Force: the college, the community and businesses, and the foundation. The insights stated by the same college's foundation president are as follows,

> "Once we have our five-year fundraising plan in partnership with the college, we need to look at the operations of the foundation and see how well suited we are internally to meet those goals. Do we have the right staff, do we have the right structure, who do we have on the board, all those things related to operations need to be well aligned with our fundraising goals in order for us to be able to do our work? So that's been some of the things that I've been doing with the college foundation as chair.
>
> We had originally about 60 community members, stakeholders in the community, which participated in a series of meetings evaluating the data that was provided by the college and the foundation staff and looking at the proposals that faculty and other staff provided to the President's Task Force (PTF) and prioritizing it from the perspective of which ones the members of the PTF felt would have most response from the community. Which would be most likely to attract funding and to receive a strong response from the community. It's a very collaborative process, a very deliberate process in analyzing data, looking at opportunities, looking at options, program, and seeing what we hear from our funders and donors that would be likely to be supported. Because in the PTF we include a lot of our funders, some of our major funders are there."

The combined leadership and foundation management experience of this college's president, executive director, and foundation president developed a robust and supported foundation and advancement program. This college has one of the few vice presidents of advancement and development, and their salary is greater than those of the other vice presidents, due, in part, to the gifts generated in support of the college. They are currently in a five-year campaign for $35 million, and they have established a 10-year, $100 million dollar campaign.

Theme Four: Integral or Independent Foundations

There is value to be integrated with the college, and there is value to be independent of the college; those two positions are not mutually exclusive. The commonalities are that they have the same mission: to support the college, its community, and the students.

The two findings provided insights into the challenges and benefits of each relational option. On the whole, it seems that there is a greater return on investment gained by community college foundation independence from the college with a strong, equal partnership with the president. There are more factors over which there is little control: the elected trustees, the selected college president, the internal bureaucracy, and college politics. The separation seems to be of greater benefit to an independent foundation whose focus is not as significantly distracted by these issues as would a foundation integrated into a potentially dysfunctional college environment.

Finding 1: Inclusion in the College Organizational Structure

Most California community college foundations started as a department of the college. In the beginning, it was common to have a part-time volunteer or retired administrator with no fundraising experience oversee the development efforts and management of the foundation. As time has gone one, there has been little examination of the value of continuing to be part of the college's organizational structure. They are verbally considered "integral" to the campus but are often treated differently than the academic and student programs when it comes to identifying their value in the strategic planning and funding processes. One interviewee stated,

> I also think it's very critical to be integrated into the life of the campus, so for those foundations that are completely separate from the district or the college, I think there are some disadvantages to that. Because I'm a college employee I sit on cabinet, I attend a lot of things, I go to the budget meetings because I want to hear for myself what the challenges are, I go to a lot of the meetings that help me to see the overall goals of the college. I don't go to a lot of things I don't have to, but those kinds of things overall what do you call it, planning, developing the overall purpose of the college, those kinds of meetings I go to. And I think that the fact that I'm on cabinet and I make presentations there and I help to do the things that they need help with... I sit on some of the committees for hiring, not a lot because I don't want to take all my time doing that kind of stuff, but I've done it when I really have something to add to the position, like for the marketing person. I sat on that because I felt I had a lot of knowledge in that arena, and I wanted to be able to sit on that. I will make sure someone from the foundation sits on the president's hiring committee. It doesn't have to be me, but it has to be someone from the board and so For that reason it's important to be integrated into the key things at the college, so you are part of the conversation. I think the biggest challenge with faculty and staff is that because I'm the only fundraiser in the college, basically, the only professional fundraiser.

This executive director's perspective may be limited to their experience with their community college. The research shows that there is no correlation between reporting to the superintendent/president and being a member of cabinet. This research showed that there are many foundation executive directors who report to the president but are not on cabinet.

One significant challenge is that most executive directors report to the college president, but their primary duty is to support the foundation board of directors in their philanthropic role. It puts the executive director in the position of "serving two masters." If a college president is knowledgeable about non-profit rules, regulations, and authority over decision making, they would know that they should not pressure the executive director to do their bidding regarding foundation management and activities. Every college president is typically an ex-officio member of the foundation board of directors, which is the appropriate forum to express their viewpoints and requests. However, this is not always the case.

One executive director was released from their position “for no cause” without any consultation with their foundation board of directors. The president had misappropriated foundation funds for personal benefit and used foundation funds for a golf tournament that included a political candidate in their foursome. The foundation board acts as trustees of the organization's assets and ensures that the nonprofit is professionally and ethically managed and remains fiscally sound. In doing so, the board must exercise proper oversight of the organization's operations and maintain the legal and ethical accountability of its staff and volunteers (Foundation Center, 2015). The president unilaterally making decisions about foundation staff and foundation expenditures demonstrates the worst-case scenarios for the executive director reporting to the president. As one interviewee stated,

> “And it’s complicated, because I report directly to that position, I don’t actually report directly to the Board, which I think I should. But I kind of do anyway, but it's not written in my job description. That reporting thing is complicated, and I think a foundation director needs to not fight about who’s the top dog but just work to make everybody look good, whatever that means in your particular college. And give them the tools that they need to be successful. And also know the tools that you need to be successful and fight for them in a strategic way that doesn’t ruffle people’s feathers. Easier said than done.”

At minimum, it seems that a foundation executive director should have a joint report to both the college president and the foundation board of directors, to ensure the judicious evaluation of the position. The next section examines the benefits and challenges of an independent foundation with a strong, “separate but equal” partnership with the superintendent/president.

Finding 2: The Independent Foundation Partnered with the College

Having a separate foundation may provide more benefit to philanthropy efforts by not being tied to the college bureaucracy. The independent college foundation interviewed is run by a chief executive officer who is paid by the foundation and reports to the foundation board of directors and not to the college president. They are considered peers, and work in partnership in support of their community college. The independent foundation pays for all of its operational costs as well, and does not use college functions such as marketing, information technology, and accounting services. They are self-funded and self-sufficient, and for that they avoid the internal college politics, unstable leadership, and competition for resources.

> "The president is my peer, the president is my partner, but she doesn't report to me, and I don't report to her. We negotiate these relationships with our communities."

The independent foundation has the same structure as many auxiliary foundations; they have a MOU with the college, they are given free office space in close proximity to the superintendent/president, and they are a part of cabinet as needed when relevant agenda items require their attendance.

> "I am not officially, and its partly by mutual agreement that I don't want to be, and they don't need me there and therefore we're not. I know that I can always attend. Early on in my tenure I attended most board meetings, academic senate meetings, I spent a year basically getting to know people and them getting to know me. When we were rolling out big initiatives like the Promise, I spent a lot of time with those committees to try and walk them through and get their buy in. But at this point I'm not, yeah, I don't want to sit in those roles because so much of what they're doing, I don't mean to sound arrogant, but I could help them do a lot more efficient work in those spaces, but it's not my job, and I really don't feel that it's mine to insert my opinion there. And frankly, the good will we now have which was fragile for a very long time is partly because we do our thing, they do theirs, and we meet where there's a relevant partnership. But I don't get caught up in their politics, and they don't get inserted into ours and that's just healthier. So, that's part of that independence.

During their experience with numerous interim presidents, they have been both on and off of cabinet. With their current interim president, they have both determined that the president and the executive director would craft the agenda together.

> "I said look, having had the experience I just had, it's a waste of my time, and it's frankly inappropriate some of the things you all talk about, I don't think I want to know the in the weeds disciplinary actions of your employees… So, let's maybe construct an agenda where the big picture relevant things are up here, I join you for that, I disappear, and you can get into the weeds on HR or COVID policy."

The stature of the role of foundation executive directors also has a great bearing on their success. When considering potential community college presidents, one interviewee stated,

> "In a college system many people in this seat are either deans, or considered equivalent to deans, or associate deans, or associate vice presidents, or something else. And if you look at how presidents are hired, almost all say preferably you've been a president somewhere else, at least you've been a vice president for a number of years. And if the foundation leadership is not considered equivalent to vice president level work, we'll never be in the mix for those roles."

