

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX
to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
IL:25397579		JUL 16 2003
JAN 08 2008		01 23 03

**FINANCING ONTARIO COMMUNITY COLLEGES: WHAT ROLE DO
FOUNDATIONS PLAY IN AUGMENTING FINANCIAL
SUPPORT FOR ONTARIO COLLEGES?**

By

Karen Louise Shaw

A DISSERTATION

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1997

ABSTRACT

FINANCING ONTARIO COMMUNITY COLLEGES: WHAT ROLE DO FOUNDATIONS PLAY IN AUGMENTING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ONTARIO COLLEGES?

By

Karen Louise Shaw

The purpose of this study was to determine the form and scope of fund raising by Ontario colleges in solicitation of the private sector. Scope is defined as purpose, staffing and results, and form is defined as foundations or other. The study also investigated the characteristics related to successful fund raising and the roles and responsibilities of the individuals charged with developing and operating a successful college foundation. The study included a survey questionnaire with 100% response rate administered to all twenty-five Ontario colleges as members of the Association of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Interviews were conducted with persons representing three Ontario college foundations selected according to Mucklow's (1990) criteria for success. Eleven colleges with foundations and 10 colleges which raise funds from the private sector provided data that could be used for the study. The eighteen interviews which comprise the second part of the study were conducted with six persons from each of the three selected college foundations. The interviews investigated the role and responsibilities of individuals responsible for, or involved with the foundation. With the paucity of research on fund raising in Canadian colleges, the study utilized literature related to American college fund

raising as a basis of comparison. The importance of presidential leadership; location; linkage with the community; the term length and number of board members; type of staffing; and faculty involvement in fund raising; were all factors in predicting success of the foundation. Ontario's post-secondary education has traditionally been funded by government. With the dramatic cutback in government financial support, the importance of studying characteristics recognized as essential for a successful fund raising operation has become of paramount concern to many in the college sector. There seems to be a common perception held by many that Canadians are not as philanthropic as many Americans. This research study provided data that this perception may not be accurate. This study will contribute both theoretically and practically to the study and development of establishing foundations for colleges in Canada.

© Copyright by
KAREN LOUISE SHAW
1997
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

DEDICATION

To my husband Bob, and our three daughters. Without their love, support and encouragement, this goal would not have become a reality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge several persons and institutions that provided assistance in my completing this dissertation. Kathryn M. Moore, Ph.D., my advisor who directed this study, provided guidance and moral support to assist me in completing this study.

I am sincerely grateful to Glenn Crombie, President of Cambrian College, Sudbury, Ontario. I would also like to acknowledge several important sources of administrative and informational assistance, particularly Drew Nameth, Martin Hicks and Laurie Kukulewich of the Ontario Ministry of Education and Training and the Interlibrary Loan Department of Laurentian University, Sudbury, Ontario. I wish to thank the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education for funding that will assist in the distribution of this dissertation to Canadian Colleges. Special thanks to my colleagues, particularly Marina Heidman Ph.D., Gail Skornschek Ph.D., and Kathy Mezei Ph.D., who were such an important part of this doctoral journey. Special thanks as well to my sister Candace Innes and her family for providing me with accommodation throughout this process. As well to Roy Giroux, Ph.D. and Howard Hickey Ph.D. for initiating this program in Canada.

I sincerely appreciate the eighteen persons who shared their experience, their thoughts, ideas and commitment with me throughout the extensive interviews.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	1
Rationale for the Study	7
Significance of the Study	8
In the Beginning	9
The Status of Funding Today	12
The Research Question	13
Assumptions	15
Limitations	16
Organization of the Study	16
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Public Policy Review	21
Community College Issues	30
The New Clientele	33
Aging with Grace	34
The Reality of the 1990's	35
Foundations- A Relatively New Field of Research	38
Measuring Success	44
The Role of the President, Development Officer and Governing Board of the Foundation	45
The Conclusions of the Literature	48
Operational Model for Foundations	49
Summary	52

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	54
Research Design	55
Definition of Terms	57
Outline of the Study Procedures	60
Restatement of the Problem...Part A	60
Development of Survey Questionnaire	61
Population	62
Methods & Procedures	62
Response to the Survey	64
Restatement of the Problem...Part B	64
Development of Interview Instrument	65
Selection of the Sample	66
Methods & Procedures	69
Response to Interview Questions	71
 CHAPTER 4: PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	 72
Part A: Response to Mailed Survey Questionnaire	73
Question one: Colleges with Foundations	73
Question two: Foundation Staffing	74
Question three: President's Time Devoted to Fund Raising	74
Question four: Level of Involvement of Local Community	78
Question four:Longevity of Foundations	78
Question five: Foundation Board Representation of Staff	80
Question six: Involvement of College Staff in Fund Raising	81
Question seven: Resource Allocation from Fund Raising	83
Question eight: Donor Recognition	84
Question nine: Affiliation with Professional Association	85
Question ten: Involvement with Alumni	87
Part A: Survey: Results of College Without Affiliated Foundations	89
Question eleven: Ontario Colleges Without Foundations	89

Question twelve:College Staffing Responsible for Fund Raising	90
Question thirteen: President’s Time Devoted to Fund Raising	91
Question fourteen:Allocation of Revenues Received	92
Question fifteen: Allocation of Revenues Received	94
Question sixteen: Donor Recognition	95
Question seventeen: Professional Affiliation	96
Question eighteen: Involvement of Alumni	97
Part B: Response to Interview Questions	99
Restatement of the Problem	99
Population	99
Specific Foundations Studied	100
Section I Part i Analysis of Interviews of Presidents	108
Section I Part ii Questions Specific to Presidents	121
Section II Part i Analysis of Interviews of Chair of the Board of Directors	126
Section II Part ii Questions Specific to Role of Board Chair	135
Section III Part i Analysis of Interviews of Executive Directors	140
Section III Part ii Questions Specific to the Executive Director	153
Section IV Part i Analysis of Interviews of Faculty Members of the Board	157
Section IV Part ii Questions Specific to the Role of Faculty on the Board	168
Section V Part i Analysis of Interviews with Members of Board of Governors Liaison to the Board of Directors of Foundation	172
Section V Part ii Questions Specific to Role of Board of Governor Liaison to Foundation	180
Section VI Part I Analysis of Interviews with Community Donors	183
DISCUSSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS	189
Presidential Leadership and Commitment	189
Efficient Full-Time Executive Directors of Successful College Foundations .	192
Strong and Committed Foundation Boards	196
The Importance for a Strong Case Which People Will Support	198

The Importance of Good Public Relations	200
The Importance of the Involvement of College Employees	201
SUMMARY AND MAJOR FINDINGS	203
Comparison Between American College Foundations in California and Ontario College Foundations	205
Discussion of the Ontario College Foundations Based on the Characteristics of Successful College Foundation in the Literature	208
Level of Funds Raised According to the number of Full-Time Student Equivalent	209
The Nature and Extent of Involvement with Foundation by the President of the College	210
Level of Staffing and Executive Director Responsible for Foundation Operations	212
The Prestige, Connections and Number of Foundation Board Members, as well as the Size of the Board and the Number of Years in Operation ..	213
College Employee Involvement	213
Allocation of Resources Raised and Total Assets Acquired between 1993-95	214
Donor Recognition Programs	215
The Association with Professional Organizations	216
The Involvement and Ongoing Communication with the Alumni	216
Level of Funds raised according to the potential Wealth of Resources in the Community	217
The Extent of Public Relations Developed with Potential Donors	217
Planning and Meeting the Objective outlined by the Foundation Board and Staff Members	218
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	220
Overall Findings	221
Considerations	227
Expansion of Mucklow's Theory	228
The Role of the Foundation as a Catalyst	230

Reflections	233
Recommendations for Further Research	236
APPENDIX A: COLLEGES QUALIFYING FOR STUDY	239
APPENDIX B: ENGLISH LANGUAGE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	240
APPENDIX C: LETTER FROM PRESIDENTIAL COLLEAGUE SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN STUDY TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE COLLEGES	245
APPENDIX D: LETTER REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY ...	246
APPENDIX E: FRENCH LANGUAGE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	247
APPENDIX F: LETTER FROM PRESIDENTIAL COLLEAGUE SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN STUDY TO FRENCH LANGUAGE COLLEGES	257
APPENDIX G: LETTER REQUESTING PRESIDENT'S CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERVIEW FOR COLLEGES WITH FOUNDATIONS SELECTED AS SUCCESSFUL FOR PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY	258
REFERENCES	260
UCRIHS Approval	273

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

PROBLEM STATEMENT

In the decade of the nineties, massive government financial cutbacks to post-secondary education, combined with economic uncertainty and inflation, have caused community colleges in the province of Ontario to consider alternate ways of generating revenue. One of the alternative sources in generating additional revenue is the community college foundation. Although the college foundation is a relatively recent means of generating additional revenue within Ontario colleges, there has been a similar expansion of foundations within American community colleges. According to Byron McClenney, President, Community College of Denver in a speech given to The Further Education Funding Council on February 27, 1995 in Toronto, Ontario, the growth of foundations in American colleges has increased rapidly as colleges have experienced a large decline in state funding between 1990 and 1995. This statement was reinforced by Kinnard Wright and Susan Kelley of the National Council for Resource Development when they issued a Legislative Alert on August 18, 1995 stating

IMMEDIATE ACTION RECOMMENDED. Significant cuts to key education programs were passed by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services on July 12. Action is needed NOW to fight these cuts. Just as community colleges have fought the rescision of FY 95 funds, which is currently bottled up in the Senate and no longer targets

Tech Prep due in part to our efforts, there is every reason to believe that we can influence the proposed cuts to the FY96 budget that are emerging in the Appropriations Committee.

As such, fund raising, and particularly the college foundation, have become a much more important resource to assist colleges in remaining viable. Could three decades of success by the community colleges in Ontario, which resulted in continuous and increasing demand for programs and services, be crippled by the reduction in government financial support? How will this affect the colleges' growth and development?

Since the mid 1960s, the college system in Ontario has expanded from a few thousand students to more than 135,000 full time equivalent post secondary students and has provided more than 4.6 million training days to apprenticeship, adult training and day student programs in 1993-94. (ACAATO . . . aide memoire, 1995). The provincial work-force has become skilled and well trained to meet the needs of business and industry over that period of time. Student enrollment has continued to expand, and the system of college education has become accessible to numerous students. The college system reflects a low fee structure, is geographically accommodating, and is technologically aligned with business and industry. Colleges have also begun servicing multicultural, multi-linguistic, and multi-skilled students in a barrier-free environment which is user friendly for students with special needs.

In the beginning of the 1970s, a series of events began to affect the government support for community colleges. The world wide oil crisis, major shifts in the Canadian

economy, inflation and unemployment caused governments to begin to change the original federal-provincial cost sharing agreements for post secondary education. The new cost sharing arrangement did not match the ongoing student expansion in college enrollments. This problem was not unique to Ontario. Wattenbarger and Heck(1983), in commenting on a similar problem in American colleges stated: “*community colleges must now either accept a closing door or find some new ways to prop it open(p.283).*” The situation was recognized by Ontario college leaders as they set about to strategize a plan of action.

In the late 1980s the Ontario colleges went through a massive province-wide strategic planning process, called Vision 2000. To help ensure their survival, colleges initiated significant new programs and services to provide students with current and futuristic skills and program opportunities. This thrust led to large increases in enrollment and a greater demand for entrance opportunities by students of all ages and needs. The funding problems the Ontario colleges were experiencing was compounded by the growing demands of students for entrance to the colleges. Some colleges began seeking outside sources of funding in addition to government revenues, to support their operations. One of the new revenue sources was the creation of college foundations to solicit support from the private sector through fund raising efforts.

The Ontario Colleges were initiated solely through government financial support. Presidents of Ontario Colleges have traditionally been selected for the position as a result of their demonstrated ability to manage a complex institution within the guidelines and

operational mandate outlined by the provincial authority. Presidents were traditionally not selected on the basis of their fund raising skills. College boards of governors have been traditionally appointed by the Provincial Council of Regents according to a formula that reflects and represents the demographics of the community in which the college operates. Traditionally, the president and the board were never expected to, nor were they appointed to, secure financial support from any source other than the government. Now, with funds drastically reduced from government sources at an accelerating pace, the president and boards are faced with the decision of trying to secure income from a nontraditional source in a time of severe economic restraint within the private sector and growing demands for student entrance to colleges. At the same time vastly increased competition for fund raising by non-profit organizations have added more pressure to the challenges of college fund raising.

The purpose of the study was to determine the form and scope of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges and to identify the qualities that were shared by community colleges with successful private fund raising programs managed by college foundations. In surveying the literature on fund raising in community colleges in Canada, the paucity of research on this topic caused this researcher to utilize literature related to American community college fund raising as a basis of comparison. The literature review focussed on fund raising in community colleges and, in particular, college foundations. The American college foundations have been studied extensively, and criteria for success of foundations have been thoroughly documented by the following

researchers. Bremer (1965), Silvera (1974), Luck and Tolle (1978) measured efficiency and effectiveness as an element of total gift income per full-time student equivalent. Duffy (1979) and Sharron (1978) defined success in terms of the strong public relations the college employed and the ability to get the community involved in the process of fund raising. Janney (1994) studied the role of the president in fund raising success and Miller (1991) looked at the role of motivating factors that shape the development officers. According to Angel and Gares (1989), the criteria recommended for strengthening of foundations include:

- *a strong and committed leader, board and staff;*
- *a centralized and decentralized organization that supports the fund raising goals of the institution;*
- *and fund raising strategies which include good prospect research, strong alumni giving, and a program of deferred giving.(p. 8).*

According to the Sharron study (1982a), every successful organization has certain characteristics that enable it to function more productively. Without these components, the organization has been shown to have great difficulty in attaining a level of success(p. 82). This research study utilized the criteria for successful fund raising in Canadian colleges which was established by the William Mucklow study (1990). This criteria defined success by dividing the average financial contribution attained from the private sector fund raising attained in a given time period by the average annual FTE for the same time period. Using this criteria three Ontario college foundations were selected for further study.

A study of California community colleges by Piland and Lowden (1992) and outlined in the Trustee Quarterly (pp. 6-15) entitled California Community College

Foundations; Fund-Raising Efforts, demonstrated similar results to this research study. This research study of Ontario colleges indicated 11 colleges had established foundations since 1980. Three colleges were in the process of establishing foundations when the study was conducted in 1994-95, and 10 colleges were raising funds from the private sector without the use of foundations. The trends in Ontario were similar to college foundations studied in California. One of the earliest established Ontario college foundations was modeled after a California community college foundation. This information was provided to the researcher during the interview with the president who first established this college foundation in Ontario. It seemed particularly appropriate to utilize the Piland and Lowden (1992) study as a comparison.

There seemed to be a common perception held by many Canadians that Canadians are not as philanthropic as many Americans. As post-secondary education has been supported by government since it was initiated in Canada, fund raising has not been regarded as a critical component for financing higher education in Canada. However, since the dramatic cutback in government financial support, the importance of studying characteristics recognized as essential for a successful fund raising operations has become of paramount concern. This study contributes both theoretically and practically to the study and development of establishing foundations through which colleges can successfully raise funds from the private sector.

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

In an effort to offset funding cutbacks, some of the colleges have created affiliated foundations to enhance private fund raising. This study looked at some of the questions that the colleges now face, and the ways in which colleges are addressing the issue of uncertainty and potential financial exigency. After years of successful achievement by colleges in Ontario, some of the questions being asked are:

- Although community colleges in Ontario were created by legislation and have been maintained by government funding, will colleges now have to seek financial support through corporate, foundation and personal donations in order to sustain their operations?
- If the goal of the college is to provide current, relevant and futuristic skills training and knowledge acquisition to students, why does the Ministry of Education continue to set limits to the ways in which the college can acquire funds from the private sector?
- College presidents have been hired to manage complex educational institutions traditionally financed through government sources. Will future presidents of colleges consider fund raising a primary part of their mandate?
- If the role of governance is mandated to the college board of governors, how does the college maintain strong ties with the foundation board once that foundation is created?
- How does a college, without the history and experience in fund raising, become a successful player in the significantly competitive field of fund raising?

- How do colleges attract development officers with a sensitivity to the college culture and an ability to work closely with corporate leaders in order to achieve the foundation goals and objectives?

This study was designed to explore the processes being used to fund raise by Ontario colleges through solicitation of the private sector and does not aspire to address all these questions in detail. The questions were provided as an example of some of the issues which have to be addressed as the business of fund raising progresses in Ontario community colleges.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is extremely timely as all colleges in Ontario are faced with significant government cutbacks in funding. This research provides a basis for decision making by colleges which are searching for alternate funding opportunities. The criteria for success that has been documented through earlier research and verified through this study will provide the decision makers with a benchmark from which to assess their strengths and weaknesses when analyzing their potential for fund raising. This study forms a framework to understand how the Ontario college foundations are organized and how they operate. It also adds to the data for the national research agenda proposed by Dennison and Gallagher (1986) to provide greater awareness of the growth of the college movement in Canada.