> "One of the big blocks is that the assumptions of the value of the foundation are enshrined in that, and so even if they're not conscious assumptions, they're built into that structure that the foundation is somehow equivalent to this side program way down over here as opposed to core functioning department of the institution."

From the comments on the surveys as well as the interviews, history seems to show that expert community college presidents and trustees are the exception rather than the rule. Their tenure can cause turmoil within the college and the community. The separateness of independent foundations has been beneficial in protecting the goals, interactions, and relationships with the community at large, and in some ways lead the college's presence in the community when it's least capable of representing itself. As stated by one interviewee, "Our independence is why we're successful."

Theme Five: Effective Fundraising Requires Professional Staff

While expecting to have more in depth research on the fundraising methods employed by the various college development offices, the resulting research focused to a greater extent on the organizational challenges and opportunities for success. This section's finding is simple. Minimal staffing prevents the growth of more robust development efforts. A single development officer (usually the executive director) has to divide their focus on multiple donors as they arise. They may be planned gifts, endowments, or other types of donations. While actionable, this prevents any one person from focusing on a specific type of donors and donations, but instead they must do their best to respond to diverse and sometimes unplanned cultivation and solicitation efforts.

Finding 1: Managing Gifts versus Developing Gifts

The lack of staffing prevents most colleges from developing a robust array of development programming. As one interviewee stated,

> "What they don't understand is that trust of the community is the preeminent concern. Foundation only works if the community around it has faith in it. And that comes from a good track record, a clear vision, professional staffing."

Scholarships, annual giving programs, and some endowments are common, with partial focus on corporate and foundation grants. Major gifts and planned giving are addressed as they arise. The foundation grows with their investment income. Without additional staff, many major gifts become lucky accidents rather than long planned moves management (which are the actions an organization takes to bring in donors, establish relationships, and renew contributions). Development offices with minimal staff are limited to managing gifts, rather than developing them. "The only element holding up success in securing charitable support is funding the cost of fundraising" (Holmes, Jr., 2010).

Findings Related to Research Questions

The following section will align the findings with the research questions.

Question One: Fundraising Challenges

Research question one asked, "What challenges do California Community College foundation executive directors face in their professional role?" Most of those findings relate to two primary issues: the superintendent/president's impact on fundraising and the need for staffing and resources. The role of the superintendent/president is critical to the life of the college, whether it includes the development office being integrated to the college or being independent from the college.

One of the colleges that participated in the interview had seven superintendent/presidents within six years. Instability in the president's tenure makes not only the operations of the college, morale, and community relations suffer, but also makes it extremely difficult to raise funds in support of a college in turmoil. The minimum qualifications expected for candidates for college president also call in to question how equipped they are to take on that leadership role. The reporting structure can also create an untenable situation if the president has experience or knowledge of how foundations can be operated. A foundation executive director can spend years developing a thriving foundation structure only to have their position eliminated for other than the objective measures of success. The relationship with the president requires constant negotiation and renegotiation with the personalities at the helm of the college and depends on the probity and integrity of the individual at the helm. Reporting to the president rather than the board of directors leave to chance that a knowledgeable and experienced president will be hired.

The lack of sufficient staffing and resources has been discussed throughout this research. One executive director indicated the use of consultants to help fill the staffing gap, though that does not help support the in-person relationships needed to cultivate donors. There are many political implications that create this challenge. There is significant competition from other areas of the college for resources that impact the students immediately. Little to no support is provided to invest in the establishment of development efforts that will allow them to be self-funding. The trustees may also put pressure on the president if those college needs remain unfilled. The lack of development staffing is exacerbated by the addition of other college duties, usually advancement focused responsibilities. The lack of stature of the philanthropy efforts within the college makes it difficult for their staffing and funding needs to be supported.

Question Two: Elements of Fundraising Success

The elements of fundraising success are woven through all the findings. The findings within the organizational models and foundation management align most closely with this question. A summary of the professional experiences, training and knowledge, and personal characteristics follows.

Professional experience in prior philanthropy roles is critical to the success of the foundation executive director. Experience need not be only in education development, but community non-profits as well. A master's degree is a requirement for many executive director positions, and the outreach to professional organizations such as NCCCF and CASE provide peer support, sharing best practices, and foster innovation and creativity. In terms of personal characteristics, the ability to communicate well, relate to people of different beliefs, political viewpoints, cultures, and backgrounds are critical. The ability to think strategically, navigate political challenges, and keep the focus on the mission also key to the position. Prioritization and multitasking are needed, but also innovation to work within the specific college and the community it serves.

Question Three: Community Collaboration. All executive directors work with the internal college community. Scholarships are the usually the initial source donations for newly established foundations. Many foundations set aside money for college grants to which the faculty, staff and programs can apply. Some presidents' request help from the foundation for bond initiatives, capital campaigns, or equipment and other operational needs.

One example of a significant collaboration between the foundation and the college was given by an executive director. This interview transcription tells the story.

> "One example is our cosmetology program. They've been renting a space about 12 miles out, there's an old strip mall out there and they had this really back corner of it, and they were paying $20K a month for this space, it was about 6,000 square feet. They had purchased a private cosmetology school which is how the program grew. And this was about 20 years ago. The Paul Mitchell school was closing down sites and they happened to

> own the property in downtown, and they pitched it to the college, and I happened to be in the room when it happened. And of course, the college said, they said would you like the space, and the college said we'd love it. But you know it's listed at $6M dollars, and they're like, we can't buy it. Because I heard the conversation, I approached the Board of Trustees and the President, and said "You know, we could buy it if you would want to have that space, we'd just have to work out the numbers." And so long story short, we negotiated an all-cash purchase price of $5.3 million for a 10K square foot renovated cosmetology building in downtown, right by where all the salons and all the folks that are going to employ these graduates are, and the college rents it from us, so we hold it as an investment in our permanent endowment. I said I'll keep the rent the same, even though you have 10,000 brand new square feet in downtown, as long as it returns at least 4% on our endowment because we're buying it with restricted endowed dollars. So now we hold it as part of our permanent endowment portfolio, they have better space for the same price in downtown, we have an asset that performs better than all of the bonds, and all of the fixed income assets that we liquidated to buy it, and so it's a great example of like, "See, this is the other way you can leverage assets from a successful foundation, it's not just the dollars we send you. It's that we can be a partner."

Examples such as these demonstrate the power and potential of community college foundations. This transaction was supported by the self-funding, independent foundation with a staff of 15 and $90 million in assets. They are peers to the college president, and very much partnered with the college. It is an example of how in some ways, there are more opportunities in being excluded from internal college politics and focusing on the outcome of providing philanthropy support for the college and its students.

Conclusion

This research focused on community college foundations and the challenges and successes experienced by foundation executive directors. The data gathered is intended to inform and to maximize non-profit giving in support of the college and its students. Initially using the example of four-year universities transitioning from dependence on public funding to a partnered dependence on public and private funding, this research does not expect community colleges to emulate the exact structures, practices and organizational models employed by four-year universities. The community college structure must evolve as a refection of the community it serves.

Nonetheless, there are gold standards in university fundraising that can be appropriately emulated within community colleges. The four-year university practices can be used as templates for success and modified as needed. It is hoped that this research will help to break down the college obstacles to supporting their college's philanthropies and helping to rise the much-needed dollars for education.

CHAPTER FIVE: REFLECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Restatement of Motivation for this Study

This study was initiated by my experiences in advancement at a high-ranking four-year research university for 15 years, followed by 13 years at a local community college as the Executive Director of Advancement and Foundation. It has been seven years since I worked at the community college. As the first professional advancement and development professional to oversee the foundation, which had been led by part-time volunteers and a retired vice president of student affairs, I had no idea of the challenges I would face. In addition, my duties not only included being executive director of the foundation, but I was given the oversight of the college's public relations manager and the institutional research department, which had no manager but did have a research coordinator.

The following 13 years were filled with remarkable success and equally great struggle. I started with student workers, who were trained and then hired into their college full-time positions. As fundraising grew, the foundation paid for their salaries as an accounting assistant and a database manager. After a number of years, I hired a development officer, funded by the foundation. None of these had job descriptions suitable for development duties.