IN THE BEGINNING

Colleges in Ontario began with a flourish of excitement. As Abram Konrad outlined in his A Green Paper on Board Governance of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario, April 1993:

What began as a dream in the hearts and minds of visionary leaders in the 1960s has flourished into a complex network of structures and processes responding to the dynamic needs and opportunities of human growth and development.

When the colleges in Ontario were created in October 1965 by the provincial Bill 153, as an Amendment to the Education Act in the Legislature of Ontario, money was no object and expectations were high. There was an abundance of students who were a relatively homogeneous group. The student's goal was to become employed and, once employed, they almost took for granted they would be promoted. Faculty and staff hired by the colleges possessed youth, vigour and extensive business and industrial skills that were current and applicable. According to Dennison and Gallagher(1986):

The decade of the 1960s was truly a 'golden age' for public education in Canada. It was a period when public demand for more advanced education and the financial capability of governments in Canada to respond to these demands coincided in dramatic fashion. (p. 5)

The financial support of both federal and provincial governments seemed to be almost without question. The country wanted to build a skilled and knowledgeable workforce that would lead Canada to even greater prosperity. Dr. Paul Axelrod (1982) painted the picture of the exciting and energetic thrust of the new opportunities created by implementing a community college system in Ontario:

Propelled by buoyant economic conditions, favoured by free-spending politicians, and buttressed by widespread public support, higher education during the 1960s became one of Canada's major growth industries. Between 1960 and 1970 full time enrollment across the country almost tripled to 316,000. In the same period expenditure by Canadian universities increased 600 per cent to \$1.6 billion. All of this was to say nothing of the massive expansion of community college education for the training of students in technical and vocational areas. The spin off effects of educational investment into other regional economic life, if uncalculated, was unmistakably evident. Popular faith in the economic value of post secondary education reached unprecedented heights (p.37).

This system was born at a time when the political will was concentrated on creating an educational system that would meet a variety of needs. Colleges of applied arts and technology were established based on four principles of operations as outlined in the Statement in the Legislature By the Minister of Education Introducing The Establishment of Ontario's College System, May 21, 1965.

- 1) the colleges must embrace total education, vocational and avocational, regardless of formal entrance qualifications;*
- 2) they must develop curricula which meet the combined cultural aspirations and occupational needs of the students;*
- 3) they must operate in the closest possible cooperation with business and industry, and with social and other public agencies to ensure that curricula are at all times abreast of the changing needs of a technological society; and*
- 4) they must be dedicated to research not only in curricula, but in pedagogical technique and administration (p. 11).*

In recognition of these long-term economic and social goals, initially 10 regional development areas in Ontario were adopted as the locations for the colleges. As the system began to expand, 12 additional sites were added in recognition of the growing public

demand. With the introduction of the French speaking colleges in the early 1990s, the colleges of applied arts and technology of Ontario under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education and Training numbered 25 in 1996.

At the outset it was noted that the college system in Ontario was started in a time of economic growth and affluence. An article appearing in *The Globe and Mail*, March 19, 1965 outlined the beginnings of the federal-provincial involvement in financing a new post secondary level of education in Ontario:

Access to federal funds through the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act (TVTA) of 1960 was especially influential on the course that Ontario colleges would take. This legislation was one of a series of federal measures to support training programmes designed to prepare individuals to enter the workforce with appropriate levels of skill in needed occupations (p. 1).

In 1965 the Government of Canada agreed to reimburse the Province of Ontario at a rate of 75% toward the cost of new buildings and equipment for a period of six years and then to continue with 50% support of these facilities and equipment to the Province thereafter. As a result of such a lucrative arrangement, the Province of Ontario had the opportunity to create an an instant system of colleges. As stated in the same article of March 19, 1965:

The "instant" system of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario, with heavy emphasis upon technical and vocational education, might never have materialized in the absence of federal financial support . . . The period was one of economic buoyancy, with general public support for educational expansion, and for a future with the expectation of both growth in the business and industrial sector and an accompanying need for trained manpower to sustain it (p.1).

Thirty years later, another article appearing in *The Globe and Mail* dated January 13, 1996 outlined how the colleges had begun significant downsizing, by reducing staff and cutting programs. The downsizing was the result of the \$690 million cut in transfer payments by the Province to college budgets. In the 1996 *The Globe and Mail* article by Jennifer Lewington, she pointed out that:

Ontario community colleges will have fewer courses, fewer teachers and, despite demand, up to 10% fewer students this fall as a result of unprecedented provincial government cuts to education . . . In the latest sign of the emerging provincial trend, Centennial College announced yesterday that it will eliminate three programs and temporarily suspend two others, citing a reduction in government grants. The cost savings for cancelling the three programs permanently is \$1.1 million . . . In November, the government cut funding to community colleges by 15% to \$689 million this year, as part of sweeping reductions in all levels of education (p.1).

The two articles, both appearing on the front page of *The Globe and Mail*, but 30 years apart, show the evolution of financing for colleges in Ontario. In 1965 there were no limits on public funding for the college system, but by 1996, colleges faced extreme demise of programs because of devastating cuts to funding.

THE STATUS OF FUNDING TODAY

Recent economic circumstances and political actions have begun to impact on the community colleges in Ontario and have redefined the financial involvement of the government in post secondary education. The Honorable Paul Martin, Minister of Finance for the Government of Canada, announced in the budget speech, February 1995, the reshaping of educational transfer payments. The Ontario provincial government, which

was elected in June 1995, introduced a new financial policy with the announcement of a 9.1 billion spending cut to provincial coffers. A second round of cutbacks to post secondary education resulted in a further \$400 million decrease to funding in the Ontario college system for 1996. As a result of these political events, it has become obvious that government financial support for the community colleges in Ontario continues to erode. As this decrease in financial support continues, colleges will need to find new sources of revenue. Consequently, colleges have put even greater emphasis on fund raising as a means of gaining revenue that will make up the shortfall in their financial resources.

THE RESEARCH QUESTION

The purpose of this study included the following:

- 1) To investigate the scope and form of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by colleges in Ontario between 1993-95. Scope is defined as purpose, staffing and results, and form is defined as foundations or other funding sources.
- 2) To identify which Ontario colleges have established affiliated foundations and to investigate their operating procedures.
- 3) To identify the roles and responsibilities of the individuals charged with developing and operating a successful college foundation.
- 4) To identify which foundations have been most successful and to determine if they exhibit characteristics determined by previous research that is associated with successful foundations.

Part A: Operations

- Does the foundation have full time staff and does it adhere to the criteria for successful college foundations?
- What is the role of the president in supporting the foundation fund raising activities?
- Does the foundation function in a way in which the goals and activities support the mission of the college?
- Does the college staff support the foundation financially and through volunteer service?

Part B: Organization

- What is the role of the board of directors?
- Does the board of directors support the work of the foundation both financially and through solicitation of others?
- Does the revenue from fund raising support scholarships and bursaries?
- Are the alumni major contributors to the foundation?

For the purposes of this study, Mucklow's definition of success was used. This definition states: Success within the community college foundation is determined by dividing the average annual new yearly assets by the average annual FTE for the years (1993-95) years determined by researcher (1990).

Mucklow's research sought to gain an understanding of the essential elements of successful fund raising. As well as using Mucklow's equation for predicting success in Canadian two-year college foundations, this study used research done on American college foundations. This study sought to determine whether the Ontario college foundations incorporated the elements regarded as successful by American research. The importance of investigating the findings established in Mucklow's study, and researching the successes of the American college foundations was deemed timely in light of the policy and funding changes that Ontario has recently experienced. The results of this study will provide current data for the board of governors and presidents of the colleges in Ontario. This study will also add to the limited data base in this relatively new function within post-secondary education in Canada.

ASSUMPTIONS

It was assumed that a common frame of reference exists for terms and concepts used. It was further assumed that college officials, board members, and donors will provide the time necessary to participate in completing a questionnaire and a personal interview.

LIMITATIONS

The current economic climate may have influenced some of the responses and the opportunity to include their data in the survey results. This was be taken into consideration when assessing the data. There is always a concern for the interpretation of data, given changing social conditions and economic environments. This is not a historical study of the colleges; it is limited to public sector colleges in Ontario from 1993-95. The research is based on both survey results and extensive interviews. The collection of information was dependent on the willingness of individuals to complete the questionnaire or to be interviewed. The level of candor which might reasonably be expected of individuals currently in office or who may have felt their reputation was at stake, was a consideration that was part of the researcher's awareness. The findings of the study are pertinent to Ontario colleges and are concerned with the fund raising aspect of the college operation. It is pertinent to the particular times in which this study was conducted. The definition of full-time equivalent (FTE) and financial assets data were provided by the Ministry of Education and Training, Province of Ontario, September 1996. FTE and financial data are not standardized throughout Canada.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the topic; a statement of the problem, purpose and significance of the study; a listing of the research questions; definitions of key terms; identification of assumptions; a review of the methodology; and an outline of the limitations and delimitations.

Chapter 2 explores and analyzes the literature related to the study. The chapter is divided into several sections so as to capture the major areas of interest which form the study.

Chapter 3 provides the design and methodology of the study. It includes a description of the population, survey design, interviews, information gathering procedures and data analysis.

Chapter 4 contains a presentation and analysis of the findings of the study with discussion and observations of the findings.

Chapter 5 summarizes the study, presents the conclusions, examines the implications of the findings, and suggests areas for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A selected review of research literature relevant to this study is divided into four main categories.

1. **Public policy review** examines the original model for funding colleges and the federal- provincial funding agreements. The literature then reflects the changes to the basic funding formula, and what those changes mean to the colleges financial status. This then sets the stage for the study into the need for augmenting the financial resources to the colleges.
2. **Literature relating to the issues the colleges are facing** examines the environment including: demographics; accountability; and productivity; in which the college operates.
3. **Research conducted** analyzing the structure and function of American college foundations and focusing on the organization and operation of those foundations.
4. **Utilizing the research** which has been recognized as a means of measuring what constitutes success for college foundations.

Philanthropy has been part of the American educational culture for centuries. The tradition of philanthropy in the United States directed towards higher education began in the 1630's with the creation of Harvard University.

According to Ironfield (1991):

Studies of organized collegiate philanthropy did not occur until after World War II and were stimulated, not by scholars, but by the Carnegie Foundation and Ford Foundation among others. A meeting of scholars and funders in Princeton, New Jersey in 1956 provided the impetus to outline a research agenda for college development that would guide future scholarship. (p.18).

Fund raising for higher education has now been recognized as a new growth area in North America. As Michael Worth(1985) explains in CASE (9, 2), Public College and University Development:

Possibly the two most significant trends in educational fund raising in the past decade have been the growth of private philanthropic support of public higher education and the emergence of aggressive development programs at public colleges and universities . . . While from 1971-72 to 1980-81 total voluntary support of higher education increased by 101.5% — from \$1.6 billion to \$3.3 billion — private gifts to public institutions increased by 160.8%. (p. 1).

A comprehensive review of the literature revealed that foundations affiliated with colleges in the United States have become a major growth phenomenon, with well over two-thirds of the colleges utilizing foundations to support their college financial resources. The foundations of American colleges have been studied extensively and have been researched from a variety of vantage points. However, to date there has been very little research done in the field of philanthropy at colleges in Canada. Consequently, American

research has been utilized extensively in this study as history has shown that many Canadian activities have been influenced by American initiatives.

Fund raising has suddenly been thrust to the forefront of the agenda for public sector institutions in Ontario. The need for funding has become a paramount concern for most college administrators in 1996. Accessing significant funds from the private sector to augment massive cutbacks in government funding has become part of strategic plans for many administrators and college boards. As early as 1988, Kopecek predicted that in order to maintain programs and quality instruction in the colleges, other sources of financial assistance, particularly from individuals, corporations and businesses would be needed.

Research by Luck and Tolle(1978), and Duffy(1979), indicates that to effectively serve their communities, the public American community colleges will need the fund raising assistance of a not-for-profit foundation.

How different is the situation in Canada? In order to better understand the circumstances challenging the colleges in Ontario now and in the near future, the funding arrangement, legislative regulations and rapidly changing circumstances must be delineated. Hence a comprehensive review of the literature on fund raising in community colleges, as well as a review of financial, administrative and historical information on the structure and function of the colleges in Ontario, was undertaken for this study. A review of socio-economic and public policy papers was also an important part of this research.

PUBLIC POLICY REVIEW

**COMPLEXITIES OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM TWO LEVELS
OF GOVERNMENT**

How could the 'golden age' of public education in Canada as described by Dennison and Gallagher(1986) when stating:

It was a period of public demand for more advanced education and the financial capability of governments in Canada to respond to these demands coincided in dramatic fashion.(p.5)

change those dreams put forward in the hearts and minds of the visionary leaders of 1960's as described by Konrad (1993)?

To appreciate the support for post-secondary education in Canada, and Ontario in particular, one should become acquainted with the complex and confusing role and function of the federal and provincial governments in underwriting the costs of this education. Under the *1867 British North America Act*, Canada became an independent country with separate provinces. Under the *British North America Act*, provinces were given responsibility for the education of their citizens.

Due to a rather unusual arrangement in 1867, the Constitution of Canada was not ratified until 1982. After 115 years of debate, the then Canadian Prime Minister, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, guided the resolution to an agreement and brought the Constitution to Canada along with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Quebec never supported the ratification of the Constitution and, as late as 1995, Quebec held a referendum vote

on whether to remain a province within Canada. Federal and provincial jurisdictional rights and responsibilities have been a complex arrangement from the beginning. Although post-secondary education is recognized as a provincial responsibility, the federal government has been involved in funding post-secondary education in varying forms and degrees since the Second World War.

According to the Report of the Standing Committee of Senate, (1987) entitled National Finance: Federal Policy on Post-Secondary Education, chaired by The Honourable Fernand E. Leblanc, the background papers refer to the original delegation of jurisdiction for post-secondary education in Canada as outlined in the *British North America Act*. The following statement from the Report of the Standing Committee of Senate gives an overview of the structure of this arrangement. The National Finance: Federal Policy on Post-Secondary Education (1987), speaks to the underlying rationale for potential conflict between the federal and provincial authorities:

When the Fathers of Confederation planned the Canadian constitution they allotted to the federal government those responsibilities that in their view were national, dynamic and likely to expand, and left to the provinces those that were local and static. To meet its constitutional responsibilities the Dominion was given unlimited powers of direct and indirect taxation. To pay their expenses the provincial governments were expected to rely on certain cash transfers from the federal treasury known as "statutory subsidies" and on natural resource revenues (p.xiii).

Under the *British North America Act* the provincial governments also were given the power to impose direct taxes. This power was to enable the provinces to authorize local authorities to levy property taxes for municipal purposes. In the policy outlined in the

National Finance; Federal Policy on Post-Secondary Education, the founding Fathers of Confederation did not believe that the provincial politicians would ever:

...bring themselves to introduce direct taxation for provincial purposes which was regarded as being too riskful. The founding Fathers never envisioned the importance of direct taxation nor did they foresee the development of the national character of post-secondary education...(p. xiv).

During the Second World War, the Parliament of Canada began a personal and corporate income tax system. This was the introduction of direct taxation to individuals, corporations and estates that ultimately changed the structure and began the first “tax-sharing” arrangement between the federal and provincial governments.

After World War II, a Canadian Vocational Training Centre, designed specifically to train soldiers and others for Canadian industry, was set up in each province. With the increased demand for skilled labour, especially in the technology and technician level, the province of Ontario introduced a whole new level of education. On May 21, 1965, the Honourable William Davis, Minister of Education, introduced into the Legislature of the Province of Ontario a program to create a system of colleges of applied arts and technology to take full advantage of this new federal funding initiative for the provinces. In his Statement in the Legislature, Introducing Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario, May 21, 1965 as:

...a bill to enable the establishment and operation of a system of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology . . . The bill marks a major step forward in the development of our educational system; it provides for the introduction of a new level and type of education, one which is still in keeping with our traditions and accomplishments. Above all else, it goes far towards making a reality of the promise - indeed of the stated policy - of this Government

to provide through education and training, not only an equality of opportunity to all sectors of our population, but the fullest possible development of each individual to the limit of his ability (p. 1).

Thus the Community Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario were created using federal and provincial financing. The following year, in a speech by the Right Honorable L. B. Pearson, Prime Minister, in his opening statement to a federal-provincial conference on higher education in Edmonton, Alberta, on October 24, 1966, the Prime Minister spoke of the need for a federal presence in post-secondary education financing:

Education is, under our constitution, a matter of provincial jurisdiction. The federal government does not dispute this or wish in any way to do so. At the same time, education is obviously a matter of profound importance to the economic and social growth of the country as a whole. This is particularly true of higher education . . . Because of this broad interest in the adequacy of educational opportunity, the federal government is prepared to take action to help alleviate the financial difficulties that provinces may encounter in shouldering the burdens placed on them especially by the increasing costs of an adequate standard of higher education . . . Under the present system, a province has a stronger incentive to establish and operate a post-secondary institution that can qualify under the training agreements, than it would have to provide additional university facilities for which there is no shared-cost incentive... The expiration of the training agreements provides an opportunity to remove this anomaly and to treat all post-secondary institutions alike. Technological institutes can be included with universities in determining the basis of the proposed new financial arrangements. As a consequence, the action of the federal government can be essentially neutral in its effect on the institutional structure of post-secondary education within any province. (p. 6, 7) Federal-Provincial Conference on Higher Education, the Honorable Mr. Pearson(1966) .

Under the *Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act*, 1967 (FPFAA), Part II, all payments for post-secondary education were to be authorized by the provincial govern-

ments. This new plan saw a rise of 20% per year of cash payments to the provinces. The federal government had no control over the total amount of cash to be paid out which ultimately led to the discussion of capping the payments.

The (FPFAA) program has been characterized as one developed as part of an integrated policy for the general restructuring of fiscal relationships with the provinces: In a real sense it was what the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in its 1976 review of the Canadian education system, called federal aid for the solution of other political tasks. (Hon. R. E. Leblanc, 1976, p.5). The basis of payment was broadened to include all post-secondary education. Other federal programs of assistance to non degree granting institutions were altered or suspended. At the same time, the fact that the payments were made directly to the provinces accelerated the creation of provincial government departments or agencies to oversee the development of post-secondary education and to distribute funds to the appropriate institutions.

In 1972, the Act capped the increase to a ceiling of 15% per province. By the mid 1970s it was apparent that financing post-secondary education by the federal government was in jeopardy for the following reasons:

- the provinces used federal monies at fifty cent dollars
- the federal government had no control over spending
- the federal government wasn't given political credit for expenditures
- programs required continuous auditing

In 1977, the *Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act* (EPF) changed the principle of federal support for post-secondary education, hospital insurance and medical care. These were replaced by unconditional block grants (or transfer of funds) to each province. These transfers were still in the form of two general components: a transfer of taxing power and a cash payment. In summary, the 1967 program was changed in 1977 to Established Programs Financing (EPF). This program proposed that:

- the federal government continues to pay a substantial portion of the costs;
- there be greater equities among provinces;
- financing should become more stable;
- there was flexibility introduced in usage of funds for education and health;
- the two levels of government continue joint policy discussions and maintain funding in 1977 with post-secondary ratios of 32.1% and medical 67.9%.

By 1980, thought was being given to the need to reduce EPF costs and at the same time to explain more fully to the Canadian public, the rationale for the involvement of the Government of Canada in the financial support of post-secondary education. In 1982, and again in 1984, under the EPF Act the amount of the cash payment transfers to the provinces was reduced. In attempts to alleviate the discrepancy between the labour market needs and the training capacities of industry and institutions, the federal government passed the *National Training Act of 1982*. Along with this act was a change in the policies for funding necessary training and the introduction of the Skills Growth Fund, which

provided capital to upgrade institutions for the new types of training that would be required. With the introduction of these funds came a new proviso from the federal government. Non-profit training institutions were allowed access to this funding along with the colleges. This introduced a whole new component to post-secondary training. Unlike the United States, colleges in Canada have been totally vulnerable to the political decisions of the federal and provincial governments because as crown agencies, the colleges have not had significant input during development of those decisions.

In the late 1970's, the federal government expended a realized loss of revenue with the downturn in the economy and lower personal income tax payments. This revenue decline coupled with constant increases in the payments to provinces for higher education resulted in a substantial decrease in transfer payments of 32.1% in 1982-83 to 28.7% in 1984-85.

In 1985, the Council of Ministers of Education of Canada, met and produced a report entitled *Principles for Interaction: Federal-Provincial Relations and Post-Secondary Education in Canada*. At the same time the Secretary of State (responsible for transferring the funds to post-secondary institutions) produced a report entitled *Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada*. In this report, Mr. A. W. Johnson stated:

five provinces received more money from the federal government PSE than they transferred to their institutions: (p.18)

There seemed to be a constant state of disagreement between the provinces and the federal government which felt the provinces were not transferring the funds to the end user as designated. In June 1986, Bill C-96, *An Act to Amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and the Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977*, and the Established Program Financing was changed once again. This amendment reduced the growth in the total transfer to the provinces beginning in 1987-88 by 2%, but guaranteed its continuation on an equal per capita basis.

As a result of this change:

The provincial governments can expect to receive \$5.7 billion less in the five-year period 1986-87 to 1990-91 than they had expected under the previous legislation. For post-secondary education portion, this will amount to approximately \$1.6 billion. (Report of the Standing Committee of Senate, p.26).

This report goes on to state:

The problems in post-secondary education financing today are a direct result of these decisions, which in hindsight appear to be misjudgments. The provinces have the constitutional responsibility for post-secondary education, while the federal government provides much of the money (p. 27).

This places in context the realities of the world of federal-provincial tax revenue sharing and the situation facing post-secondary education financing in Canada today. The Government of Canada provided revenue through a block funding program known as Established Programs Financing. The Standing Committee of Senate concluded after studying this program that the EPF program had failed.

The fundamental funding relationships for post-secondary education in Canada, and the Ontario community colleges in particular, appeared to be tense from the outset. During the years since the creation of the community colleges in Ontario there has been considerable upheaval and restructuring in the economies of Ontario and of Canada. The text previously quoted from a federal Senate Committee on financing was written from the perspective of the federal government. In order to understand some of the decisions affecting funding through federal and provincial support, the preceding excerpts provide a basis for understanding the changes in funding to post-secondary institutions that have taken place in the past few years.

With the oil crisis of 1972 and 1974, unemployment and inflation, as well as the growing independence of Quebec, led to a concern by politicians for caution in spending at the post-secondary level. The use of the words “retrenchment” and “priorities” became more common as the federal government struggled with its own priorities. As Axelrod(1982) states in his review of Higher Education in Canada between 1930-80:

Recession, rationalization, and restraint - these were the watchwords which shaped higher education in the 1970s and early 80s. Against such obvious debilitating pressures, the goals of widening accessibility, fostering social criticism, enhancing cultural development, and preserving institutional autonomy struggled to assert their priority in the framing of post-secondary educational policy (p. 36).

Axelrod was commenting particularly on Canada’s universities; however, his comments applied to an even greater extent to the public colleges, which were perceived by the Canadian public and politicians in quite a different light from the universities. Dennison

(1986) puts it particularly well when he and Gallagher state:

The colleges did not enjoy the mystique of the university tradition. They were commonly regarded as means rather than institutions of inherent value in their own right, and they were closely tied to government, not only for their funds but also for their rationale as producers of graduates who ought to be able to satisfy immediate manpower needs of the country, the province, or the community (p.84)

In the past, colleges were considered trade schools to fill the need for skilled technicians. Colleges today are providing multi-skilled and multi-faceted education and training encompasses learners from literacy to applied research.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ISSUES

CHALLENGES FOR GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY

The funding issue has not been the only source of difficulty faced by Ontario colleges. Criticism concerning the perceived lack of productivity *vis a vis* the funds received from the public taxpayer, has been voiced by more than one commentator in the past. One particular article, published in the June 9, 1992 edition of the Financial Post by Editor Diane Francis, indicates an outrage at the cost of educating students at the college level. Francis calls the:

...colleges 'wanna-be universities' with teachers even called professors and lots of needless liberal arts options. But these colleges were not intended to compete with universities; they were to train workers . . . even more outrageous, in Ontario, the government gives community colleges \$6,150 per student per year, or considerably more than the average of \$5,250 per year per student it gives to universities (p. 2)

Her comments drew the ire of many in the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. In fact, Francis' comments were incorrect. The college received an allocation of \$5200 per student while the universities received \$7,400 per year in 1992. The reason for illustrating this misperception by Ms. Francis is to point out that even media personalities have been party to the misrepresentation of the facts and the animosity created by not understanding the complexity of the funding formulas for colleges in Ontario.

Earlier, the comments made by Robert D. Kennedy, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Union Carbide Corporation in his speech April 25, 1991 to the Business and Education Conference at the Conference Board of Canada indicated his concern over the educational system in general and the productivity level in particular. Mr. Kennedy's premise is that the educators who run the system should be more accountable to the students and the taxpayers, while at the same time they should be given more responsibility and allowed more input to the education for which they are being held accountable. This point was made repeatedly at the hearings on the Royal Commission on Learning held in 1994, in Ontario. As well the accountability issue became a predominant theme for taxpayers, parents, and the business and corporate community, by the Ontario Conservative Party during the 1995 provincial election.

In addressing the accountability issue during the Standing Committee of Senate on National Finance: Federal Policy on Post-Secondary Education, in 1987, A. W. Johnson's

remarks in summarizing the position of many federal politicians regarding Established Programs Financing, stated:

There is no assurance to the Parliament of Canada or to the people of Canada that the monies which have been appropriated by this Parliament and transferred to the provinces presumably for post-secondary education is actually going to post-secondary education in an unintenuated way . . . If the universities and colleges had received from the provinces the rate of an increase which equalled the rate of an increase in the federal fiscal transfers to the provinces, they would be \$3 billion better off today than, in fact, they are now. Proceedings, First Session, Thirty-third Parliament, Issue No. 13. (p 73).

This issue of accountability was considered at great length during the massive investigation into the college system in Ontario entitled Vision 2000. One group of recommendations in Vision 2000 dealt with the equivalency of learning outcomes, system-wide standards, program review for accreditation, and the need for more general education in all college programs.

Colleges have a unique relationship and responsibility with both levels of government, their respective communities, and their students. With the intense debate on deficits at both the federal and provincial levels of government, the focus of publicly funded institutions has come under even more intense scrutiny. Media exposure, review committees and task forces have profiled the perceived areas of weaknesses and inequity. The need to justify their performance to all sectors has become a target that is compounded even further by other aspects of changing circumstances.

THE NEW CLIENTELE

One significant area of accountability impacting on the fiscal health of the institutions has been the dramatic change in the demographics of college students. In the original mission of the colleges in Ontario as outlined in the Amendment to the Education Act (1965):

...to provide through education and training, not only an equality of opportunity to all sectors of our population, but the fullest possible development of each individual to the limit of his ability. Statement in the Legislature by Mr. Bill Davis, May 21, 1965, (to create the colleges of applied arts and technology in Ontario) (p. 1).

In the last decade the number of individuals, particularly adults, who have been accessing community colleges in Ontario has been increasing dramatically. With staff layoffs in business and industry, as well as the introduction of mature women, immigrants and special needs persons to the marketplace, the diversity of the clientele for community colleges has changed dramatically. The average student is no longer white, male, 18-22, as was the case in 1970. The majority of the student population is now female, ethnic and 28-35 years of age. There has been a five fold increase in full time students in the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario. These 25 colleges, with three colleges catering exclusively to francophone students; while the increase in part-time enrollment has also expanded exponentially. Enrollment increases coupled with the continuously expanding delivery of programs and services have challenged the colleges as they shift to meet the ongoing changes in society. Originally Ontario colleges provided programs of two or three years in length which were geared to the male high school graduate with a particu-

lar focus on programs geared to trades and technology. Now programs and services span basic literacy to advanced post diploma in programs such as business, health, applied research, electronic technology, and robotics to name just a few. Duration of programs and courses range from several days to several years, with program delivery shaped to individual needs taking into consideration age, gender, ethnicity and intellect. A recent phenomenon has been the huge increase in university graduates who are accessing college programs. This phenomenon appears to be as a result of the need for specific skills. In the current employment market, colleges are recognized for providing added marketable skills to the graduate.

AGING WITH GRACE

Adding to the complexity of issues facing the college system, is their maturing workforce. With most of the colleges in the Ontario system starting at relatively the same time approximately 30 years ago many of those who originally began with the college are now waiting for their retirement. These are the very professors, administrators and support staff who are being expected to provide the energy, strength and expertise to restructure and reposition the college system. At the same time the productivity level is reduced by restrictions created by the terms and conditions of the collective agreement ratified following the province-wide strike in 1984. The mandatory standard workload form, limiting the number of teaching hours, the number of preparations, and the restrictions created by the union against hiring part-time faculty. These issues have created a mismatch between the faculty required to teach and the time frame and number of hours for program delivery.

THE REALITY OF THE 1990's

The funding essential to support the role of a catalyst for society, as stated by Paul Gallagher in 1990, has been significantly challenged with the dramatic shift in policy changes by the federal and provincial governments since 1992. The 1993 federal government announcement of block funding with the health sector has severely eroded the transfer payments to the provinces. This change in block funding has provided the provincial government with a rationale for even greater reduction to the colleges by the newly elected Progressive Conservative government in 1995. This new provincial government announced its first funding reduction to the colleges just four weeks after being elected. The \$8 million cutback was a first brush of the expected sweeping changes that the Progressive Conservative government were expected to introduce since they had won the election on a campaign for major reductions to the provincial deficit. Without a reversal in the federal policy on transfer payments which could be passed on to the colleges, the expected downsizing of provincial grants will strike an even greater blow to the colleges. The scramble to meet the demands of increased enrollment, dramatic shifts in the demographics, new technology, program innovations, physical plant deterioration, negotiated agreements, aging staff, professional development, legislative requirements of equity, health and safety, and a myriad of other factors is challenging the colleges to consider different approaches to fulfill their mandate and meet their mission. According to Dennison (1994), who many consider an established authority on the Canadian college systems, the five years from 1996 to 2001 will undoubtedly tell an interesting story of change and redirection in one of Canada's largest and most complex community college systems.

This overview provides an understanding of the basis for Ontario college funding. As this dilemma is not unique to Ontario, it is expected that the trend of uncertain government funding is probably applicable across Canada.

Faced with uncertainty in traditional funding and with growing demands for programs and services, colleges in Ontario must look to alternative sources for support. Colleges in Ontario have been very entrepreneurial in their approach to doing business. As such this entrepreneurial approach will be important to the college in adapting to the highly competitive market forces. In the report entitled The Ontario College Financial Crisis, a paper prepared for the Council of Presidents by a joint Task Force of The Administrative Services Coordinating Committee and The Instruction/Programs Coordinating Committee (1995), a list of savings and revenue generating possibilities was developed. It called for more collaboration among the colleges in breaking down artificial barriers; facilitating transfer of staff due to downsizing; tendering ancillary operations; block servicing provincially for computers, banking, energy-efficiencies; restructuring the incentive for staff, and investigating the possibility of matching funds raised in the private sector. In a presentation given by members of the Task Force of the Administrative Services Coordinating Committee to the Model of Financing Conference in 1995, revenue generating suggestions included: negotiating sponsorships with companies to advertise their products; provide 'exclusives' to partners in industry; endowing a chair for a specific program; raffling a scholarship, tuition, annual residence fee, or 'guaranteed' entrance in a future year; increasing donations to Foundation, eg. in lieu of rollbacks for staff, allowing them to donate equivalent salary to Foundation and receive the tax benefit.

At another 1993 conference sponsored by Association Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, The Road Ahead: Understanding the Finances of Ontario's Colleges, it was reported that the provincial government had changed its policy to permit the colleges to undertake fund raising. In 1991-92, private donations amounted to only 1.2% of over-all revenues and consequently it was anticipated that it will be a significant challenge to expand this source of revenue given the tradition of modest corporate donations to colleges in Canada. According to the Conference Board of Canada (1995) in their annual Corporate Donations Budget Outlook by the Institute of Donations and Public Affairs Research, corporations give the largest share of their total donations to post-secondary education . The potential to create new partnerships with industry could also become a significant factor in the future. Colleges have a great product to sell - accessible, quality applied higher education. This important commodity of quality higher education, if properly supported, will allow our society to move into the next millennium with the strength of new knowledge and new skills, for a vast number of individuals.

The need to support colleges both financially and morally has never been greater. Although colleges are faced with the issues previously outlined: productivity, accountability, relevance and faculty issues, the increase in enrollment and the need for skilled labour reflects the importance of college education to the business sector as well as society in general. The challenges of soliciting that financial support from the private sector and opportunities utilized by colleges to seek additional revenue form the basis of this study.

FOUNDATIONS - A RELATIVELY NEW FIELD OF RESEARCH

Some Ontario colleges have just started to create foundations to facilitate fund raising while others have established foundations over the past decade. This research will be particularly helpful to many colleges weighing the pros and cons in establishing a foundation and what aspects of the development of a foundation should receive particular attention.

Fund raising and the creation of foundations attached to the American colleges have been well documented and appear to be studied at great length according to the number listed in *Dissertation Abstracts*. This study has relied extensively on the American research due to the paucity of literature about the Canadian system. American college foundations were initiated through the support of the private sector and have continued their growth through that private sector support. It would appear that philanthropy in Canada is difficult to study because it is perceived to be such a private and personal matter (people are often unwilling to discuss their giving,) and therefore it is difficult to manipulate and test variables. One could surmise that this may be why few scholars have published research in this field.

The few dissertations done in this field of study in Canada to date are: Harvard (1975) *The Philanthropic Support of Community Colleges in Canada* ; Dellandrea (1987) "Corporate Support and University Development" ; Caton (1990) "A Preference for Prestige? Commentary on the Behaviour of Universities and Their Benefactors" ; and

Mucklow (1990) *The Canadian Two-Year College Foundation: Characteristics of Success.*

In Harvard's (1975) study, 84 colleges across Canada responded to the survey. Only nine had development officers, and five had volunteer committees for fund raising purposes (p. 42). Of the 84 colleges, 10 were private and three were church-sponsored. The total dollars raised in Canada between 1968-73 was \$2.6 million(p. 60). Of this amount, the Ontario colleges raised a total of \$5,035 from the 11 Ontario colleges out of 84 colleges across Canada responding to Harvard's survey. The total dollars raised by public colleges across Canada was \$26,208 (p.61). Harvard's study deemed alumni development as a significant aid to fund raising for colleges. This factor was disputed by American researchers as early as Duffy (1979) and Sneed (1979). The alumni factor has since been recognized by Degerstedt (1979) to be less important than other factors, such as: the involvement of the president; strong and committed board members; faculty and staff involvement in fund raising; public profile and community commitment to the college; funds directed towards scholarships and bursaries; when scrutinizing the success of foundations of community colleges.