Why did four-year university have such commitment to and support of their development staff, and community colleges did not? They were the rainmakers, allowing the research university to hire stellar staff, expand programs, and remain on the forefront of higher education in the nation. The expectation of this research was not to suggest that community colleges, who were not originally intended to need to raise philanthropy gifts to support their operations, should be emulate the same organizational structures and operations as the four-year universities. It was intended to shed light on the community college perceptions and support of development offices and their foundations and find ways to support increased fundraising success.

Although some progress has been made in the establishment and support of community college development efforts, the study confirmed that there are still many challenges faced by community college fundraisers. It is hoped that this research would help to identify the cause of these challenges, and what viable solutions might community college philanthropies might avail themselves of.

Section One: Reflections on Research

In beginning this study, it was my hope to better understand why community college institutionally related foundations (IRFs) lacked the institutional support for philanthropy that has been enjoyed by private and public four-year colleges for decades. The unpredictable revenue stream has made it difficult to serve the needs of students seeking this entry to higher education (Lanning, 2008; Ryan, 2003; Glass & Jackson, 1998). The recession in 2008 produced more serious budget cuts that resulted in limited student admission to UC and CSU, sending large numbers of students to two-year institutions.

Community college and university foundations are "idiosyncratic, reflecting the peculiarities of individual institutional cultures, state and system contexts, and financial and political circumstances" (Bass, 2003). Regional and local community influences govern community colleges to a greater extent than universities, and student diversity is greater. However, there is a great deal of internal competition for limited resources. Bolman and Deal's political frame "views organizations as roiling arenas, hosting ongoing contests of individual and group interests" (Bolman and Deal, p.194).

Figure 2. Community College Foundation Timeline References

1922:THE EARLIEST COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATION

- In California, the earliest available records indicate that Long Beach City College established a foundation in 1922, the year it was founded (Jenkins & Glass, 1999).
- Nonetheless, public funding seemed sufficient to support the growth in community colleges during the early 1960s and 1970s, so trustees and college presidents did not feel the urgency to pursue private funding (Akin, 2005).

1970s: PRIVATE FUNDRAISING EFFORTS ENCOURAGED

- By the 1970s, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) encouraged community and junior colleges to initiate private fundraising efforts. The Council for the Advancement and Support of Education opened its membership to include community and junior colleges in 1974 (Glass, Jr. & Jackson, 1998).

1978: PROPOSITION 13 REDUCES COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDING

- In California, the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, a constitutional amendment limiting property taxes, resulted in decreased property taxes and began the reduction in tax funds to support community college education (Katsinas, 2005).
- Federal grants and matching funds were used to replace some of the shortfalls, but by 2004 Medicaid costs became the funding priority in the state (Katsinas, Palmer, and Tollefson, 2004).

1990s-2000s: INCREASED FOCUS ON FUNDRAISING

- The 1990s through the turn of the 21st century brought an increased focus on community college fundraising across the nation. Tidal Wave II, a significant increase in the nation’s high school graduates, increased the need for community college access between 2000 and 2006 (Hardy, Katsinas, and Bush, 2007). The increased demand and the unreliable state funding created an untenable situation for the California community college. “Because community colleges are more dependent on state funds than other sectors of higher education (Hebel, 2003), reductions hurt more than they do at four-year colleges and other universities” (Katsinas, 2005).

BEYOND 2000: THE FOUNDATION

- The foundation board of directors are the conduit between the community college foundation and the community at large. Their role is to educate, advocate, and promote the college within the community, as well as identify questions, concerns, or needs that the community may share with them about the college (O’Connell, 2003).
- The foundation board must exercise proper oversight of the organization's operations and maintain the legal and ethical accountability of its staff and volunteers (Foundation Center, 2015).

This research confirmed some of my assumptions about the community college/development office relationship and challenged others. The things that remain the same include the uncertainty of the veracity of your supervisor if you report to the president. Challenges include instability in the president's position because of the need to continually understand the relationship and renegotiate it constantly. The insecurity of reporting to that position continues to present challenges unless you have the good fortune to have someone with strong leadership, diplomacy, and a firm understanding of their role and limitations regarding the foundation. As stated by the independent foundation CEO, "It became important to make sure that the college leadership was less and less relevant to our success." Staffing and budget continue to be a problem if you are part of the college infrastructure. The college's unfamiliarity with what the foundation does (more than just scholarships and events) makes it challenging to create a more sophisticated program in that small environment.

Significant in the reporting structure is that a foundation executive director reporting to the president only, instead of to their foundation, makes possible the misuse of foundation funding by the president. A president's lack of knowledge, understanding, ethics, or concern for non-profit laws may put the employee in a position of upholding their fiduciary responsibilities for their foundation or losing their job by challenging their supervisors illicit actions.

I was enlightened by this research on many fronts. I had presumed that if the college understood development efforts the road would be much smoother. This research demonstrated that trust building is critical, even before telling them how philanthropy works. They need to know that the foundation does not operate like a bank, the focus is not solely scholarships and college grants, and that development officers don't dictate to the donors where they want their money to go. Donors are given the opportunities for support, are shown the needs, and unless the gift is unrestricted, the money must be spent as intended.

The research also demonstrated that the external focus on the community may be more important than persuading the college constituency that the development office is a worthy investment. This is based on the deeper revelation that perhaps being attached to the college is not the most efficacious structure for successful philanthropic efforts. The independent foundation was a strong connection for the community when the community college itself was mired in controversy. Their primary role is to lead the organization, move issues forward, get consensus among a disparate group of individuals, and fundraising is always a part of it. It's about creating relationships and building political alliances needed to move things forward, find community partners, and leverage those relationships in support of the college.

Each college development office will be different, reflecting both its college community and the community at large. While certain successful models might work in one community, they may be less than satisfactory for another. The college whose executive director was the vice president of advancement and development was fortunate to have a knowledgeable, dynamic, and partnership-oriented individual at the helm. The vice president was extremely well respected, appreciated, lauded, and supported by the college superintendent/president and administration, their foundation president and board of directors, and the community at large. They were the central force in creating relationships to enhance college offerings that would support community businesses through workforce development. These in turn became donor prospects for many of the college programs, and their success in both fundraising and advancement made them a highly respected member of the college administration. This comprehensive approach to external affairs can be successful, and their foundation provided staffing for the development efforts while the college provided staffing and budget for the advancement efforts.

In contrast to this integrated college and foundation example, the foundation that was independent from the college seemed to garner all of the benefits with fewer of the challenges of being associated with the college. They operated with an awareness that trust of the community is the preeminent concern, and that the foundation only works if the community around it has faith in it. They had offices in the same building as the president, and so had both access to and visibility with the president and administration. The foundation CEO, staff of 15 and operations were all paid for by the foundation. They had a separate but equal partnership with the president, reported to and were evaluated by the foundation board of directors, and continue to be extremely successful in raising funds for their college community, with net assets of $90 million.

A recommendation for foundation success includes creating the greatest level of independence that can be supported in the particular local context, and of course that changes. In addition, there needs to be a centrality of the foundation to the institution. There is a need to continue to educate college leadership, to instill in the college community that the foundation is every bit as central to the institution as their curriculum committee, academic senate, or anything else. The third recommendation is strengthen the relationship with the community you serve and the resources to conduct your mission the best way possible, and the foundation is the vehicle for that.

The future of higher education is community colleges, as they are at the front lines of higher education. Community colleges educate nearly half of the college students in the United States yet receive a fraction of all the philanthropy to education. It is hoped that through this research, we will begin to turn the corner.

Section Two: Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The case study responses were from three different operational and organizational models that were each successful in their own way. One college had the typical limited staffing for community college foundations but used consultants to successfully fill the gap. The second college was very integrated into the college structure as the vice president of advancement and development. This college had an interim president with a great deal of experience with foundations who both lauded and championed the efforts of the vice president and the foundation. The third college foundation was completely separate and self-supporting which was beneficial in that their college had a great deal of challenges with many short-term presidents. The chief executive officer had a separate but equal partnership with the college president, which insulated the foundation from college turmoil.