Mucklow (1990) surveyed all the community colleges in Canada and of the 143 surveyed, 126 responded (88%) of which 45 had foundations. Of the 45 with foundations, only 35 surveys were actually utilized for the study. The factors determined were:

The Canadian two-year college foundation, as a partner of the affiliated institution, has largely been exempted from the local and regional research agenda. The result is that the Canadian technical and community college foundation cannot be comprehended in any definitive way at the local,

provincial, or national level. This is due to a lack of available information and the resulting data analysis necessary to create an understanding of these affiliated two-year college organizations (p. 9).

According to Mucklow (1990), only 28% of the Canadian two-year colleges had established foundations. Mucklow's (1990) study added to the criteria for success when he found that faculty and staff involvement; age of the foundation; and size of the foundation board of directors were significant factors in establishing the best predictive equation for a successfully foundation rather than the size of the alumni.

Philanthropy in higher education in Canada has been identified by many as a means of increasing resources and addressing financial constraints. As part of the 1993 Council of Presidents' Task Force Report, The Ontario College Financial Crisis , as well, this was discussed as recently as May 1996, in the Consortium for Community College Development, Transforming Community Colleges to Compete For The Future.

The American college foundations have been analyzed through a variety of studies Duffy (1979); Degerstedt, (1979); Sharron, (1982a); Hunter (1987); Kopecek (1988); and Warnick (1990), to determine the organizational and operational factors which lead to successful foundations. According to these researchers, one of the most fundamental determinants of success for foundations is the relationship between the foundation board and the college president. The support from the president, and his or her willingness to see the role of the foundation in image-making and fund raising, is a significant part of the presidential responsibilities according to Kopecek (1988, p. 14). Warnick (1990) found

that strong and committed foundation boards that comprise top community leaders and positive public relations and community awareness as well as strong institutional support play an important role in determining the success of a foundation. Both Warnick (1990) and Mucklow (1990) found faculty involvement in the goals and objectives of the foundation and fund raising to be other factors in predicting the success of the foundation.

The research from the American colleges has been concentrated primarily within the past two decades (1975-1995) but the initial research began in the late 1950s by Pollard and continued with studies in the mid-1960s by Bremer (1965) and Curti and Nash (1965). Studies concentrating on foundations Degerstedt (1979), Duffy (1979), Angel and Gares (1981), Sharron(1982a), Hunter (1987), Warwick (1990) and Piland and Lowden (1992) have been particularly useful to this study. Utilizing these research studies, the writer was able to analyze similar criteria to determine the success of college foundations in Ontario. Documentation on the history and research of other colleges was used as a basis to interpret the findings of this analysis.

One of the first to conduct research into fund raising in post-secondary education was Pollard (1958). His study, *Fund-Raising for Higher Education*, along with Curti and Nash's (1965) study, profiled the establishment of such institutions as Johns Hopkins University, the University of Chicago and Princeton University. This early research spoke about philanthropy as being a twentieth century development, conducted on a small scale and financed by the wealthy few in response to personal begging appeals (p.1).

Bremer (1965) was also an early researcher, while Luck and Tolle (1974) were one of the first to study foundations. Duffy (1979), Sharron (1978) and Degerstedt (1982) have done a series of studies of college foundations and are recognized as the lead researchers in this field. Later studies done by Hunter (1987), Ironfield (1991), Walter (1993), Gatewood (1994), and Spangler (1994) indicated institutional characteristics related to success. Clements (1990) identified marketing practices and developmental system elements related to successful foundations. Warnick (1990) determined that the characteristics of successful foundations included strong and committed boards, confidence in the college's leadership, successful solicitation for scholarships, and a feeling that a college education was a good investment.

In an October 1989 article by Vince Stehle, in The Chronicle of Higher Education, he states that multimillion dollar campaigns of the sixties have given way to billion dollar campaigns of the 1990's. American colleges have utilized fund raising as a major source of revenue. According to Sharron's (1982a) study, four year public colleges in the United States have sought private and corporate sources of income for many years. Two year public colleges have historically viewed fund raising with disdain according to Hunter (1987). However, according to Hunter (1987) public colleges which began fund raising in the sixties and seventies, have now become seriously active. Sharron noted in a 1982 survey of American community college foundations that more foundations were activated and established in 1980-82 than from 1900 to 1979.

In Hunter's study (1987) of the American community college foundations, success was defined as the specific dollar value of private funds generated by the foundation in a given year (p.3). While success was defined by Luck and Tolle (1978) as the number of gifts accumulated. They went on to say that foundations must have long term and short term goals, i.e., providing extra dollars for today, but also setting aside some dollars as endowment for the future (p.49).

Canadian colleges have just recently begun embracing philanthropy. Mucklow's (1990) research shows that colleges were relatively exempt from philanthropy until the mid 1960's. However, philanthropy has played a role in establishing Canadian universities. The beginnings of Dalhousie University (1818), McGill University (1821), Queen's University (1841), and McMaster University (1887) all had support through philanthropy that was primarily from religious organizations. The multimillion dollar campaigns recently initiated by Canadian colleges have a tremendous distance to bridge before they reach the level of dollars raised by American colleges over the years.

It would appear that a successful form of fund raising for both American and Canadian colleges has been through charitable foundations. This structure of fund raising through charitable foundations has as its sole mandate the financial support of the college for which they are affiliated. The growth of foundations in American colleges took place in the early 1970's. According to Mucklow (1990), Canadian colleges appear to lag behind by approximately 10 years in the creation of such foundations.

MEASURING SUCCESS

Fund raising has been analyzed by a number of American researchers beginning with Pollard in the 1950's and followed by Bremer and Curti and Nash in the 1960's. Most research has occurred within the last two decades (1975-1995) and has primarily focused on measuring success according to the following criteria:

- Level of funds raised according to the number of full-time equivalent students enrolled: Luck (1974); Silvera (1974); Mucklow (1990);
- Level of funds raised according to the potential wealth of the local environment: Pickett (1977); Leslie (1979); Duronio and Loessin (1991);
- The extent of the public relations developed with potential donors: Duffy (1977); Sharron (1978); May (1985);
- Level of involvement of faculty and staff with the foundation: Bremer (1965);
- Role of the president in fund raising success: Robinson (1989); McNamara (1989); Janney (1994);
- Role of the motivating factors of development officers: Miller (1991);
- Prestige, connections, and wealth of foundation board members as well as size of board and number of years in operation: Sprangler (1994); Graham (1994);

However, foundations are only as good as the people who support them according to Ishoy (1972) who stated:

Just as any good pair of scissors needs two blades, with each blade helping to keep the other sharp, so it is that any good fund raising operation needs both kinds of leadership - the layman who leads and the staff who manages and serves. The better each is and the better they work together, the better the result will be. And leadership in itself is always the key factor

in successful fund raising, whatever the cause, whatever the goal, and whatever the scope of the campaign. (p. 40).

A well-structured foundation employs a professional executive director full time and a complement of staff who manage the operation. They work under the direction of successful business leaders who demonstrate their commitment to the particular college by serving on the board of directors of the foundation.

THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT, DEVELOPMENT OFFICER AND GOVERNING BOARD OF THE FOUNDATION

Robison (1982) reported in The Community College Foundation that the most important criteria for success was presidential support of, commitment to and understanding of the fund-raising process (p.43). In the chapter on The Chief Executive and Advancement, Smith (1986) suggested that the success of the foundation is dependent on the president's willingness and capacity for leadership in the advancement effort. The four major tasks the president must perform are:

- 1. articulate clearly and convincingly the mission and values of the institution.*
- 2. secure the sponsorship of the governing board.*
- 3. recruit and relate closely to the chief advancement officer (executive director).*
- 4. serve the advancement program actively and enthusiastically, with primary attention to securing major gift support. Smith(p 697).*

The importance of presidential support, commitment to, and understanding of the foundations is absolutely paramount to success. Coupled with the importance of the pres-

ident's support, a successful foundation requires the commitment of the college board of governors and an understanding of the foundation according to Robison:

Without the presence of the above two elements, development personnel would do better not to start or attempt to reactivate a foundation program(p.44).

Besides the presidential commitment, the college board of governors must understand the structure and appreciate the significance of the success of the foundation. According to Smith, the selection of directors is as important as selecting staff for a sound and solid organization. The criteria of a solid board member includes: financial independence, time, and influence in social circles. The involvement of such a board member can be enhanced if that person is also serving as a member of the board of directors of the foundation.

According to Michael Worth (1986), who is recognized as a leader in college foundation research, fund raising leadership cannot be separated from more substantive involvement with the college. The pursuit of resources must be congruent with the needs of the institution and the goals of business and industry. Board members must be fully apprised of the academic plan for the college and be able to relate those goals to the external community. The commitment of the foundation board member is critical in the raising of funds. It is also important that the board member is a peer of those from whom they are soliciting and they themselves must do the asking.

The involvement of the college staff, including the pivotal role of the executive director, is discussed by Jenner (1986) in which he points out that college staff are as important in determining success for foundations as any other factor. In general, professional foundation directors were personable, socially adept, pragmatic, creative, assertive, self-confident, committed, and active participants in community activities (p.158). Other characteristics of foundation executive directors were; strong managerial skills, residents of the community for some time, and deemed to be a driving force behind the successful resource development program. The development officers in Jenners' report indicated there was a strong working relationship between themselves and the college president. (p.159) Jenner also found that success resulted from the staff working closely with the board of directors. Smith (1986) reinforced this comment: It is imperative that the executive director be not only permitted but also encouraged to develop close working relationships with members of the governing board as well as other key leaders (p. 701). He found that the strength of the fund raising endeavours was a function of the strength of the operation of the foundation. Included in his findings was the need for full-time staff and an adequate budget to operate the foundation. Jenner also found that adequate time was needed to develop the program and centralize the control of development by the foundation office. Community participation and alumni involvement were also recognized as important components in Jenner's findings.

Duffy's (1979) study defines effectiveness or success as an organization's ability to meet its stated objectives (p. 77). More importantly, Duffy also examined those persons

most involved with community college foundations, especially the college presidents and development officers. Planning is a key to effectiveness according to Duffy; Luck (1974); Silvera (1974); and Sims (1973). Planning includes the development of well-established policies for receiving gifts. (Nusz, 1986). Clements (1990) noted the need for well planned investment policies. Duffy (1979) outlined another fundamental need which was: to have a mission statement and goals stated by the foundation(p. 77). As a result of these components, a foundation's planning occurs as a function of institutional history, values, management culture, and evolution in the development function (p.41) according to Loessin & Duronio (1990). Planning for foundations is multi-faceted and structured to take advantage of the benefits of each part that contribute to the goals and objectives of the mission of the college and foundation.

THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE LITERATURE

A review of this literature helps one to conclude that to function successfully, a foundation requires the support of the college's governing or advisory board and the commitment of its president. According to Rennebohm (1985), Robertson (1981), and Robison (1982) the president works with the foundation to establish and clarify realistic goals. When the results of the research are combined it helps create an operational model for successful college foundations.

A successful foundation is one that involves the college president and community in planning for resource development Duronio & Loessin (1991), Warnick (1990), Tolle

(1966). In addition to a dynamic development officer and the support and participation of community leaders, Hollingsworth (1983); Ryan (1989); Konecek(1982), state effective foundations need a clear and strong mission statement, professional leadership to coordinate activities, open communication, adequate support staff, and a productive working environment Hollingsworth(1983); Ryan(1989); and Wise and Camper(1985). A key element to ensuring the foundation's existence is the board of directors, a group of individuals who should represent a cross section of the community and have direct access to the local power structure. Since it is the board's primary responsibility to raise funds, members should have legal, financial, and investment expertise according to Davidson & Wise (1982). Studies by Luck (1974) and Silvera (1974) rank the amount of money raised as the major characteristic of a successful community college foundation while Sharron (1978) and Duffy (1980, 1982) rank strong public relations with the community as the major characteristic. Foundation boards have an important role to play in successful public relations.

OPERATIONAL MODEL FOR FOUNDATIONS

Sharron's (1978), Organization of the Foundation Board, originally written for the National Council for Resource Development, has been recognized as one of the cornerstones of pragmatic research into the operations for a successful foundation. Sharron's (1978) recommendations include:

The establishment of a foundation by the college board of governors. Board membership should not exceed thirty members and the president and development officer should be voting members of the board. Moreover, the board should have wide spread representation from the business and community interests and board members should be influential and have access to large

amounts of money. Local power structures should be represented on the board. Finally the minimum term of each board member should be for three years.(p.16).

Kopecek (1982) added the following to Sharron's (1978) list of recommended procedures for the operation of the board of directors:

The board should meet infrequently in regular session, perhaps three times a year. The day-to-day operations of the foundation should be guided by an executive committee and the executive director who is a full-time member of the staff. Board members should be consulted informally to give advice, to promote the foundation and college, to contribute financially, and to help with fund-raising (p.15).

An ideal foundation model structure would be based on Sharron(1982a) and Kopecek's(1982) listed recommendations. In order for such a foundation model to function effectively, certain personality traits of the director and staff significantly enhance the chance of success. Personality characteristics of advancement officers, according to Jacobson (1986) must be risk taking and effective communication skills. They must be interested in many areas of learning, be enthusiastic, and be able to exercise restraint under stress. The effective manager must demonstrate sound management and leadership skills, resilience and patience. Knott(1992) added to Jacobson's (1986) list. Knott noted the following nine characteristics or assets of individuals that contribute to success in the field of fund-raising:

- *remarkable energy and ability to efficiently accomplish great amounts of work*
- *search for and sense of professional calling*
- *leadership in establishing new ideas and ways of doing things*
- *mentoring of young people in the profession*

- *creativity in solving problems and achieving goals*
- *persistence in finishing a task*
- *delight in anonymity*
- *loyalty and commitment to the organization and the profession*
- *common touch, the consummate ability to make the profession relevant to the layperson (p:xvi)*

The personality characteristics noted by Knott (1992) are not unique to foundation fund raising but are sought by many organizations seeking candidates with strong leadership skills according to Human Resources Canada, A Labour Market Review, (1997, p. 4).

When Broce (1986) listed the ideal characteristics of development officers, he was more specific in terms of personality characteristics, but he also discussed themes similar to Knott(1992). For example, Broce (1986) spoke of commitment requiring that individuals be genuinely concerned for the well-being of the institution or organization. He also spoke of the required ability to establish standards of operation, originate activity, sustain the mood, and energize others. The development officer must understand how to organize, direct, and motivate people. Commitment is sustained by a willingness to work hard, despite long hours and disappointments. Since the foundation must constantly be aware of fund raising opportunities, the development officer must have the ability to coordinate special events, to take maximum advantage of every occasion to promote their institution and to raise funds wherever possible. Broce (1986) suggested that the development officer must be versatile, with the ability to assist the president and volunteer workers in a wide range of duties. The development officers must have mastered techniques of fund

raising and professional support that are necessary in all phases of the development process. Such techniques and support are necessary, not only for personal achievement, but also for mentoring others in realizing their potential. Development officers must seek professional growth opportunities while respecting the integrity and dignity of others.

In reviewing the literature, this researcher has ascertained that the successful structural model of a college foundation must include: presidential and board commitment; development officers exhibiting strong leadership and management skills; effective policies and procedures to achieve and enhance the mission and goals of the foundation; and supportive foundation and college staff who contribute both time and financial gifts.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the form and scope of financial solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges. An examination of the need for fund raising by Ontario colleges and the issues that are currently shaping that direction was reviewed. In order for the colleges to augment their funding base and create new opportunities for growth and stability, we have seen a substantial increase in fund raising, particularly through the use of foundations. Challenges which include the changing demographics of both clientele and college staff, the structural changes in the funding base, and increased demands to seek new sources of funding, have all caused colleges in Canada to scramble for new sources of revenue. The trend for college foundations to be created to financially support the American colleges has recently been replicated in Canada. This

development has led to new research in this field, particularly in the last two decades. Such research has created criteria useful to assessing the potential for success by future foundations. This study has drawn on these criteria to analyze the organization and operations of Ontario college foundations.

Colleges throughout Ontario are financially supported by a complex arrangement of federal and provincial revenues. At the same time, the colleges are maintained and operated under provincial legislation. As governments address their fiscal deficits, the concern for the impact of decreased funding at the college level is heightened. Changes that have shaped post-secondary education, particularly colleges in Ontario, since World War II were assessed as part of the review.