One limitation was that the case studies, which were originally intended to be site visits, were limited to Zoom interviews due to the COVID pandemic. While intended to also identify college-stakeholder interactions, was unable to do so because of the need to interview remotely. A site visit to a college with the opportunity to informally ask questions of some of the college faculty and staff would perhaps prove a more complete view of how the college views and interacts with their foundation.

The second limitation pertains to the selection of single colleges with their own foundation. This research did not explore the multi-college districts who have one foundation serving multiple colleges. From the survey responses one district had both. One multi-college district had a foundation that served the entire district and some of their colleges also had their own individual foundation. Researching how these variances operate and their challenges, successes, and opportunities for enhanced resource development were not examined and would be an area for further research.

A third limitation is that this research revealed examples of substantial benefits made possible through foundation revenue, which was not able to be fully explored. The independent foundation, which has net assets of $90 million, was able to purchase a building in their city for the college to lease for a mere 4% return to the foundation per year. The became part of the foundations assets while in turn providing great benefit to the college. This gave the college the use of a larger, more centrally located and less expensive location for their technical program than the one they had been leasing in a more distant location. The same college offered the California Promise program which was redesigned so that the foundation pays for all tuition, fees, books needed for high school graduates within the college district on the condition that the students commit to enrolling full-time for two years through graduation. In addition, the foundation funded a staff position to help the students with this process.

The fourth limitation was that the examination of fundraising methods and donor cultivation and stewardship, including the role of community college alumni, was limited by the interview responses leaning more towards the relationships between the college presidents, executive directors, and foundation board of directors presidents. These fundraising methods are broad enough to warrant a separate study focusing solely on these activities.

The is room to add more research to the role of philanthropy in education, and especially at the community college level. Thoughts on future research include:

- The models for four-year universities are robust and successful, but does it fit for the community college? It would be important to explore the possibility that an independent but aligned foundation paid for and reporting to the foundation may be the most effective model given the uncertainty of college leadership.

- Examine the role of community college shared governance. Does it produce the intended results, or create more division than unity?
- Examine the qualifications of current community college presidents to see if there is any correlation between educational background and experience and successful college philanthropies. Are the current minimum qualifications too low to provide a knowledgeable, experienced educational administrator and/or president? Should there

be a separate minimum qualification for superintendent/president that that of educational administrator?

- Examine the change in basic assumptions about community college student profiles. They are not all high school graduates starting on their educational path. Many are single, working parents with children, some are homeless, suffer food insufficiency, and more. Increasingly community colleges have established food pantries with the help of their foundations. Basic skills are now at the forefront of many community college student needs, not the exception. This focus changing student needs and how the philanthropies can support these efforts are worthy of research.
- Study the impact of the Promise Program being fully supported by foundation funding. Does making available free community college tuition, fees, and books to high school graduates for two years increase the graduation rate of these students? How can that program be enhanced?

There is not a great deal of research on community college philanthropies. Given the ongoing instability of state funding for community colleges, further research identifying the most successful way to create successful philanthropic partnerships and support would help ensure the resources needed to educate and support our students.

Section Three: Implications of My Study

Among the many findings provided by this research, there were three implications that seemed particularly significant. They are foundation independence, reassessing the superintendent/president's experience and qualifications regarding philanthropy efforts, and the continued need for a strong partnership, mutual respect, and support from both the foundation executive director and the superintendent president.

Foundation Independence, Self-Funding, and Reporting to the Foundation Board of Directors

The first implication is that the foundation being independent and separate from the college may be most beneficial for both the foundation and the college. This does not preclude a distanced relationship between the foundation and the college, but rather extracts the foundation from college bureaucracy and politic. This allows a closer, separate but equal relationship between the foundation CEO and the college president. This implication is not suggested to be suitable for every college, but that the assumption that community college foundation should be part of the college institution. While that organizational structure works for the larger four-year universities, it may not be optimal for the much smaller, resource deprived community college system. The research showed that being an employee of the college isn't necessary for the executive director to have an integral relationship with the college. Being thought of as a separate but equal partner to the college president seems to have greater advantages than being subsumed within college politics.

Transitioning the foundations from college funded to completely foundation funded could be achieved over time, as the foundation develops sufficient investment income to cover their costs. The current independent foundation transitioned in similarly with the support and encouragement of a president who was deeply knowledgeable about fundraising. This college president's decision resulted in one of the most successful community college foundations in the state.

Minimum Qualifications for Superintendent/President and the Need for Philanthropy Experience

The minimum qualification to be a community college superintendent president is a master's degree and one year of commensurate leadership experience. While this may have sufficed in the past, the survey and interviewee respondents indicated that almost all had experience with college presidents that were ill-equipped to lead a large and diverse educational institution. This created many challenges, short tenures in the presidency, organizational mismanagement, and created negative reputations for the college in the community. All of this also makes any philanthropy efforts a challenge unless the philanthropy is separate from the college.

In addition to the insufficient minimum qualifications, the college president's job description should include a requirement for knowledge and experience working closely with the college foundation. That should include the parameters that define what they can and cannot do with foundation funds in overseeing this position. It is important for the trustees to also evaluate the president on their successes in supporting the foundation and assisting with cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of college donors. If part of the college organization, the foundation board of directors should be included in a structured evaluation process for the executive director, by both the board and the president and not exclusively by the president. And the executive director should have the capability of creating appropriate development job descriptions where none exist without being subject to college politics.

Partnership with the Superintendent/President. Finally, regardless of reporting structure, the superintendent/president should be a champion of the executive director and the foundation. The executive directors frequently spend much of their initial tenure at the college attending meetings that may or may not have anything to do with their philanthropic function. However, this has been an ongoing need, especially if the college president is not championing the philanthropy efforts. The president should take the lead in validating and supporting the foundation efforts within the college community, it should not solely be the executive director's job. One interviewee stated that it's the executive director's duty to make the college president look good. I would argue that that goes both ways. To have to constantly self-promote within the college and pacify an insecure president takes valuable time and energy from the more important fundraising efforts. There is a need to educate, communicate, build trust, and respect between the various college entities and the philanthropy efforts.

Section Four: Personal Reflections and Conclusion

This study sought to identify the challenges and opportunities for success for community college foundations, and to better understand why there is such a lack of support from many community colleges for their revenue generating philanthropies. Working at a community college for 13 years after working for 15 years at a top tier research university was a surprisingly difficult transition. At the university I felt valued for the development and advancement work I led. At the community college, I was asked to not mention my previous job, because the community college "was not (the university)." I could not understand why a community college wouldn't want to model itself after one of the most successful universities in the country.

Why this is? Maybe it's the college size is too small to sustain a university model? I used to think a better connection with the college would help. This research made me realize that the various coalitions within the community college are understaffed and underfunded, and perhaps they don't have time or interest in learning about the foundation in an already resource depleted environment. Focusing on community relations and becoming separate may be more beneficial to supporting fundraising efforts. Demonstrating to the college community the value provided by the foundation financial support to their programs may be more impactful that discussing it.

In Chapter Two I indicated that community colleges were originally completely funded, and they were getting a good amount of money. But after Proposition 13 passed in 1978 much of the state funding was no longer available. That is part of the reason that many community college foundations were established in the 80s and 90s. And colleges still continue to add foundations, almost all of them do now, other than some of the newer and more remote colleges. And I want to be clear, I do not expect to mimic university fundraising with community college fundraising at all; it's a different creature altogether. But there are some principles that can be modified and adapted to community colleges to make them successful, which has been seen in the independent college foundation that has $90 million dollars in net assets. It is possible to do.

The growth has been mostly in the late 80s until now, probably through the 2000 to 2010 arena. And there's been a little bit of drop off because now almost everyone has a California community college foundation. But with the passage of Proposition 13, there is an expectation to raise money through their foundations to support the colleges.

The first gifts were usually scholarships and unsolicited gifts that would come into the college, and they needed a place to house the donations. Between the 2008 to 2011 economic recession there were more cuts to community college funding, and the need for that extra funding became more critical. It is unlikely that community colleges will enjoy the full state and federal funding they enjoyed when they were established. And during that time, the demand for community college education is greater than ever. During the recession four-year universities were not only more expensive but did not have the funding capacity to educate their own admitted students, so many university admits were asked to begin their education at their local community college.