With the limited research in this area in Canada, successful college foundations were assessed according to the research that has been conducted in the United States. Two dissertations that have been written on college fund raising in Canada were examined. The dissertation by Harvard (1965) was not current enough to provide data to assist in this study. However, Mucklow (1990) devised a formula that provided criteria to interpret the potential for success through the foundation. Research conducted in the American colleges has also created criteria that can be used to assess the potential for future fund raising success by foundations. This study has drawn on the criteria as outlined by Mucklow(1990) as well as characteristics determined by Duffy (1980), Sharron (1982a), Kopecek (1988), Robison (1982), Jenner (1986), and Warnick (1990), to determine the success level of fund raising by Ontario college foundations.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to:

- 1) investigate the scope and form of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by colleges in Ontario between 1993-95. Scope is defined as purpose, staffing and results, and form is defined as foundations or other funding sources.
- 2) identify which Ontario colleges have established affiliated foundations and to investigate their operating procedures.
- 3) identify the roles and responsibilities of the individuals charged with developing and operating a successful college foundation.
- 4) identify which foundations have been most successful and to determine if they exhibit characteristics determined by previous research that is associated with successful foundations.

Part A: Operations

- Does the foundation have full time staff and does it adhere to the criteria for successful college foundations?
- What is the role of the president in supporting the foundation fund raising activities?
- Does the foundation function in a way in which the goals and activities support the mission of the college?
- Does the college staff support the foundation financially and through volunteer service?

Part B: Organization

- What is the role of the board of directors?
- Does the board of directors support the work of the foundation both financially and through solicitation of others?
- Does the revenue from fund raising support scholarships and bursaries?
- Are the alumni major contributors to the foundation?

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study was administered in two distinct parts.

Part A included a descriptive survey questionnaire to determine the form and scope of fund raising by Ontario colleges in solicitation of the private sector,

where scope is defined as purpose, staffing and results, and where form is defined as foundations or other.

Part B involved interviews of specific individuals to ascertain the operational and organizational characteristics of the successful college foundation when operating characteristics are defined as: college presidential involvement; college staff complement; foundation staff contribution in terms of time and financial resources; and how revenue is allocated.

The organizational structure was defined as the role of the board, alumni, and community support. Public relations is defined in terms of the reciprocal understanding and good will on behalf of the college and the foundation. The foundations studied in part B were chosen according to Mucklow's criteria for successful foundations. Mucklow (1990) defined the criteria for success by dividing the average financial contribution received from the private sector fund raising attained between (1993-95) by the average annual FTE for (1993-95).

$$\text{SUCCESS} = \frac{\text{Average total new yearly assets (1993-95)}}{\text{Average FTE Count (1993-95)}}$$

This procedure for the study is consistent with similar American studies by Bremer (1965); Duffy, (1979); and Johnson, (1986). Using the criteria established by Mucklow

(1990), three college foundations were selected for further study. At each college foundation, six individuals were selected for an interview to assess the organization and operation of the foundation and the responsibilities of those involved in directing and sustaining that operation. The details of the research design, the population of the study, the procedures for collecting the data, and the components of the two parts of the data collection instrument are described in this chapter.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

In this study the following terms are defined:

ACAATO: the Association of Community Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. It is a voluntary nonprofit association established by the Governors and Presidents of Ontario's Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology to meet their needs for college system advocacy, research and planning and human resource development.

Advancement: a total program to foster understanding and support for a college or university. (Muller, 1977, 1986) Richards and Sherratt (1981) include five major elements under the umbrella of a coordinated program which include: fund raising, public relations, internal and external communications, government relations, and alumni relations. (Smith, 1989, p. 1)

Foundation: The term foundation, as described in the Canadian Income Tax Act: 149.1.

[Charities]

PUBLIC FOUNDATION Public foundation means a charitable foundation of which,

(A) where the foundation has been registered after February 15, 1984 or designated as a charitable organization or private foundation pursuant to subsection (6.3) or to subsection 110(8.1) or (8.2) of the Income Tax Act, chapter 148 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952,

(i) more than 50% of the directors, trustees, officers or like officials deal with each other and with each of the other directors, trustees, officers or officials at arms' length, and

(ii) not more than 50% of the capital contributed or otherwise paid into the foundation has been so contributed or otherwise paid in by one person or members of a group of such persons who do not deal with each other at arms' length, or

(B) in any other case,

(i) more than 50% of the directors or trustees deal with each other and with each of the other directors or trustees at arms' length, and

(ii) not more than 75% of the capital contributed or otherwise paid into the foundation has been so contributed or otherwise paid in by one person or by a group of persons who do not deal with each other at arms' length and for the purpose of subparagraph (A)(ii), a reference to any person or to members of a group does not include a reference to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province, a municipality, another registered charity that is not a private foundation, or any club, society or association described in paragraph 149(1)(l).

College-affiliated Foundation: "A charitable corporation organized for the exclusive purpose of benefitting a particular community college or for specific purposes in connection there with" (Silvera, 1974, p.11). The Ontario college-affiliated foundations are directed by a board of directors which is made up of volunteers from the community. The board of directors also has representation from the college board of governors, who act as liaison to the college board of governors, college faculty, who represent the college facul-

ty interests on the board, and the college president and foundation staff, which include both full-time and part-time paid staff.

Development: A continuous program and set of activities conducted by a college in a planned campaign for seeking and obtaining private support, and for the identification, cultivation and solicitation of various sources of donations. The planned promotion of understanding, participation and support which includes three interdependent activities: planning, constituency relations, and fund raising... The three activities are interrelated, interdependent and very much people-oriented. (Broce, 1986, p. 27).

Development Officer: For the purpose of this study, the term development officer will be used synonymously with the term fund raiser. Participants in the study may not have the title development officer, but their chief responsibility in their institution is fund raising.

Fund raising: The most sophisticated of all forms of public relations, it is the act of asking a person for a gift of money (Broce, 1986, p. 27).

Key Informant: An informant answers specific questions and then supplies additional unsolicited information both related and unrelated to the question, giving the researcher a broader view of the situation (Spradley & McCurdy, 1981, p. 75).

New Assets: Contributions (cash, property, equipment, securities, endowments) made to the foundation for a specific year excluding interest and income from any previous year. (Johnson, 1986).

Philanthropy: philanthropy is love of mankind and includes voluntary giving, volunteer service, and voluntary association primarily for the benefit of others.(Fisher 1989, p.18).

Success: Success within the community college foundation as defined by (Mucklow 1990, p. 13) was determined by dividing the average financial contribution attained from the private sector fund raising annually by the average annual FTE for the years 1993-1995.

$$\text{SUCCESS} = \frac{\text{Average total new yearly assets (1993-95)}}{\text{Average FTE Count (1993-95)}}$$

OUTLINE OF THE STUDY PROCEDURES RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM - PART A: MAILED SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study was to investigate the form and scope of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges. The questionnaire was formulated to ascertain:

1. the extent (or not) of fund raising currently being conducted
2. the type of staffing (full-time and/or part-time) for fund raising purposes
3. the results (level of assets) that have been achieved to date
4. the type of donor recognition programs
5. the affiliation with professional organizations
6. the level of communication with the alumni and
7. where the revenue is directed (scholarships, capital, etc.).

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire was developed from a variety of survey instruments that were used in previous research, Clements (1990); Hunter (1987); Mucklow (1990); Warnick (1990). The questionnaire was directed at seeking input from the presidents of each of the 25 colleges in Ontario. The descriptive data derived from the questionnaire was verified by data attained from Ontario government sources (Ministry of Education, (1995).

Descriptive survey implies the assumption that whatever we observe at any one time is normal and under the same conditions, could conceivably be observed at any time in the future... In employing this method, the researcher does two things: first, he observes with close scrutiny the population which is bounded by the research parameters; second, he makes a careful record of what he observes so that when the aggregate record is made, the researcher can then return to the record to study the observations that have been described there (Leedy, 1980, pp.97-98).

The descriptive survey questionnaire was organized around the following topics:

- 1) staffing levels: number of full-time development directors, full-time staff and the number of part-time staff
- 2) amount of president's time devoted to fund raising
- 3) board composition: number of members of the board of the foundation, length of term for board members, and involvement of college faculty who represent faculty on the board of directors
- 4) college staff who contribute to the foundation through fund raising efforts both in terms of time and/or financial support and
- 5) results of fund raising: do the funds go to buildings and/or student needs?

POPULATION

A mailed questionnaire was the most practical and efficient way of obtaining this information to determine the extent of fund raising currently being conducted by all 25 colleges in Ontario.

The survey questionnaire was sent to the 25 public colleges in Ontario that are members of the ACAATO of Ontario. English questionnaires were sent to the 22 English language colleges (see Appendix B). French language questionnaires were sent to the three French language colleges. (See Appendix E.).

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF DATA COLLECTION

Each college president in English language colleges was provided:

- the survey questionnaire, (see Appendix B)
- a letter from the researcher requesting participation, (see Appendix D)
- a covering letter from a presidential colleague known to the researcher outlining the research project, (see Appendix C)
- a return self-addressed stamped envelope was included with the survey and
- a letter to president of colleges with foundations selected for interview (see Appendix G).

Each college president in French language college was provided:

- the survey questionnaire, (see Appendix E)
- a letter from the researcher requesting participation, (see Appendix D)
- a covering letter from a presidential colleague known to the researcher outlining the research project, (see Appendix F) and
- a return self-addressed stamped envelope.

To attain a maximum response the researcher's letter offered the opportunity for respondents to obtain a copy of results of the study. According to Alreck & Settle(1995), a copy of the report of some of the results of the survey may be a powerful inducement to respond (p. 203). Each college president was requested to complete the questionnaire and return it to the researcher in a self-addressed and stamped envelope within a 20 day time period. A follow up telephone call was made to each president's administrative assistant to assure the researcher that the questionnaire had been received. If there was no reply within two weeks, a second telephone call was made to request completion of the survey. Those who did not respond within a 30 day period were sent a fax of the original letter and questionnaire with the consent form.

RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY

- All 25 Ontario public colleges (n=25) responded.
- Not all responding colleges provided sufficient actual data that could be used for analysis. These data were derived from the preceding table.
- One college is not involved with fund raising and therefore did not qualify for the research. (n=1)
- Eleven colleges reported that they raise funds through a foundation affiliated with the college. (n=11)
- Ten colleges reported that they raise funds for the college but do not have an affiliated foundation. (n=10)
- Two colleges (n= 2) with foundations could not be used in this analysis because the foundations were just being created when the study took place in 1995.
- One college without a foundation could not be used in this analysis as the college was just being instituted as a college in 1995. (n=1)

Therefore, the study was conducted using eleven colleges with foundations for fund raising and ten colleges that raise funds without the use of a foundation.

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM - PART B: THE INTERVIEW PROCESS

The second part of the study, the on-site interview process, was formulated to collect additional data from the three most successful colleges with foundations as

determined by Mucklow's (1990) formula, and to investigate:

- 1) their organizational and operating procedures
- 2) the roles and responsibilities of the individuals charged with developing and operating a successful college foundation
- 3) the level of contribution of the college administrators and faculty to the college fund raising in terms of time and/or financial resources and
- 4) the level of contribution by the local community to the foundation, particularly by business and industry.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

The interview questions were developed from research done by Lilly Thal Warnick (1990). Dr. Warnick's study revealed characteristics associated with foundation success:

Leadership of key individuals associated with the college, foundation and the community; strong and committed boards, support attracted by scholarships and other college priority needs; contributors who valued education and viewed their donations as good investments; confidence in the college's leadership and their stewardship of funds received; personal contributions by solicitors as a prerequisite for seeking funds from others; pro-active fund raising with personal contact as the most effective approach; success as a development process over time; strong institutional support and effective planning and public relations efforts. (p. 126).

Initially the existing literature concerning fund raising was examined. Secondly, criteria established by Mucklow (1990), Duffy (1979), Warnick (1990), Clements (1990),

Hunter (1987), Sharron (1982a), Kopecek (1988), Robison (1982), Jenner (1986), Knott (1992), Angel & Gares (1989) for successful foundations, were analysed to establish the interview questionnaire with identified participants in a manner similar to the study done by Warnick (1990).

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

In selecting the foundations for the interview component of this study, the success of the foundation was determined by the criteria established by Mucklow's (1990) research, The Canadian Two-Year College Foundation: Characteristics of Success . The questions incorporated characteristics which appeared repeatedly throughout other literature as being the most critical elements in assessing the success of a foundation, as stated by Angel and Gares (1989).

The most successful college foundations were determined by dividing the total assets acquired from 1993-95 by the 1993-95 FTE enrolment as determined by the questionnaire survey. These data were verified by data attained from the Ministry of Education and Training, Colleges Branch, Province of Ontario. Table 1 lists the Ontario colleges with foundations in the order of their calculated success rate.

**Table 1 Success Rate of Ontario Colleges with Foundations
As Calculated According to Mucklow's Formula**

College	FTE 1993-94 1994-95	Assets \$ 1993-94 1994-95	Success Rate \$
CollegeC	10,866	1,386,866	127.63
CollegeR	11,145	1,083,000	102.55
CollegeL	12,578	1,194,651	94.97
CollegeP	7483	642,122	85.81
CollegeO	5387	444,652	82.54
CollegeN	6233	485,436	77.88
CollegeK	22,780	1,718,423	75.44
CollegeQ	19,863	1,266,280	63.75
CollegeM	27,347	837,220	30.61
CollegeA	26000	349,000	13.42
CollegeW	12,276	151,357	12.33

Table 2 illustrates the three most successful colleges with foundations which were chosen for further study in Part B of this research.

Table 2 Ontario Colleges with Foundations Chosen for Further Study

College	FTE 1993-94 1994-95	Assets \$ 1993-94 1994-95	Success Rate \$
CollegeC	10866	1,386,866	127.63
CollegeR	11,145	1,083,000	102.55
CollegeL	12,578	1,194,651	94.97

The original letter of request to the college president stated that three foundations would be studied in more detail. Presidents of colleges chosen for further study were asked to support this research by encouraging participation of those being requested to be interviewed. The researcher contacted the director of development at each of the three selected colleges and requested the name, address, phone and fax number of each person designated for further study at their college. A total of 18 interviews were conducted with representatives at each of the three foundations with:

- the president of each of the three colleges (n=3)
- the member of each of the three foundation boards of directors (n=3)
- the development officers of the three foundations (n=3)
- the member of each of the three college boards of governors (n=3)
- the member of each community representing donors for each community (n=3)
- the faculty member (n=3).

The personal interviews provided information on:

- 1) the nature and extent of presidential involvement with the foundation
- 2) the level of commitment and involvement by members of the board of the foundation
- 3) the level of public relations and community involvement with the foundation
- 4) the role of the executive director and the day-to-day management of the foundation and
- 5) the contribution by college administrators and faculty to the college fund raising.

Methods and Procedures

Each interview participant was contacted initially by a letter (see Appendix G for English language colleges outlining the research being conducted and requesting their voluntary participation in this research. This letter also provided the consent form which the participant was requested to complete and return in the attached self-addressed envelope. A personal telephone contact by the researcher to determine a time and date suitable for the interview was made with the interview participants. Interviewees were provided with a copy of the questions in advance of the scheduled interview. The interview protocol provided an explanation of the purpose of the research along with details outlining the confidentiality to be maintained. Each participant was requested to provide a pseudonym to disguise their identity when the interview was transcribed for publication.

The personal semi-structured interview was chosen for several reasons. The interview is flexible and adaptable, and leads can be followed up. The interview questions initially asked were followed by an open-ended question, allowing the interviewee to provide further information, thus providing the researcher an even greater awareness of relationships and perceptions felt by the interviewee. Borg and Gall (1983) stated that the semi-structured interview is generally most appropriate for interview studies in education. It provides a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permits gathering valuable data that would not be successfully obtained by any other approach. (p. 442). The researcher's experience as a data collector involved interviewing participants as part of

her professional position. Interviews were taped in order to alleviate, as much as possible, the risk of skewing the data analysis.

Of the 18 interviews, 13 interviews took place in the office or boardroom of the interviewee. One interview with the faculty of one college was conducted in the staff room after hours while no one else was in the room. Four interviews had to be conducted by telephone due to inclement weather conditions resulting in travel problems for the researcher. The interviews conducted by telephone appeared consistent with the data in interviews conducted face to face. According to Borg and Gall(1989) Educational Research (1989), telephone interviews produce comparable information to face-to-face interviews (p.457). According to Suchman (1967) after comparing data from personal interviews with telephone interview results it was found that in none of these experiments was there any indication that the telephone results were less satisfactory than those obtained by personal interviews.(p. 67). According to Suchman (1967) who compared data from personal interviews with telephone interview results, in none of these experiments was there any indication that the telephone results were less satisfactory than those obtained by personal interviews.(p. 67). At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher transcribed the interview and sent the results to the participant for their review. Each interviewee was requested to make changes as they deemed necessary and return the transcript to the researcher as soon as possible.

Response to Interview Questions

The semi-structured interview was divided into two parts. The first 14 questions were asked of each participant except the community donor. The second section of questions varied in number and were specific to the role the individual played within each foundation (eg. college president, board of governors member, foundation board of directors member, director or faculty). The interviews were exploratory and provided data reflecting perceptions and opinions concerning roles and responsibilities in relation to fund raising through the foundation. Immediately prior to concluding the interview, each participant was asked if they had any comments or questions they wished to state.

All the participants were extremely supportive of this research and answered each question in great detail. When the transcripts were faxed to each participant, they returned the original with or without corrections within a matter of days.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This research study explored the scope and form of solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges during 1993-95. Eleven colleges (n=11) with foundations and ten colleges (n=10) without foundations provided useable data to work with Part A and Part B of this study.

Part A. This section includes responses to the mail survey by the colleges which fund raise through foundations and those colleges which fund raise without foundations.

Part B. This section includes data interpretation of the interviews conducted with five members of the Board of Directors of the three most successful colleges foundations. These interview responses by the President, the Executive Director, the Chairman of the Board, a faculty representative, the Member of the Board of Governors liaison to the Foundation Board and a Community Donor provide information concerning the organization and operational procedures of the three most successful foundations.

PART A RESPONSE TO THE MAILED SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This Section Refers to Ontario Colleges that use a Foundation to raise funds from the private sector

Question 1: *Colleges with Foundations*

In analysing the data from 11 colleges with foundations and using Mucklow's formula, the data appeared to break down into three sections.

Table 3 Colleges with Foundations

Group	College	FTE 1993-94	Assets \$ 1993-94	Success Rate \$
A	college C	10,866	1,386,866	127.63
	college R	11,145	1,083,000	102.55
	college K	12,578	1,194,651	94.97
B	college P	7483	642,122	85.81
	college O	5387	444,652	82.54
	college N	6233	485,436	77.88
	college L	22,780	1,718,423	75.44
	college Q	19,863	1,266,280	63.75
C	college M	27,347	837,220	30.61
	college A	26000	349,000	13.42
	college W	12,276	151,357	12.33

The first three college foundations in Group A appear to be much more successful than the average of Group B, the second highest group of college foundations per student FTE. Group B appears to be more successful foundations than the average of Group C, the third group of the college foundations per FTE.

Question 2: *What is the composition of staff employed to support the fund raising efforts by the college foundation?* The responses to this question by colleges with affiliated foundations is presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Foundation Staffing

Group	College	Full-time Exec. Director	Full-time Staff	Part-time Staff
A	college C	yes	yes	yes
	college R	yes	yes	yes
	college K	yes	yes	yes
B	college P	no	no	no
	college O	no	no	no
	college N	no	no	yes
	college L	yes	yes	yes
	college Q	no	no	yes
C	college M	yes	yes	no
	college A	no	no	no
	college W	yes	yes	yes

One hundred per cent (100%) of the college foundations in Group A employed full-time executive directors, as well as full-time and part-time staff to support the operations. Twenty per cent (20%) of the college foundations in Group B employed a full-time executive director, full-time staff and part-time staff. Sixty-six per cent (66%) employed a full-time director or full-time staff in Group C, while one college foundation did not employ any staff at the time of the survey.

Earlier research has established the need for a salaried designated development officer with the responsibility for directing the private fund raising efforts and translating the mission of the college to potential donors, Ottley (1978); Luck and Tolle (1978). "Foundations with a full-time executive director have been much more successful than those relying upon part-time leadership or the 'borrowed' time of a development officer also responsible for other duties such as grant writing, alumni affairs, and public relations" according to Woodbury (1989, p. 176). The pre-existing literature clearly shows the importance of having staff on a full-time basis to support the operations. It seems to be a key determinant of success. According to Ryan (1989), "to create the cooperation necessary to build communities, community college presidents and trustees will be looking for competent chief advancement officers," (p. 23). Research also indicates the importance of a member of staff being responsible to facilitate the relationships between the college and the external environment.

The results of the survey indicate that fifty-four decimal five percent (54.5%) of the colleges with foundations have full-time executive directors who report to the president

and the foundation board. McNamara (1989, p. 161) states that the need for the “chief development officer to report directly to the president and have the skills, ability, and professional background” is critical to that person being able to carry out their responsibilities. The importance of the chief development officer having previous experience has also been noted in research. The colleges with foundation directors indicated that just over one-half (58.3%) of the directors have had prior experience in fund raising.

Question 3: *How much time does the president of the college spend on fund raising?*

The response of colleges with affiliated foundations is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: President’s Time Devoted to Fund Raising

Group	College	Percentage of President’s Time Devoted to Fund Raising
A	College C	0-10%
	College R	0-10%
	College K	0-10%
B	College P	11-25%
	College O	0-10%
	College N	0-10%
	College L	0-10%
	College Q	11-25%
C	College M	11-25%
	College A	0-10%
	College W	0-10%

The foundations in Ontario appear to deem this particular element in their fund raising as less critical than the literature review indicated. Only three college presidents commit up to one-quarter of their time to fund raising. The other eight colleges with foundations indicated that fund raising by the president was not as great a commitment.

The research by Angel and Gares (1989) indicates, "the success or failure of private fund raising in a community college may not depend *solely* on the president, but he or she certainly is the pivot point around which an effective fund raising program turns" (p. 13). The need for presidential leadership was supported in the research by Ingram(1993); Janney(1994); Jenner(1986); Kopecek(1982); Levin(1993); Spangler(1994) and Walter(1993). In the study, "Effective Presidential Leadership In Fund-Raising: A Case Study of a Community College Foundation, Walter(1993) found the lack of success of the foundation was directly related to the lack of presidential leadership and involvement with fund raising at the institution where the case study was conducted. Whereas Schulze, (1991) argued that his research did not support the literature that presidential involvement was critical to the success of the fund raising efforts. Schulze was the only dissenting voice in the literature studied and therefore it appears that presidential commitment to fund raising is integral to the operation of a successful foundation. The importance of the president in fund raising has been stated repeatedly throughout the literature.

Question 4: *How long have the colleges had foundations responsible for fund raising and what is the level of involvement as determined by the number of board members and the length of the term that board members commit to the foundation?*

Table 6 **Level of Involvement by Community**

Group	College	Length of Term for Board Members	Number of Board Members	Date of Origin
A	college C	6 years	20	1983
	college R	3 years	22	1990
	college K	3 years	15	1991
B	college P	3 years	15	1994
	college O	2 years	18	1994
	college N	2 years	15	1995
	college L	5 years	5	1984
	college Q	5 years	12	1980
C	college M	open	10	1987
	college A	3 years	6	1995
	college W	3 years	16	1980

The level of involvement in this study was measured by the number of board directors and their length of term on the board. Other researchers such as Kopecek (1988),

Sharron (1978) and Hunter (1987) have determined there appears to be an optimal range of 18-35 board members, which results in organizational efficiency and effectiveness for a college foundation.

The response to question (A. 1) of the survey, concerning the length of the terms for board of directors, indicated that seventy-two point seven per cent (72.7%) of the board directors have terms of three years or longer.

Mucklow (1990) identified the length of time a foundation has been operating as being an important factor in determining the ultimate success of a foundation.

The survey results indicated that Ontario college foundations have existed from one year to 16 years. The colleges have only just recently established foundations as part of the college resource development system and the number of board members fall within the range of 5 to 22 board members with the length of time on the board being between 2 and 10 years.

Question 5: *What level of commitment in time and/or financial contribution does the college administration, faculty and support staff provide in supporting the fund raising activities of the foundation?* The responses of the colleges with affiliated foundations are found on table 7.

Table 7 Level of College Staff Represented on Foundation Board of Directors

Group	College	Administration	Faculty	Support Staff
A	College C	yes	yes	yes
	College R	yes	yes	no
	College K	yes	no	no
B	College P	yes	yes	yes
	College O	yes	yes	yes
	College N	yes	yes	yes
	College L	no	no	no
	College Q	no	no	no
C	College M	no	no	no
	College A	no	no	no
	College W	no	no	no

The importance of support from the internal college community including administrators, faculty and support staff is critical to the success of the fund raising endeavour according to Mucklow (1990). In Ontario, some colleges with foundations include their

faculty, support staff and college administration on the boards of the foundations representing their constituencies as members of the board of directors.

In group A, one hundred per cent (100%) of the foundations indicate that the college administration is represented on the board of directors, sixty-six per cent (66%) of the foundations indicate they have faculty members present on the board of directors and thirty-three per cent (33%) of the foundations have support staff on their board of directors. In group B, sixty per cent (60%) of the foundations have faculty members present on the board of directors and sixty per cent (60%) of the foundations have support staff on their board of directors. In group C, none of the colleges surveyed have internal college employees represented on their board of directors of the foundation.

According to Keener(1989), “the college staff and the community representatives are joined in tandem to achieve objectives. Thus, the staff members must not only perform effectively, they must also elicit participation from other college employees and community members.” (p. 154).

Question 6: *What percentage of the college staff, particularly faculty and support staff, are involved with the fund raising efforts of the foundation?* The responses of the colleges with affiliated foundations are shown on Table 8.

Table 8 College Staff Involved with Fund Raising

Group	College	College Faculty and Staff involved with fund raising
A	College C	26-50%
	College R	11-25%
	College K	0-10%
B	College P	0-10%
	College O	11-25%
	College N	0-10%
	College L	0-10%
	College Q	0-10%
C	College M	0-10%
	College A	0-10%
	College W	0-10%

In group A, one college indicated up to one-half of their employees supported the fund raising efforts of their college foundation through their time and financial contributions. One college indicated up to one-quarter (25%) of their college employees supported the fund raising, while the third college indicated up to 10 per cent (10%) of their employees supported the college foundation. In group B, one college indicated up to one-quarter (25%) of their employees support the fund raising of the foundation while the other four colleges (80%) indicated up to 10 per cent of their employees supported the college foundation. In group C, all the colleges indicated up to 10 per cent (10%) of their college employees supported fund raising through the college foundation.

Question 7: *Where does the college allocate their funds that they have raised? Toward capital projects and/or scholarship programs?* Table 9 indicates responses by colleges with affiliated foundations. In group A, one hundred per cent (100%) of the colleges raise funds for scholarships and for capital projects. In group B, sixty per cent (60%) raise funds for scholarships and forty per cent (40%) raise funds for capital projects. In group C, thirty-three per cent (33%) provide funds for scholarships, while the other colleges either did not provide any data or did not raise funds for scholarships or capital projects.

Table 9 Resource Allocation from Fund Raising

Group	College	Capital Campaigns	Scholarship Campaigns
A	College C	yes	yes
	College R	yes	yes
	College K	yes	yes
B	College P	yes	yes
	College O	no	yes
	College N	no	yes
	College L	yes	no
	College Q	no	no
C	College M	no	no
	College A	no data	no data
	College W	no	yes

Question 8: *Do college foundations have a formalized program to acknowledge their donors?* Donor recognition is understood by foundations to be formal recognition of donor gifts. It may be in the form of public media acknowledgement, tangible items or personal recognition by an authority figure. Table 10 shows responses from colleges with affiliated foundations.

Table 10 **Recognition of Donors**

Group	College	Donor Recognition Program
A	College-C	yes
	College-R	yes
	College-K	yes
B	College-P	yes
	College-O	no
	College-N	no
	College-L	no
	College-Q	no
C	College-M	no
	College-A	no
	College-W	no

In group A, one hundred per cent (100%) of the college foundations have established a formalized program to recognize their donors. In group B, twenty per cent (20%) of the college foundations have a program established to recognize their donors. The remaining eighty per cent (80%) of the group B college foundations do not have a formal donor recognition program. In group C, none of the college foundations have established a donor recognition program.

Question 9: *Does the college foundation belong to the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education (the professional association in Canada) that would augment professional development for the staff and board of the foundation?* Responses of colleges with affiliated foundations are shown on Table 11.

Table 11 Foundation Affiliation with Professional Organization

Group	College	Affiliation
A	College-C	yes
	College-R	yes
	College-K	yes
B	College-P	yes
	College-O	no
	College-N	no
	College-L	no
	College-Q	yes
C	College-M	no
	College-A	no
	College-W	yes

In group A, one hundred per cent (100%) of the college foundations maintain a current membership in the Canadian Council for Advancement of Education. In group B, 40 per cent (40%) belongs to the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education. In group C, 33 per cent (33%) of the foundations maintain a current membership in the CCAE.

Question 10: *Does the college or the foundation have an alumni association and do the alumni receive regular communiques from the college foundation?*

Table 12 **Involvement of Alumni**

Group	College	Communication with Alumni	Alumni Association
A	College-C	yes	yes
	College-R	yes	yes
	College-K	yes	yes
B	College-P	yes	yes
	College-O	no	no
	College-N	no	no
	College-L	no	no
	College-Q	yes	yes
C	College-M	no	no
	College-A	no	no
	College-W	yes	yes

In group A, 100 per cent (100%) of the college foundations send communications in the form of newsletters or correspondence to their alumni and 100 per cent (100%) have

formal alumni associations. In group B, 40 per cent (40%) send communications to their alumni and 40 per cent (40%) have formalized alumni associations. In group C, 33 per cent (33%) send communications to their alumni and 33 per cent (33%) have formalized alumni associations.

PART A

Questionnaire Survey Results for Ontario Colleges that Raise Funds Without Affiliated Foundations

Question 11: *What is the scope and form of fund raising in Ontario colleges where form is defined as other?* The success rate of the 10 colleges that raise funds without affiliated foundations is presented in Table 13.

Table 13 **Ontario Colleges Which Raise Funds from the Private Sector
Without Established Foundations**

Group	College	FTE 1993-94 1994-95	Assets 1993-94 1994-95	Success Rate\$
A	College-G	11,126	2,375,571	213.52
	College-H	7517	850,000	113.07
	College-J	19,747	2,049,000	103.76
	College-Y	11,184	803,207	71.81
B	College-S	2043	100,000	50.17
	College-D	7309	161,674	22.12
	College-E	19,194	328,000	17.09
	College-V	24,137	285,855	11.84
	College-I	9,481	89,946	9.17
	College-U	29,952	231,610	7.73

In analysing the data from the ten colleges without foundations and using Mucklow's formula, the colleges appeared to break down into two groups. In group A, the colleges have the highest ratio of FTE to assets and appear to be much more successful than the average of Group B with fewer assets per FTE.

Question 12: *What is the composition in the form of numbers of staff employed to support the fund raising efforts by the college?*

Table 14 College Staffing Responsible for Fund Raising

Group	College	Full-time Staff	Part-time staff
A	College-G	yes	yes
	College-H	yes	yes
	College-J	yes	no
	College-Y	yes	yes
B	College-S	no	yes
	College-D	no	yes
	College-E	no	no
	College-V	yes	yes
	College-I	yes	no
	College-U	no	no

In group A, one hundred per cent (100%) of the colleges employ full-time staff for fund raising and only seventy five per cent (75%) have part-time staff responsible for fund

raising. In group B, thirty three per cent (33%) of the colleges employ either full-time staff to be responsible for fund raising, while fifty per cent (50%) employ part-time staff to be responsible for fund raising.

Question 13: *How much time does the president of the college spend on fund raising?*

Table 15 **President's Time Devoted to Fund Raising**

Group	College	Percentage of President's Time Devoted to Fund Raising
A	College-G	11-25%
	College-H	11-25%
	College-J	0-10%
	College-Y	0-10%
B	College -S	0-10%
	College-D	0-10%
	College-E	11-25%
	College-V	0-10%
	College-I	0-10%
	College -U	11-25%

In group A, fifty per cent (50%) of the college presidents spent up to one-quarter of their time in raising funds. In group B, one third (33.3%) of the presidents spent up to one-quarter of their time on raising funds, while two thirds (66.6%) of the presidents spend up to ten per cent of their time on raising funds.

Question 14: *What percentage of the college employees, either administrators or faculty, of the college, contributed to/or worked with the fund raising activities of the college?*

Table 16 **College Staff Committed to Fund Raising**

Group	College	% of Administrators	% of Faculty
A	College-G	26-50%	11-25%
	College-H	26-50%	26-50%
	College-J	0-10%	0-10%
	College-Y	11-25%	0-10%
B	College-S	0-10%	0-10%
	College-D	0-10%	0-10%
	College-E	26-50%	11-25%
	College-V	0-10%	0-10%
	College-I	0-10%	0-10%
	College-U	0-10%	0-10%

The involvement of the internal college community is important to the college fund raising endeavours as outlined in the research by Keener (1989) when he stated,

The college staff and the community representatives are joined in tandem to achieve objectives. Thus, the staff members not only perform effectively, they must also elicit participation from other college employees and community members (p. 154).

In group A, two of the colleges have one-half contributions made by their administrators. In group A, the contribution of time and/or finances by faculty to fund raising varied, with one of the colleges having a 50 % contribution, another with a 25 % maximum contribution, and the other two with only up to 10% of the faculty contributing.

In Group B, one college has up to one-half of their administrators contributing time or finances to the fund raising. The other colleges show that administrators contribute only up to ten per cent. The faculty in five of the colleges contribute to fund raising and one college indicated that up to one-quarter of their faculty contribute to fund raising.

Question 15: *How does the college use the funds raised by the fund raising programs from the private sector?*

Table 17 **Allocation of Revenues Received**

Group	College	Capital Campaign	Scholarship Campaign
A	College-G	yes	yes
	College-H	yes	yes
	College-J	no	yes
	College-Y	yes	yes
B	College-S	no	yes
	College-D	no	yes
	College-E	no	yes
	College-V	no	yes
	College-I	no	yes
	College-U	no	yes

In group A, seventy five per cent (75%) of the colleges have raised funds for capital projects, while one hundred per cent (100%) of the colleges raise funds for scholarships. In group B, none of the colleges raised funds for capital projects while one hundred per cent (100%) of the colleges raise funds for scholarships.