Community colleges get the least amount of money than the UCs, California State Universities, or K-12. So how do you support those without an added non-profit infrastructure? I think there are more colleges that are growing more educational infrastructures, and their foundations are being turned to for capital campaigns, bond measures and more. So, the expectation for the community college to raise private funds is there, but there is not a similar expectation within the college to invest in development program programming. The financial need for philanthropy funding for community colleges will only continue to grow. It is hoped that the college leadership, including the trustees, will be visionary enough to see and invest in it.

Conclusion

This research provided great insights into the inner workings of many of our California community college foundations. I hope to share the information learned through this research with networking organizations such as the Network for California Community Colleges and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. I would like to provide consulting support to other community colleges and hope to create other opportunities to share this information and provide support for other community college foundation leaders.

In conclusion, it is important to realize that community colleges educate 44% of all college students in the United States but receive less than four percent of the philanthropy for education. As one interviewee stated, “we catalyze new programs for the institution, we commit the college to the community, and we grow resources.” The role of philanthropy in community colleges continues to be critical to their success, and as another interviewee stated, “I do think the future of higher education is community colleges, period.” And I completely agree.

Appendices

Appendix 1

California Community College Foundation Survey

California Community College Foundation Survey 2018

The purpose of this survey is to collect information that will allow California community college foundation staff to identify best practices and solutions to challenges that impact their fundraising success.

All information will remain confidential, and pseudonyms will be used. The final analysis will be shared with all participants and will report general trends.

Please fill out one survey per institution.

Question Title

1. Does your foundation represent a single college or district with multiple colleges?

- Single college
- District with multiple colleges

Question Title

2. GENERAL
Are you the foundation executive director for your community college?

- Yes
- No

Other (please specify your title)

Question Title

3. Is your foundation auxiliary or independent?
- A Memo of Understanding (MOU) defines the support -- financial or in kind -- provided by the college and what reciprocal support is provided by the foundation)

- Auxiliary with MOU - partnered with the college with shared foundation and college support
- Auxiliary but with no MOU - partnered with the college with no defined reciprocal agreement
- Independent - self-funding, no college support

Question Title

4. What is the size of your community college's student population (or full district per question above)?

- <2,500 FTE
- 2,500-4,999 FTE
- 5,000-9,999 FTE
- 10,000 FTE or greater

Question Title

5. What is the average median income of counties served by your community college foundation? Source: State Income Tax Returns, State of Californi, Franchise Tax Board (www.ftb.ca.gov)

- $20,000 - $25,000
- $25,001 - $30,000
- $30,001 - $35,000
- $35,001 - $40,000
- $40,001 - $45,000
- $45,001 - $50,000
- $50,001 - $55,000
- $55,001 and above

Question Title

6. In what year was your foundation established?

Question Title

7. FOUNDATION STAFF
To whom does your foundation's Executive Director/CEO report (i.e., solid reporting line)?

- Chancellor
- Superintendent/President
- Vice President
- Foundation Board of Directors
- Other (please specify)

Question Title

8. Is your foundation's Executive Director/CEO a member of your institution's president's/leadership cabinet?

- Yes
- No

Question Title

9. How many years and months have you worked at this community college as the executive director/CEO of the foundation?

Question Title

10. Have you worked in other educational institutions in fundraising, Foundation work, or other development or advancement roles? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ K-12 fundraising
- ☐ California State
- ☐ Out of state four-year university
- ☐ Private college or university
- ☐ University of California
- ☐ Other California community college
- ☐ Out of state community college

Other (please specify)

Question Title

11. How many TOTAL staff FTE are employed at your foundation/fundraising department? Do not include individuals that work exclusively on college programs, even though they may report to you.

Question Title

12. Please list your foundation/fundraising staff members' titles, indicating what percentage of their salary is paid by the college and what percentage is paid by the foundation. For example:
Executive Director, 50% foundation, 50% college
Development Officer, 100% foundation, 0% college
Accounting Assistant, 100% foundation, 0% college
Administrative assistant, 0% foundation, 100% college

Question Title

13. What percentage of time does your foundation's Executive Director/CEO devote to the foundation as opposed to other job responsibilities? (Should add up to 100%)

Foundation/fundraising responsibilities

Other job responsibilities for the college not related to foundation or fundraising

Total = 100%

Question Title

14. BUDGET/FUNDING

How are your foundation/fundraising operations funded?

- Foundation is self-supporting and raises its own operational funding
- Combination of funding from college/district and fundraising
- Funded by the college/district

Other (please specify)

Question Title

*** 15. If your foundation is self-supporting, please specify the source of operational funding. If more than one option is needed, please list in comment box.**

- Endowment Proceeds
- Direct Donations
- Administrative Fees
- Enterprise Activities (e.g., fundraisers, publishing and vending contacts, swap meets, event sponsorship)

Other (please specify)

Question Title

16. What is your foundation's current operating budget?

- $100,000 or less
- $100,001 - $200,000
- $200,001 - $300,000
- $300,001 - $400,000
- $400,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $600,000
- $600,001 - $1 M
- $1.1 M - $3 M
- $3 M or more
- Other (please specify)

Question Title

17. Has your foundation suffered recent cuts to funding?

- Yes
- No

Question Title

18. Does your foundation currently have a fundraising plan?

- Yes
- No
- In process

Question Title

19. Does your foundation's fundraising plan align with the college's strategic plan?

- Yes
- No
- Partially
- In Process
- N/A

Question Title

20. What is your current annual fundraising goal?

- No specific goal established
- $100,000 or less
- $100,001 - $200,000
- $200,001 - $300,000
- $300,001 - $400,000
- $400,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $600,000
- $600,001 - $800,000
- $800,001 - $1 M
- $1.1 M - $1.5 M
- $1.6 M - $2 M
- $2.1 M - $4 M
- $4 M and above

Question Title

21. Approximately how much has your foundation raised over the last five years?

- $100,000 or less
- $100,001 - $250,000
- $250,001 - $500,000
- $500,001 - $750,000
- $750,001 - $999,999
- $1 M - $3 M
- $3.1 M - $5 M
- $5.1 M - $8 M
- $8.1 M - $11 M
- $11.1 M - $15 M
- $15.1 M - $20 M
- $20.1 M and above

Question Title

22. On average, how many donors contribute annually to the foundation?

- 100 or less
- 101 - 500
- 501 - 1000
- 1,001 - 2,500
- 2,501 - 5,000
- 5,001 and above

Question Title

23. To what extent do you feel the college understands the role and scope of the foundation and its fundraising efforts?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all
- Please explain.

Question Title

24. To what extent do you feel that your college supports the foundation/fundraising efforts?

- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- None at all
- Please explain.

Question Title

25. FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

How many individuals are there on your foundation board of directors in total?

- 5 or less
- 6 - 10 members
- 11 - 15 members
- 16 - 20 members
- 21 - 30 members
- 30 or more members

Question Title

26. Which of the following college representatives serve on the foundation board of directors? Please check all that apply

- [ ] College president
- [ ] Trustee
- [ ] Faculty representative
- [ ] Classified representative
- [ ] Student representative

Other (please specify)

Question Title

27. What is the level of involvement in fundraising by your foundation board of directors?

- ( ) Exceed expectations
- ( ) Meet expectations
- ( ) Below expectations

Question Title

28. Does the foundation produce fundraising events?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No

Question Title

29. What events are produced? Please check all that apply.

- [ ] Annual Dinners
- [ ] Golf Tournaments
- [ ] Alumni Events
- [ ] Sporting Events
- [ ] Wine Tastings
- [ ] Swap Meets
- [ ] Farmers Markets
- [ ] Phone-a-thon
- [ ] Membership Luncheons, such as President's Circle luncheons

Other (please specify)

Question Title

30. What would you say is your greatest challenge in raising funds for your community college?

Question Title

31. What would you consider your greatest fundraising success within your college?

Question Title

32. CONTACT INFORMATION

Respondents must provide contact information to receive survey results.

Name and Title of Respondent

Name of College/District and Full Name of Foundation

Foundation Address

Address 2

City/Town

State

ZIP/Postal Code

Email Address

Phone Number

Appendix 2

Executive Director Interviews

***** Explain the goals of the study and the purpose of the interview. Explain the consent form and obtain a signed copy. Ask for permission to record and answer any questions they may have about the study or the interview itself. I will use a verbal consent.

1. Did you have any previous roles at your institution? At any other educational institution? If so, what were those? (RQ1)

2. What is your professional background? (RQ2)

   a. How have these positions or experiences prepared you for your foundation work? (RQ2)

3. How did you assume the role of foundation executive director? (RQ2)

4. How are the foundation's fundraising goals determined? (RQ2)

   a. Do you think these goals are realistic? (RQ2)

   PROMPT: Do you feel the president provides the necessary guidance to determine the fundraising priorities?

5. Do you have other roles/responsibilities that are not related to fundraising, and if yes, what are they? (RQ1)

   a. What do you do in these roles? (RQ1)

   b. How do you balance your foundation roles and your non-foundation roles (RQ1)

   c. In what ways, if any, do these roles intersect? (RQ1)

   d. What do you see as the benefits of having dual roles? (RQ1)

   e. What do you see as the challenges of having dual roles? (RQ1)

6. Given the nature of foundation work and the financial challenges that are facing schools, from your perspective, what do you see as the major challenges to your position? (RQ1)

   a. What are the challenges related to:

      i. Working with the college president/administration? (RQ1)

      PROMPT: How does your reporting structure impact your fundraising efforts?

      PROMPT: Do you feel the president/administration understands your role in fundraising?

      PROMPT: To what extent is the president involved in the foundation? Is it an arms-length relationship? Are they more (or less) involved than necessary?

PROMPT: Do they view the foundation as an integral part of the college, or a separate entity.

PROMPT: How are you evaluated?

ii. Working with faculty? Staff? Students? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Are your faculty involved with the foundation activities? Are they donors?

PROMPT: Do faculty, staff, and students dialogue with you about their needs and possible involvement with foundation activities?

iii. Collaborating with volunteers and Foundation Board of Directors? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Approximately how many years have they been involved with your foundation (less than five, more than five, more than 10)?

PROMPT: Do you feel your board members effectively support your policy making efforts? Fundraising efforts?

iv. Policy development? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel that you have a good understanding of required foundation policies?

PROMPT? What resources do you turn to when you have policy questions with which you are unfamiliar?

v. Working with the business community? (RQ1)

PROMPT: How do you feel the business community views the college? The foundation?

PROMPT: Does the college have a strategy to increase community visibility and support? Does the foundation have a strategy to increase community visibility and support?

vi. Working with the community's political arena? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What kind of interactions do you have with the political leaders in your community? With whom do you interact (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.) and the college?

PROMPT: What challenges do you face, if any, in dealing with your community's political representatives?

PROMPT: What is the relationship between the community's political representatives (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.) and the foundation?

vii. Managing expectations for fundraising? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel the fundraising expectations for the foundation as attainable? Why or why not?

viii. Getting necessary resources (both staff and financial)? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What do you believe are the influences in the foundation receiving or not receiving the necessary support? Why?

ix. Other?

7. Do you think the campus community at your institution understands your role? (RQ3)

   PROMPT: Why or why not?

8. Do you feel that you and the foundation are an integrated part of campus, or do you feel you are viewed as a separate entity from the campus? Please explain. (RQ3a)

9. Tell me how you collaborate with others on campus for your foundation work? (RQ3)

   a. With which programs do you collaborate?

   b. Tell me about the benefits of this collaboration?

   c. What are the challenges?

10. Do you serve on any college committees? If yes, please tell me about them. (RQ3)

    PROMPT: How does your college committee work impact your foundation efforts?

11. Tell me how you collaborate with other foundation executive directors on other campuses? (RQ3)

    a. On what specifically do you collaborate? (RQ3)

    b. Tell me about the benefits of this collaboration? (RQ3)

    c. What are the challenges? (RQ3)

12. Do you use any professional networks to inform your work? (RQ3, 3a)

    a. If so, what are those professional networks? (RQ3, 3a)

    b. Do you consider them helpful? If so, how are they helpful to your work? (RQ3, 3a)

13. What or whom has been most beneficial to your position as foundation executive director? Why? (RQ1, RQ3a)

14. What do you feel foundation executive directors need to be successful in fundraising at their colleges. (RQ1)

15. Is there anything else that you would like to say that I have not asked you about?

Appendix 3

Foundation President Interviews

***** Explain the goals of the study and the purpose of the interview. Explain the consent form and obtain a signed copy. Ask for permission to record and answer any questions they may have about the study or the interview itself. I will use a verbal consent.

1. How long have you been on the Foundation Board of Directors? (RQ2)

   a. How long have you served as Foundation President? Did you have any previous officer roles on the Foundation? If so, what were they? (RQ1)

2. What is your professional background? (RQ2)

   a. How have these positions or experiences prepared you for your foundation work? (RQ2)

3. How are the foundation's fundraising goals determined? (RQ2)

   a. As the Foundation president, do you participate in setting the fundraising goals? Please describe how you are involved. (RQ1b)

   PROMPT: Do you feel the president provides the necessary guidance to determine the fundraising priorities?

   b. Do you think these goals are realistic? (RQ2)

4. How often does your Foundation Board of Directors meet? (RQ1b)

   a. Do you think this is too often, not enough, or just right?

   b. On what additional Foundation Board subcommittees do you serve?

   PROMPT: Is this beneficial or necessary in your role as Foundation president?

5. What other professional positions or significant experiences have you had that have prepared you for the role of Foundation president? (RQ2)

6. Given the nature of foundation work and the financial challenges that are facing schools, from your perspective, what do you see as the major challenges to your position as Foundation President? (RQ1)

   a. What are the challenges related to:

      i. Working with the college president/administration? (RQ1)

         PROMPT: How does the reporting structure impact your fundraising efforts?

         PROMPT: Do you feel the president/administration understands your role in fundraising?

         PROMPT: To what extent is the president involved in the foundation? Is it an arms-length relationship? Are they more (or less) involved than necessary?

PROMPT: Do they view the foundation as an integral part of the college, or a separate entity.

ii. Working with faculty? Staff? Students? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Are your faculty involved with the foundation activities? Are they donors?

PROMPT: Do faculty, staff, and students dialogue with you about their needs and possible involvement with foundation activities?

iii. Working with volunteers and Foundation Board of Directors? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Approximately how many years have they been involved with your foundation (less than five, more than five, more than 10)?

PROMPT: Do you feel your board members effectively support your policy making efforts? Fundraising efforts?

iv. Policy development? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel that you have a good understanding of required foundation policies?

PROMPT? What resources do you turn to when you have policy questions with which you are unfamiliar?

v. Working with the business community? (RQ1)

PROMPT: How do you feel the business community views the college? The foundation?

PROMPT: Does the college have a strategy to increase community visibility and support?

vi. Working with the community's political arena? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What kind of interactions do you have with the political leaders in your community? With whom do you interact (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.) and the college?

PROMPT: What challenges do you face, if any, in dealing with your community's political representatives?

PROMPT: What is the relationship between the community's political representatives (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.) and the foundation?

vii. Managing expectations for fundraising? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel the fundraising expectations for the foundation as attainable? Why or why not?

viii. Getting necessary resources (both staff and financial)? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What do you believe are the influences in the foundation receiving or not receiving the necessary support? Why?

ix. Other?

7. Do you think the campus community at your institution understands your role?

   PROMPT: Why or why not? (RQ1)

8. Do you feel that you and the foundation are an integrated part of campus, or do you feel you are viewed as a separate entity from the campus? Please explain. (RQ3a)

9. Tell me how you collaborate with others on campus for your foundation work? (RQ3)

   a. With which programs do you collaborate?

   b. Tell me about the benefits of this collaboration?

   c. What are the challenges?

10. Do you serve on any college committees not specific to the Foundation? (RQ3)

    PROMPT: How does your college committee work impact your foundation efforts?