Question 16: *Does the college have a formal recognition program to honour their donors?*

Table 18 Donor Recognition Programs

Group	College	Donor Recognition Program
A	College-G	yes
	College-H	yes
	College-J	yes
	College-Y	yes
B	College-S	yes
	College-D	yes
	College-E	yes
	College-V	yes
	College-I	yes
	College U	yes

Donor recognition is considered to be an important component of fund raising. The colleges appear to understand the significance of this component of the fund raising program as one hundred per cent (100%) have a donor recognition program.

Question 17: *Does the college belong to a professional association?***Table 19** **Involvement by the College with the Canadian Council
for the Advancement of Education**

Group	College	Professional Affiliation
A	College-G	yes
	College-H	no
	College-J	yes
	College-Y	yes
B	College-S	no
	College-D	no
	College-E	no
	College-V	yes
	College-I	yes
	College-U	yes

In Canada, the professional association that provides professional development in the fund raising field for post secondary education is the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education (CCAEE). The information gained by belonging to a professional association may indicate the commitment of the college to professional develop-

ment of the individual employee by encouraging their employees to become involved with their professional association.

The association with a professional development organization appears to be considered important to the colleges with seventy-five percent (75%) of the Group A colleges supporting such an initiative. The information gained by involvement with a professional association may or may not be beneficial depending on the level of commitment that the college exhibits and encourages as the individuals strive to achieve the follow up from the professional training and staff development programs.

Question 18: *Does the college have an alumni association and does the alumni receive regular communiques from the college?*

The importance of having an alumni association affiliated with the college and regular communications with them is obvious from Table 20 with a one hundred per cent (100%) affirmative response to both of these questions in the survey. The alumni has been traditionally seen to be a major underpinning to any kind of fund raising program by a post-secondary institution. Ontario colleges are not the exception according to this survey. The development of the alumni is still a long way from achieving the status of alumni involvement with both the college and the fund raising endeavours as seen by American colleges of similar size.

Table 20 Involvement of the Alumni

Group	College	Alumni Association	Regular Communique with Alumni
A	College-G	yes	yes
	College-H	yes	yes
	College-J	yes	yes
	College-Y	yes	yes
B	College-S	yes	yes
	College-D	yes	yes
	College-E	yes	yes
	College-V	yes	yes
	College-I	yes	yes
	College-U	yes	yes

PART B

RESPONSE TO THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Restatement of the Problem: Part B

The second part of this study investigated, through an interview process, the three Ontario college foundations that are most successful and their characteristics in terms of:

1. The nature and the extent of involvement with the foundation by the president of the college
2. The nature and the extent of involvement with the foundation by the board of directors as represented by the chairman of the foundation board
3. The nature and the extent of the involvement with the foundation by the faculty member of the board
4. The level of collaboration and communication with the college board of governors and the board of directors of the foundation as outlined by the board member representing both governing bodies
5. The role and responsibilities of the executive director of the foundation
6. The level of familiarity by the community with the foundation and the community view of the importance of the foundation.

Population

For purposes of this study, the researcher interviewed 18 persons who represented specific positions identified by the research as those who are responsible for the organi-

zation and operation of successful foundations affiliated with community colleges in Ontario. The specific positions that were identified for an interview were:

- the president of the college
- the chair of the board of directors of the foundation
- the executive director of the foundation
- the foundation board member liaison with the board of governors of the college
- the faculty member on the board of directors of the foundation
- the community donor

Of the three college foundations chosen as successful according to the criteria of **Mucklow's (1990) formula** research:

$$\text{SUCCESS} = \frac{\text{Average total new yearly assets (1993-95)}}{\text{Average FTE Count (1993-95)}}$$

THE SPECIFIC FOUNDATIONS STUDIED

The three college foundations were each located in different parts of the province of Ontario. College R was in the most southerly part of the province, College C in the mid-northerly part of the province and College K was at the mid-point of the province geographically. Each college was considered a mid-size college in the ACAATO structure. Each foundation has a full Board of Directors; has been operating for more than five years; each has a full-time executive director; full-time staff; have or are currently staging successful capital campaigns; have administration and faculty on their board of directors;

and have alumni associations and regularly communicate with their alumni. These foundations are all affiliated with the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education.

The three foundations selected for further research were analysed according to the criteria used by other researchers. The interviews were conducted based on questions similar to those used in Warnick's (1990) research. All three colleges studied were considered mid-size colleges (approximately 7000 students) in the Ontario college system. Each of these three colleges was established in 1965 when the Ontario government created community colleges in Ontario. Each foundation was established independent of the other colleges and each in a rather unique way.

Of the three college foundations studied, College C was one of the oldest of the college foundations. College C with an enrolment of 6500 students serves a vast geographic area in the mid-point of Ontario. It has one main campus and six satellite campus sites throughout the region. College C serves a regional population of 250,000 with a variety of programs, but this College is particularly known for the programs that support the mining industry which is the main economic base of the region. There is a close relationship between the College and the community it serves, through programs and services which compliment the needs of the community. The College foundation is actually housed in a facility completely separate from the main campus in a building which was given to the College by the largest mining corporation in the community. The founding Chairman of the Board of Governors of the College was one of the corporate leaders in the mining industry. This person then became the founding Chairman of the

Board of Directors for the College Foundation which was created in 1983. The partnership between this industry leader and the College was ultimately instrumental in the success of the Foundation. He was the original Chairman of the College Board of Governors, and he then became the Chairman of the Foundation Board of Directors. He also served as the Chairman of the first capital campaign conducted by the Foundation. Following the first successful capital campaign, a man who was equally connected to the major mining company, but as leader of the union at the mining corporation, then became the chairman of the second capital campaign conducted by the Foundation. This relationship between the College Foundation and the mining company and its union was seen by the community as an endorsement of the importance of the Foundation. A large segment of the population of the community was involved with the corporation as employees, suppliers, and professional support and therefore the support shown for the College and the Foundation had credibility in the minds of the general population. The success of College C Foundation was not only built on a strong liaison with industry but it was also the result of the operational structure of the Foundation Board itself. The President of College C and the original Chairman of the Board of the Foundation had formed the partnership to create the Foundation originally. This relationship between these two leaders was based on mutual respect and commitment to the task. This partnership between these two leaders was instrumental in forming a board of directors for the Foundation which represented a cross section of community leaders which ultimately created a circle of very influential community friends for the Foundation. The fifteen Members of the Board of Directors of the Foundation committed a significant amount of time to the Foundation

Board, with most members having had more than thirteen years experience on the Foundation Board of Directors. This level of commitment created an environment of strength, continuity and experience which was instrumental in the success of this foundation according to the President of College C.

The staff of College C became very involved with the Foundation, particularly in the second capital campaign which aimed to assist students with special needs. The faculty in particular saw this initiative as the kind of support that would allow the faculty to assist these students through specialized equipment and facilities, and which in the past had not been available. Another factor in the success of the foundation was that of the Foundation staff. The staff of the Foundation had the experience, background and involvement with the community which augmented the resources of the Board of Directors in facilitating a strong operational direction for the Foundation. Regular communications between the President of College C, the Executive Director and the Chairman of the Board of the Foundation, enabled the Foundation to maintain a focus on the mission of supporting College C.

College R is located in the southern-most tip of the province of Ontario. It is located in the so-called “banana belt” where the fruit and tourism industries are very strong. The College serves a population base of approximately 200,000 with an enrolment at the College of just over 7,500 students. The College is recognized for its’ strong business, hospitality and tourism programs, radio and television broadcasting, along with many

retraining and trades oriented programs that serve the automotive, abrasive industrial and technology sectors within that geographic region of the Province.

Originally, College R was perceived to be one of the leading colleges in the province. However, when the founding president retired, the incoming president did not maintain this reputation. The image of the college lost credibility in the minds of the public due to what was perceived as lack of leadership. With the appointment of this president's replacement in 1989, the growth of the college and its image in the community surged ahead. This new president brought leadership and established quality programs, which created a new image and improved relationships with the community. The President and the Executive Director of the foundation established partnerships with the private sector. This President, along with the Board of Governors of the College, established a College Foundation to recapture former "friends" of the college and initiate a major fund raising endeavour.

The Foundation was established in 1990 and the acquisition of an experienced and knowledgeable Executive Director assisted in facilitating the establishment of the foundation. The Members chosen for the Board of Directors of the Foundation, many of whom had been previously on the Board of Governors of the College, were very committed to recapturing their previous image and established reputation. The Members of the Board of Directors worked closely with the President of the College, the Chairman of the Board of Directors, a well known business leader in the community, and the Executive Director

of the Foundation, whose experience and expertise, accelerated their acquisition of knowledge as to the roles and responsibilities of the Board Members.

Although the Foundation did not have the history of some, the enthusiasm of both the President of the College, and the Executive Director of the Foundation, coupled with the drive and determination of the Chairman of the Board of Directors saw the growth and achievements by the Foundation which spoke highly of the commitment of these individuals. The other Members of the Board of Directors also committed their time, energy and contacts to making the goals and objectives of the Foundation a success. Although at the time of this study, the Board was frustrated with the reneging of their partnership with the Provincial Government, the focus on the task was still very strong at the time of the interviews with the Members of the Board of Directors. The College R Foundation was considered a successful operation that continues to grow and develop.

College K, is situated just north of the largest major metropolitan area in the province and has a population base of approximately 150,000 people. The economic base of the community has a mix of tourism, automotive production, small manufacturing, farming and small to medium size professional and technology companies. Related to these companies, the College, with an enrolment of 7200, has established an excellent reputation for programs and services geared to the auto industry which is one of the largest employers in the area. The College also provided unique programs related to the tourism sector. The College is considered only a mid-size college in the provincial system.

However, it became well-known because the previous president, who was rather flamboyant, became widely recognized for being assertive when it came to developing relationships with the private sector.

Prior to the Foundation being created, this president had developed an involvement with the automobile industry across the country. This collaboration ultimately resulted in the creation of the Canadian Automotive Institute, in which automobile dealers across the country resourced the operations of the institute and funded scholarships and awards that supported their industry through training and development.

College K's Foundation had only been established six years prior to this study. The Foundation's predecessor was a development office directed by an experienced and well-organized person who reported to the President of College K. This Development Office had an advisory committee which, with the recommendation of the Development Director and the President, decided to form a Foundation. This was the turning point in the view of the President, and the Development Director, in creating a viable, and well-connected operation which could provide much needed financial support for the College. The Chairman of the Board of Directors, although not having previously been on the Board of Governors of the College, was a retired banker and gave a great deal of his time to furthering the goals of the Foundation. On the Board of the Foundation, the two past Chairpersons of the Board of Governors of the College both have a strong commitment to the College. Their participation, along with the commitment of the Chairman of the

Foundation Board, the strong support of the President, and the knowledgeable and well managed operations of the Foundation under the direction of the Executive Director, allowed a relationship to develop with the Board of the College. This relationship accelerated a recognition of the Foundation's importance to the College. As well, the current Chair of the Board of Governors of the College was previously a member of the Board of Directors of the Foundation. While the Foundation had not been in operation for a long period of time, a strong bond with the community formed in large part thanks to the support from these aforementioned persons, as well as from "friends" of the College through the Canadian Automotive Institute, and those involved in the previous Development Office initiatives. This strong bond with the community has assisted this Foundation to grow and develop into a very successful operation. Managing the investments worth over one million dollars from the previous funding initiatives became one of the priorities for the Board of Directors of the Foundation. Fifteen members of the Board of Directors of the Foundation, many of whom were involved from the outset, account for a major part of the creation of the Foundation. They worked hard to make the Foundation's envisaged goals and objectives development become a reality. At the time of the study, the Chairman, the President of the College, and the community donor who was a Past College Board Chair and currently involved with the solicitation for the capital campaign, all shared with the researcher their frustration in not being able to complete part of the capital campaign initiative. Despite the short existence of this Foundation, an involvement of major community leaders, a solidly committed President and an Executive Director with commitment helped spur the exceptional growth rate of their Foundation.

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS POSED IN THE STUDY OF SUCCESSFUL COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATIONS IN ONTARIO

This section provides an analysis to responses of the interview questions (found in Appendix I). Fourteen general questions were asked of each person interviewed with the exception of the community donor. The answers given by the interviewees have been used to compare and contrast similarities and differences to the American college foundations as outlined by research conducted in the United States.

SECTION I - PART i

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Question one - President:

As President, how do you view your role with the foundation and its fund raising activities?

All three Presidents felt they were providing leadership by articulating the college mission, acting as motivators and communicators, and building and maintaining ties with both College and external communities. The Presidents each understood the importance of cultivating prospective donors and were personally involved in solicitation.

Examples of comments made by Presidents citing how they saw their role with the foundation.

I think my role is to support the Executive Director's work and to keep the Foundation Board aware of what the College is trying to do and clarify the college's ongoing needs. I also try to act as a bit of a cheerleader to encourage board members to continue to commit their time and to be involved with us.

I worked to assist the board in whatever manner I could. I worked with the executive director to stimulate the interests of the board members and to facilitate the role of the executive director whenever possible. I made sure the foundation had what it needed in terms of staff and I went with the executive director to meet all the business leaders long before we considered starting fund raising.

Question two - President:

Your Community College Foundation is one of the leaders in the province, in terms of successful fund raising. Why do you think it has been successful?

What are the secrets to the success of your foundation?

Each President spoke of the importance of key people involved with the Foundation. One President spoke of the significance of the first Chairman of the Board of Directors. This person was a major corporate leader and in turn provided strength, knowledge and wisdom in establishing the Board for the Foundation. Other Presidents spoke of the importance of choosing the right Executive Director to provide guidance and leadership in establishing a strong direction for the foundation. The Presidents also spoke of strong and committed Board Members; enthusiastic and well-organized staff; the position

of the college in the community; and the care and planning that went into the strategic planning for a successful campaign. The successful campaign profiled the Foundation and the College in the minds of the community and reinforced the role played by the Board, the Presidents and the Staff.

These are a few examples of comments made by Presidents concerning the reason for the Foundation success:

We were one of the first to take the role of the Foundation seriously . . to market the institution [meaning the college] through the Foundation. It is successful because the initial Board Members including the Chairman were from the College Board of Governors . . . the Chair of the Foundation Board and all the other members were very successful business leaders . . . they took the mandate seriously and that carried through.

Our success was partly as a result of choosing the right Executive Director. He went out there and sold the community on the College. We had some fences to mend and he went out there and got involved in the community and [was] able to tell the story and friend raise. When we needed them, they were there for us.

First, a lot of the credit has to go to the Executive Director for providing the leadership and the organizational support to the various activities with her energy and her enthusiasm. Those are certainly factors contributing to our success. Also we're in a situation in our catchment area where we are the only post-secondary institution in the community . . . We're viewed as a very important community resource . . . As well there are a number of very committed individuals who have been on board with the foundation since it started.

Question three- President:

Please give me examples of an important difference at the College brought about through Foundation support?

All three Presidents felt the foundation provided a vehicle for the major corporate and community leaders to become aware of and involved with the needs of the College. The Foundation was able to profile the significant opportunities for the college to develop and consequently create economic and cultural spin-offs to the community that would not have existed otherwise. This is exemplified in some comments made by the Presidents:

The profile of the college has been greatly enhanced by the activities and fund raising by the foundation . . . the support to build the (complex) and the support for student financial assistance through scholarships and bursaries . . . We couldn't have a fitness centre without the foundation . . . It has made a major difference to the college.

The heightened awareness among the influential people in the community about the needs of the college. The fact that we are an important resource in the community . . . Something that is overstated, but it's true, fund raising is a very important part of fund raising. Getting people involved spins off, not just giving of money but becomes vitally important in supporting the institution in other ways, whether it's jobs for graduates or in our case a lot of cooperative placements for students, involvement in curriculum, involvement in advisory committees . . . You certainly become more aware of the strong feelings that the community has towards the College and that is very gratifying.

The importance of knowing the movers and shakers cannot be emphasized too much. They not only are the decision makers in the private sector, they reach far into the government sources that make the decisions. The

Foundation gave us a vehicle to have these key players involved with us in a way that was not happening otherwise.

Question four- President:

How do you go about getting donations? Do you meet personally with prospective donors?

All three Presidents contributed as major donors to their campaigns. They each felt that the Board Members should make appropriate financial contributions according to their ability to give and they each felt that the staff should also give within their financial ability to contribute. Two of the three Presidents felt very strongly about the importance of cultivation, solicitation, and recognition of donors and both were personally involved with fund raising requests. The third President spoke about the experience he was gaining in solicitation. His predecessor was quite “good at it” and was known for his ability to gain entry into the wallets of friends and associates. This president was “feeling more comfortable at it” although he did not do a great deal as yet. He commented:

I feel more comfortable with it as we go along to a large degree partly because of those Volunteers we spoke about and also because of the preparatory work that the Executive Director does before we go in to do the ask.

Similarly the other Presidents spoke of the preparation done by three Executive Director. One commented:

I rely on the Executive Director to determine the participants . . . who I should be involved with . . . what would be most advantageous . . . the

Executive Director has to determine who is best to approach and how they should be approached.