11. Do you use any professional networks to inform your work? (RQ3, 3a)

    a. If so, what are those professional networks? (RQ3, 3a)

    b. Do you consider them helpful? If so, how are they helpful to your work? (RQ3, 3a)

12. What or whom has been most beneficial to your position as foundation president? (RQ1, RQ3a)

    a. Why? (RQ1, RQ3a)

13. Is there anything else that you would like to say that I have not asked you about?

Appendix 4

College President Interviews

***** Explain the goals of the study and the purpose of the interview. Explain the consent form and obtain a signed copy. Ask for permission to record and answer any questions they may have about the study or the interview itself. I will use verbal consent.

1. How long have you been President at your institution? (RQ2)

   a. Did you have any previous roles at your institution? At any other educational institution? If so, what were those? (RQ1)

2. What is your professional background? (RQ2)

3. How did these roles and experiences help you in support of the foundation? (RQ2)

4. How are the foundation's fundraising goals determined? (RQ2)

   a. Do you think these goals are realistic? (RQ2)

5. What percentage of your time do you allocate to working in support of the Foundation? (RQ1)

6. Please describe your involvement in the foundation and its fundraising efforts? (RQ1)

   a. Do you sit on the Foundation Board of Directors?

   b. How active are you in establishing the fundraising goals and priorities?

   c. Are you involved in prospect identification and cultivation? If yes, please describe.

   d. Are you involved in finalizing gifts?

   e. Do you participate in donor recognition and stewardship? Please describe.

7. How do you balance your presidential responsibilities with your participation in the foundation roles (RQ1)

   a. In what ways, if any, do these roles intersect?

   b. What do you see as the benefits of managing both roles?

   c. What do you see as the challenges of managing both roles?

8. Given the nature of foundation work and the financial challenges that are facing schools, from your perspective, what do you see as the major challenges to your position? (RQ1)

   a. What are the challenges related to:

      i. Working with the foundation executive director? (RQ1)

         PROMPT: Do you feel you understand the executive directors role in fundraising?

PROMPT: Do you view the foundation as an integral part of the college, or a separate entity.

PROMPT: Is fundraising a component in your evaluation by the Trustees?

ii. Working with faculty? Staff? Students? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you encourage faculty involvement with the foundation activities? Are they donors?

PROMPT: Do faculty, staff, and students dialogue with you about their needs and possible involvement with foundation activities?

iii. Working with volunteers and Foundation Board of Directors? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel your board members effectively support your policy making efforts? Fundraising efforts?

iv. Policy development? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel that you have a good understanding of required foundation policies?

PROMPT: What resources do you turn to when you have policy questions with which you are unfamiliar?

v. Working with the business community? (RQ1)

PROMPT: How do you feel the business community views the college? The foundation?

PROMPT: Does the college have a strategy to increase community visibility and support? Does the foundation have a strategy to increase community visibility and support?

vi. Working with the community's political arena? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What kind of interactions do you have with the political leaders in your community? With whom do you interact (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.)?

PROMPT: What challenges do you face, if any, in dealing with your community's political representatives?

PROMPT: What is the relationship between the community's political representatives (mayor, senator, assemblymen, city council, etc.) and the foundation?

vii. Managing expectations for fundraising? (RQ1)

PROMPT: Do you feel the fundraising expectations for the foundation as attainable? Why or why not?

viii. Getting necessary resources (both staff and financial)? (RQ1)

PROMPT: What do you believe are the influences in the foundation receiving or not receiving the necessary support? Why?

ix. Other?

9. Do you feel that you and the foundation are an integrated part of campus, or do you feel you are viewed as a separate entity from the campus? Please explain. (RQ3a)

10. Do you participate in professional networks to support the college's fundraising efforts?? (RQ3, 3a)

    a. If so, what are those professional networks?

    b. Do you consider them helpful? If so, how are they helpful to your work?

11. What do you feel foundation executive directors need to be successful in fundraising at their colleges. (RQ1)

12. Is there anything else that you would like to say that I have not asked you about?

References

Abrahamson, K. (2006). The ethics of rationing education in the California community colleges. *EJournal of Education Policy,* (Winter).

Akin, S. R. (2005). Institutional Advancement and Community Colleges: A Review of the Literature. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 6*(1), 65-75. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ijea.2140234

American Association of Community Colleges, *Community colleges past to present.* 2008a. Retrieved Nov 22, 2008, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu?About CC/history/Pages/pasttopresent.aspx.

Anderson, S. (2004/2005). Successful community college fund-raising programs. *Community College Journal, 75*(3), 19-20-25.

Anderson, J. M. and Snyder, T. (1993). The Community College Foundation manual & Guide. Network of California Community College Foundations (Ed 365 369)

Astin, A. W., & Oseguera, L. (2004). The Declining "Equity" of American Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education,* 27(3), 321-341. doi:10.1353/rhe.2004.0001

Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). What determines alumni generosity? Economics of Education Review, 15, 75-81. doi: 10.1016/0272-7757(95)00026-7

Bakhit, K. (2014). Presidents' Mindsets Toward Resource Development at California Community Colleges. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 38(10), 889-902. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.722414

Bass, D. (2003). From the foundations up: Contexts for change in community college advancement. *New Directions for Community Colleges,2003*(124), 15-26. doi:10.1002/cc.129

Bellafante, G. (2014). How can community colleges get a piece of the billions that donors give to higher education? New York Times. Retrieved November 16, 2014 from http://www.nytimes.com.2014/11/16/nyregion/at-college-where-alumni-pockets-are-shallow-a-struggle-to-raise-money.html

Besikof, R. (2010). The role of community college president in fundraising: a best practices study. (Doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles, California.

Bohn, S., Reyes, B., & Johnson, H. (2013). The impact of budget cuts on California's community colleges (PPIC Publication). Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=1048

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. Oxford University Press.

Bromley, D. B. (1986). The case-study methodology in psychology and related disciplines.

Bucci, D. A., & Waters, R. D. (2014). The Financial Consequences of Silence: The Lack of Dialogue on Community College Fundraising Websites. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 38*(10), 873-888. doi:10.1080/10668926.2012.720864

California Community Colleges. (2010, October). *A pivotal time: Measuring the potential of revenue-generating efforts for California community colleges.* Sacramento, CA: Foundation for California Community Colleges.

Carlsen, C. J. (2003). Weaving the foundation into the culture of a community college. New Directions for Community Colleges, 2003(124), 47-51. doi:10.1002/cc.133

Carter, L. S. (2010). A donor-focused fundraising model: an essential tool in community college foundation's toolkit. Distributed at the Council for the Study of Community Colleges Annual Conference, Seattle, WA

Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations from selective colleges. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership,* 12, 119-138.

Community College Journal, April/May 2001, Vol. 71 Issue 5, p10-12, 3p Abstract: Excerpts from America's Community Colleges: A Century of Innovation. An overview of the origins and history of the community college movement in the U.S. and profiles of some distinguished community college alumni are presented.; (AN 507764777)

Community College League of California Fast Facts (2016, January), retrieved from http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/Publications/FF2016.pdf

Cook, W. B. (1997). Fundraising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty. *Journal of Higher Education,* 68(1), 53-86.

Craft, W. M. & Guy, K. E. (2002). Community college fundraising prospects for the future, *Community College Journal,* 29-31.

Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick, N.J.: *Rutgers University Press*

Daniel, D. (1991). Marking the commitment to resource development. *Community, Technical, and Journal College Journal, 62,* 6-7.

Davis, J. S. *Unintended consequences of tuition discounting.* 2003. Indianapolis: Lumina Foundation for Education. Retrieved April. 19, 2009 from heep://www.luminafoundaiton.org/publications/Tuitiondiscounting.pdf.

Drummer, C., & Marshburn, R. (2014). Philanthropy and Private Foundations: Expanding Revenue Sources. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2014*(168), 77-89. doi:10.1002/cc.20122

Evelyn, J. (2004a, April 30). Community colleges at a crossroads: With new missions, surging enrollments, and falling support, even the promise of access for all is in question. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved June 19, 2007 from http://chronicle.com/weekly.v50/i34/34a02701.htm

Gentile, P. (2009). *Ensuring the American Dream: Perceptions of New Jersey community college presidents on fundraising as an alternate revenue source to preserve access and affordability* (Published dissertation No. 3350254). University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Nebraska.

Gilroy, M. (2001). America's Community Colleges: A Century of Innovation. *Hispanic Outlook*, 12, 7-11.

Glass, J. C., & Jackson, K. L. (1998). Integrating resource development and institutional planning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(8), 715-739. doi:10.1080/1066892980220802

Gwyer, S. (1997). Fundraising in Community Colleges. 1.

Hall, M. R. (2002). Building on relationships: A fundraising approach for community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(1), 47-60. doi:10.1080/106689202753365007

Hardy, D. E., Katsinas, S. G., & Bush, V. B. (2007). Tidal Wave II, Community Colleges, and Student Financial Aid. *Enrollment Management Journal*,23-48.

Hearn, J. C. (2003). Diversifying campus revenue streams: opportunities and risks. Washington, DC: *American Council on Education.*

Hebel, S. (2003 May 30). Unequal impact: community colleges face disproportionate cuts in state budget. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved June 19, 2007 from http://chronicle.com.weekly/v49/i38/38a02101.htm

Herbin, P., Dittman, T., Herbert, J., & Ebben, K. (2006). Status of alumni development in American's community colleges (New Century Series Resource Paper #12). Washington DC: Council for Resource Development.

Holmes, J. (2009). Prestige, charitable deductions, and other determinants of alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. Economics of Education Review, 28, 18-28. doi:10.1016/j/econedurev.2007.10.008

Holmes, R. J., Jr. (2010). The challenge of funding fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2010*(149), 27-37. doi:10.1002/he.378

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428–444). Sage Publications, Inc.

Jenkins, L.W, Glass, J. C. (1999). Inception, growth, and development of a community college foundation: Lessons to be learned. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *23(6)*, 593-612. doi:10.1080/106689299264602

Kaplan, A. E. (2012). 2011 Voluntary support of education. New York, NY: *Council for Aid to Education*.

Katsinas, S. G., Tollefson, T. A., and Reamey, B. A. (2008) *Funding issues in U.S. community colleges: Findings from a 2007 survey of National State Directors of Community Colleges. 2008.* Retrieved Nov. 20, 2008, from http://www.aaccnche.edu.fundingissues.

Kawasaki, G. (1991). Selling the dream: How to promote your product, company, or ideas, and make a difference, using everyday evangelism. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Keener, B. J. (1982). The foundation's role in resource development. In W. Harvey Sharron Jr. (Ed.). *The community college foundation* (pp3-17). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.

Keener, B. J., Carrier, S. M., & Meaders, S. J. (2002). Resource development in community colleges: A National Overview. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 26*(1), 7-23. doi:10.1080/106689202753364972

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (1998). Building a dialogic relationship through the World Wide Web. *Public Relations Review, 24*(3), 321-340.

Kirkland, T. P., & Ratcliff, J. L. (1994). When Community Colleges Change Their Presidents. *Community College Review*, *21*(4), 3-12. doi:10.1177/009155219402100402

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lanning, P. (2008). Reaching critical mass: Why community colleges need to increase private funding. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.

Lanning, Paul. (2008). "The True State of Fund Raising at Two-Year Colleges." *Community College Times,* Jan 8, 2008. Retrieved Nov. 10, 2008 from http://www.communitycollegetimes.com/articlecfm ?TopicId+17&ArticleID=710

Lindahl, W. E., & Winship, C. (1992). Predictive models for annual fundraising and major gift fundraising. *Nonprofit Management Leadership Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *3*(1), 43-64. doi:10.1002/nml.4130030105

Lysakowski, L. (2004). Building an effective board of directors. *Association of Fundraising Professionals, 5*. Retrieved August 01, 2016, from http://www.afpnet.org/files/ContentDocuments/5%20Building%20an%20Effective%20Board%20of%20Directors-1.pdf

McDonald, J. G. (1995). *Changing state policies to strengthen public university and college trustee selection and education.* (AGB Public Policy Paper Series, no. 95-2). Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1995 (ED 412829)

Merriam, S. B., (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Monroe, C. R. (1972). *Profile of the community college: A handbook*. Jossey-Bass.

O'Connell, B. (1985). *The board member's book: Making a difference in voluntary organizations*. New York, NY: Foundation Center.

Patterson, V., Justice, M., & Scott, J. (2012). A longitudinal examination of the relationship of selected institutional variables to community college foundation revenue. *Administrative Issues Journal AIJ, 2*(2), 127-138. doi:10.5929/2012.2.2.11

Phelan, D. J. (2005). The changing role of the president as a fiscal leader. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2005*(132), 87-98. doi:10.1002/cc.219

Rainey, L. (2014, March 07). California Master Plan for Higher Education faces new scrutiny, old challenges | The Daily Californian. Retrieved August 17, 2016, from http://www.dailycal.org/2014/03/06/california-master-plan-higher-education-faces-new-scrutiny-old-challenges/

Ricciardi, N. (1928). *The Need for Terminal Courses in the Junior College*. California State Department of Education.

Robinson, S. (1982). The development of the two-year college foundation and techniques of success. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), The community college foundation (pp. 31-48). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.

Romano, J. C., Gallagher, G., & Shugart, S. C. (2010). More than an open door: Deploying philanthropy to student access and success in American community colleges. *New Directions for Student Services, 210*(130), 55-70. doi:10.1002/ss.360

Ryan, G. J. (1994). The president's role in fund raising. In R. J. Pappas (Ed.) *Strategic marketing for presidents* (pp. 81-87). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Ryan, E. F. (2003). Sources and information: Development and fundraising within community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2003(124), 95-104. doi:10.1002/cc.138

Sausner, R. (2003). “Astounding transformations.” *University Business,* March, 2003, pp. 27-31.

Schuyler, G. (1997). Fundraising in community college foundations. *ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges, ED405943,* 1-5.

Selingo, J. (2003). “What Americans think about higher education.” *Chronicle of Higher Education, May 2,* 2003, p. A10.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research a guide for researchers in education & the social sciences.* New York (Estados Unidos): Teachers College Press.

Skari, L. A. (2013). Community College Alumni: Predicting who gives. *Community College Review.* doi:10.1177/0091552113510172

Smith, N. J. (1993). Raising funds for community colleges. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), Educational fund raising (pp. 347-356). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246. doi:10.1177/1098214005283748

Tillery, D., and Wattenbarger, J. L. (1985). “State power in a new era: A threat to autonomy. In D. Campbell (ed.), Strengthening Financial Management, *New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 50*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.

Vaughn, G. B. (2006). *Significant historical events in the development of the public community college.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 2006.

Warwick, M., Hart, T., & Allen, N. (2002). *Fundraising on the Internet.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Waters, R. D. (2007). Building the nonprofit organization-donor relationship online: The increasing importance of e-philanthropy. In S. C. Duhé (Ed.), *New Media and Public Relations* (pp. 299-312). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Wattenbarger, J. L., & Witt, A. A. (2008, October 22). ERIC - Origins of the Comprehensive Community College., *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 1995. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ515208

Wenrich, J. W., & Reid, B. L. (2003). It’s not the race I signed up for, but it’s the race I’m in: The role of community college presidents. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2003* (124), 27-32. doi:10.1002/cc.130

White, F. L. (2011). Creating effective board-CEO relationships and fundraising to achieve successful student outcomes. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 2011*(156), 23-29. doi:10.1002/cc.463

Worth, M. J. (1993). Educational fund raising: Principles and practice. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Worth, M. J. and Asp II, J. A. (1994). *The development officer in higher education: Toward an understanding of the role.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no 4. Washington D.C.: George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, 1994. (ED 382107)

Worth, M. J. (2002). *New strategies for educational fund raising*. Westport, CT: O

Vaughn, G. B. (2006). *Significant historical events in the development of the public community college.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 2006.

Yamada, T. (2010). Restructuring the California State University: A call to action. *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 91-106.

Yin, R. (2014) Case Study Research: Design and Methods. 5th Edition, Sage, Thousand Oaks.