Question five- President:

In what way are you involved with Foundation planning and goal setting?

Each President responded in a similar manner stating they were, as any other Board Member, involved with the planning and goal setting. At that level they are involved with Board Members as colleagues and they provide advice from time to time to the Executive Director of the Foundation. Comments from the Presidents indicated:

I try to do it in such a way as it's a contribution to those discussions (at the Board) instead of trying to take over the discussion. I am very interested in the planning and goal setting but I don't interfere on a daily basis. I work with the Board and the Executive Director on that.

Question six - President:

Please explain two or three major activities carried out by the Foundation and, of these, which do you consider to be the most successful?

One Foundation had successfully completed a major capital campaign that provided a much needed complex to be built on the main campus. At the time of the interview, the Foundation was involved in a second major capital campaign to build a centre of excellence for students with special needs. The other successful endeavours of the foundation included restoring and renovating a major complex which housed the College busi-

ness enterprise centre and owning a fitness complex. The student financial assistance program was well endowed and provided timely and needed resources to students faced with financial burdens or provided a resource to recognize exceptional talent. The President could only relate one area of nonachievement - the annual giving campaign was not successful. The second President outlined the goals for a major capital campaign that was currently underway at his college. However, this campaign was faced with uncertainty as it was being conducted in partnership with the Provincial Government. At the time of the interview, it was not clear whether the monies that had been approved for the government's portion of the partnership were in fact a reality. (Unlike the United States, where the citizens vote on debentures to fund capital projects, the Canadian system allows politicians to allocate resources to fund capital projects but if the government in power is defeated in an election, the funds allocated may or may not remain designated for that project. This was the case with both other colleges who had partnered with the provincial government to fund a portion of the capital for the project to be completed). One president commented:

We've had some rocky moments in the capital campaign because we built around a partnership with the government and we haven't been able to get the government to commit the capital that they had committed to it a couple of years ago, so we've had a slow start.

However, this President did state that their first capital campaign, in partnership with the automobile industry, had been very successful. He felt that the foundation had played a major role in the success of that campaign. The third College, which was involved in partnership with the Provincial Government in a campaign, also expressed

frustration after having attained significant commitment and resources from the private sector, it had to be “put on hold” until they received a positive indication from the provincial government that their project was a “go ahead”. In the meantime, they were trying to maintain the support that they had received and plan for the next phase of their campaign with or without government support. If the government did not honour its commitment, the College would have to scale down their planned complex. The government’s reneging was felt to be a backward step by both colleges because they had received matching commitments necessary from the private sector and now this matched agreement could be null and void.

The area that each of these two presidents identified as unsuccessful was support from the internal college community. As they commented:

I don't think we've been able to get as much internal support as we would like. The faculty in particular have not been strong in their giving, they are not known to be supporters or givers normally. We have not made a lot of headway there. Support staff and junior administrative people tend to make contributions far more than faculty.

Question seven - President:

Are there any activities outside of those mentioned that had not been that successful?

The President of College C explained that there were:

...probably a number of things that the foundation thought they would try but that haven't worked out...an annual giving plan you know the traditional annual giving plan that may have been tried but that doesn't fit our environmental culture, and therefore yes, we have been extremely successful but not everything has been what one would consider complete.

While the other two Presidents each related their feelings of frustration with the uncertainty of the partnerships with the provincial government in their quest for successful capital campaigns. At the time of the interview, it was not clear whether the monies that had been approved for the Government's portion of each of the partnerships were in fact a reality. The areas that each of these two President felt were not successful, was in the area of support from the internal college community.

Question eight - President:

Did you make a personal monetary contribution to the Foundation?

All three Presidents were major contributors to the Foundation campaigns. The Presidents also felt that the process of solicitations was extremely important, not just for the financial contributions that it generated but even more important was the act of giving and the symbolism that it created. They each felt that the Board Members should make appropriate financial contributions according to their ability to give and they each felt that the staff should also give within their financial ability to contribute. Two of the three Presidents felt very strongly about the importance of cultivation, solicitation, and recognition of donors and both were personally involved with fund raising requests. The third President spoke about the experience he was gaining in solicitation.

I feel more comfortable with it as we go along to a large degree partly because of those volunteers we spoke about and also because of the preparatory work that the Executive Director does before we go in to do the ask. President College K

Question nine - President:

Has there been a turning point in the growth and development of the Foundation, and how would you explain that?

All three Presidents felt there was a definite turning point to development of their Foundation but each one indicated that the reason for the turning point was different. One President felt that the turning point came when the Foundation was actually formalized. Prior to that time, the Board was an advisory board to the College and although they played a pivotal role in the campaign that was achieved in partnership with the automobile industry. When the foundation became a legal entity, the president stated that:

...when the current chairman took over the chair, things got re-energized. So I think that's been a factor, as he is held in very high regard by the rest of the Board . . . the enthusiasm that was part of the first Board waned a little but things got turned around with the change in the Board Chair and brought some new life into things.

In another case, the president felt that the creation of the foundation and the hiring of the executive director were the key factors in realizing the potential of the fund raising and public relations endeavours.

As one President stated:

Hiring...with his knowledge and experience, as well as his ability to communicate our goals to the community, was instrumental in creating a better image for our college and turning around an extremely negative situation into a winner.

Whereas in another case, the President felt it was the establishment of a major fund

raising campaign that gave us the larger community profile and forced a serious commitment that was not present before that.

Question ten - President:

Since your involvement with the Foundation, in what way, if any, have your views changed about the importance of a foundation to a community college?

Each president had different experiences which resulted in initially divergent views of the importance of a Foundation. In one President's experience, his view of a Foundation was formulated very early on in his career when he had the chance to visit California on a professional visit as the President of a small college in Alberta. He felt that the Foundations he saw in operation in California allowed the college to become more self-reliant.

His comments were:

I have been a public servant all my life, the first 10 years were in government service, therefore I understand how government works. I understand the vagaries and changes in political parties and the commitment of senior civil servants. Therefore I realized for a community college, which is an arms length crown corporation, . . . it should not be totally dependent on government grants and the only way that could take place is to have an arms length foundation.

Another President did not have that background and experience. Instead, as he stated:

I think that my views have changed remarkably around the value of the Foundation beyond the actual dollars that are given, by the support and

the networking provided through the community and the opportunities that provides beyond just the opportunities for giving. So, again, the friend-raising and the connection that can be made into the community. The Board of Governors does that as well so it's like having a two tiered group of influential people who are advocating for you in a variety of ways. My views have broadened as to what the Foundation can provide. Originally I thought it would just provide tangible physical resources to us . . . but it's the other dimensions I had underestimated.

The third president knew the value of foundations and once he became President of the College he went about creating the Foundation. The President felt that importance of having the private sector committed to your College is without question a key element. According to this President, the Foundation is the vehicle to make that happen because without it you are at the whim of the government. The Board Members are an integral part of “telling our story” whether it is in the boardroom of the corporations or the boardroom of Management Board of Cabinet. (The lead government committee provincially).

Question eleven- President:

What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the Foundation?

The Presidents felt quite differently about the barriers to achieving greater goals. One President spoke about the uncertainty that exists in society today and talked about the rash of fund raising going on to alleviate the dramatic downsizing in government grants. Whereas another President thought the major barrier was in government itself. The government entered into a partnership with the college and then withdrew their support of the partnership. This left the Foundation Board of Directors with commitments to the

private sector and resulted in a major problem for the Foundation. The third President felt it was a problem with government but from the vantage point that he felt the government did not understand the role and function of a Foundation.

When the government had resources, it wanted to control the Colleges to the point of not supporting the goals of the Foundations. Whereas as soon as the government was short of money, it turned to the Foundations and said "Oh the Foundation should give us the money". So an understanding of how Foundations function and how long it takes to raise money is probably a systemic problem, because they feel if you can raise money for this you should be able to raise money for that. They don't understand how a Foundation works.

SECTION I - PART ii
QUESTIONS SPECIFIC TO THE PRESIDENTS

Question one - President:

How would you describe the importance of your involvement with the Foundation in relation to your other duties?

All three Presidents spoke of the importance of their involvement with the Foundation, but each of them admitted that they do not give it enough time. One President indicated that there should be a balance between each aspect of his job because each aspect was extremely important and one did not weigh any greater than the other. Another President recognized that he did not give the Foundation the time and attention he would like to because of the other challenges of his position. He also indicated, however, that he would feel more confident with more training and experience. The third President enjoyed his involvement with the private sector but he too realized that he would have to give it more of his time. One President commented:

The shifting role of the CEO is more toward fund raising and friend raising than some of the other things. I suspect that is not going to change. I'm not sure that all of us are as well prepared for that, either through experience or development. I feel I could use more training and more development. Most presidents don't have a huge amount of training in requesting and nurturing donors. I would suspect we could all use more training.

Question two - President:

To what degree does the College operational budget support the Foundation's operations and what is the rationale for these decisions?

Sources of operational budgets for the foundations varied. One Foundation operates on funds generated from its own resources. This Foundation, through its acquisition of a fitness centre and a large office and classroom complex, has provided the College with assets that could not have been acquired otherwise. These operations generate revenue for the foundation to operate. Another Foundation received funding generated by an annual student levy, while the third operated on partial support from the College but this was shifting substantially to a self-funding operation. Foundations require "seed" funding to become operational. This last Foundation was in the process of shifting to their own operating resources. As the President commented:

We have been shifting a little and the justification for that is that it makes the foundation feel they are more in control, but also to alleviate criticism from other parts of the college. This is also part of the rationale for shifting the responsibility to the foundation for their own operating budget.

Question three - President:

What is the relationship between the College's Board Members and the Foundation?

Each President believed their College Board of Governors were fairly knowledgeable about the activities of the foundation. None thought they were so good they did not need improvement. However, they felt that the Board was aware of the goals of the

Foundation and formally approved each of the major fund raising goals. The Member of the Board of Governors that sits on the Foundation Board of Directors provides the awareness and overall understanding of what the foundation is striving to achieve.

One President stated:

Your question has made me think about that. I'm not sure that all Board Members are as knowledgeable about the foundation as they should be. Some are. There's a few - the Chairman of the Board of Governors happens to have been the liaison to the Foundation before. I think we could do some more work there. I think we could gain synergistic momentum if we worked more closely together.

Question four - President

What is the relationship between Faculty and the Foundation?

All three Presidents indicated that the Faculty are only somewhat aware and supportive of the foundation. Having a Faculty Member on the Board of the Foundation encourages a certain amount of support and recognition. Some Faculty work with and utilize the Foundation for their own benefit and the benefit of those in their department. Others, it seems, are not aware or seem not to care to know about the Foundation. The Faculty of one College became much more involved in the Foundation following an initial highly successful capital campaign. Two of the Presidents perceived that the Faculty probably would know more if they had a specific reason to be aware of it. The presidents also believed faculty should not be expected to know about the foundation and its function unless it were something important enough to individually become aware of it.

While another President stated:

I think they are generally knowledgeable but I'm not sure how supportive. Just generally because of the nature of faculty, they tend to be a little sceptical. Academics are supposed to be a bit sceptical.

Question five - President:

To what extent are Boards of Directors of the Foundation involved with Foundation goals and activities?

All three Presidents felt the Board Members of the Foundations were quite involved with the goal setting and implementation of the activities undertaken by the foundations. Some members are more involved than others, but for the most part, Board Members were very active with the foundation.

As one President stated:

They help set the goals at the board level, and some Board Members are involved in the activities and some are not. It depends on the particular skills and activities at the time. We try to involve them as they want to be involved.

Question six - President:

How do you view the role of College public relations to the foundation's fund raising goals and activities?

All three Presidents were very enthusiastic about the role that the Foundation has played in the public relations for the College. In one case it helped turn around a rather

ugly reputation gained by the College over a period of time. In another case, the profile of the Foundation was extremely strong in the community, and it helped heighten community awareness for the college. In the third case, the foundation generated a level of involvement and recognition that will help provide for the college in the years to come.

One President stated:

It is the envy of the University. The Foundation's activities have enhanced the public image of the college. The fund raising activities tend to be very positive and widen our reputation.

Question seven - President:

What is your vision for the Foundation?

Each President said their Foundation would continue to grow and develop. They each felt it would broaden even more significantly in terms of developing greater liaisons with business and power brokers. One President felt that some of the operations of the College would be turned over to the Foundation, while another felt that the role of the Foundation would become a more significant player in developing partnerships with the private sector. One President stated:

I know it will become another part of the College that shows leadership and vision and growth for the future. We're moving in that direction. We're young and we're new at it. You need to be patient with it and not expect more than they can do, to have things come along too quickly. You have to spend time at it.

SECTION II - PART i**ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH THE
CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS****Question one - Chair:**

As Chair of the Board of Directors, how do you view your role with the Foundation and its fund raising activities?

All three Chairpersons saw their role as one of leadership. One Chair felt it was his responsibility to shape the attitude and act as a motivator to the Board. Another Chairman felt his role was providing leadership and acting as a link between the college, the president and the aims and objectives of the Foundation Board. A third chairman viewed his role as one of planning and providing strong support to the Staff, recruiting good Board representation, making fund raising calls, and “showing the flag” on behalf of the College and the Board.

Question two - Chair:

Your Community College Foundation is one of the leaders in the province in terms of successful fund raising. Why do you think it has been successful?

The first Chairperson felt the foundation had attained success because of the president’s leadership, the Executive Director’s organizational skills, and Members of the Board of Directors’ commitment.

This chair felt:

The secret to the success of the Foundation is choosing projects that are real needs and communicating that need in a very real way to a giving community.

The Chairperson of the Board of the second foundation attributed their success to the extremely well-placed Board Members, the Executive Director's leadership which kept the Board organized and well informed. Furthermore, the foundation received strong support from the college and the community.

The third Chairperson spoke of their success in terms of staging a capital campaign. They had set their goal, proceeded in segments, and exceeded their objective by over one million dollars. Aside from their capital campaign, however, the Chairman felt the Foundation had not actually achieved success in his eyes. The Chairman felt the Foundation qualified as successful simply because they were an "early starter". It is notable that this was only his perception and not that of the other Members of the Foundation Board of Directors. This Chairperson believed that the success they had achieved to date resulted from the work they had done on putting their policies and procedures in place. This chair stated:

The policies and procedures manage the endowments for scholarships and bursaries, which is over one million dollars in our case and to do that we must have not only a finance and investment committee, we have to have investment policies in place such that people feel comfortable their contributions are well managed.

He stated that the:

The CEO of the Foundation we hired is not inexpensive by Canadian standards. If we were not in a campaign mode I'm not sure the board could justify the salary structure in place.

He felt that the staffing costs were very high for what they had accomplished.

Question three - Chair:

Please give me examples of an important difference that the College brought about through Foundation support?

The first chairperson indicated that the Foundation had been instrumental in providing the College with the freedom to own its own assets and raise money for non-traditional college assets, including a fitness centre, a residence, and a major complex used for revenue generating opportunities.

The second Chairperson felt the Foundation provides three significant benefits to the college:

- Friend raising and the benefits he had already outlined.
- Gifts-in-kind, such as electronic equipment for the labs, heavy industrial equipment to augment the mechanical engineering facility, as well as other supplies which are becoming more important to the college all the time.
- Stronger community profile which facilitates opportunities for the college in a variety of ways.

This question raised a concern from one Chairman who wondered if the success factor was determined by funds raised or by friends raised or both. When not in a fund raising mode, unless the College recognized the benefits of friend raising that result from having a Foundation - which is difficult to measure, the cost of staffing a foundation can be very expensive. This foundation's contribution to the College was paramount. It helped turn around a rather negative image that the College had acquired by raising community awareness of how important the college had been in providing for the needs of the community at large. This Chair stated:

Directors need to be goodwill ambassadors for the College. Directors are people of influence and are well-connected within the various communities. They must speak out on behalf of the College whenever they have an opportunity to do so. This Board has done exactly that.

Question four - chair:

How do you go about getting donations?

Probe: Do you meet personally with prospective donors?

Each Chair indicated that the principle mandate of each Member of the Board of Directors was to meet with prospective donors to pursue fund raising. Each Board Chair indicated they personally donated leadership gifts as part of their Board Chair role.

Commented one Chair:

I have focussed on business and friendship connections - always making personal contacts.

Another Chair stated:

You just have to look at the master strategy book. You prepare a list and begin cultivation long before the request is made for funds and pick the right person to do the asking, be prepared and follow through with the ask. Eighty per cent of the campaign will come from donors donating \$25,000 and up. The visit of one donor will offset the labour intensive special events.

Question five - Chair:

In what way are you involved with Foundation planning and goal setting?

The first Chair indicated he felt Staff played a major role in directing the planning of foundation activities. However, the staff indicated that his 13 year involvement as chairman had been integral to the foundation “staying on course.” His leadership was visible in the Foundation’s success to date.

A second Chair indicated the significance of his involvement when he stated:

We have gone through the planning process and we do have working committees. We are in the process right now of reviewing the planning process. We will probably have an active committee working just in the corporate trust side. We have a need for a working committee in the gift-in-kind area, another in the planned giving area, another committee in the finance and investment, public relations, etc. But because . . . we have been very involved with the campaign. The committee work has tended to be put on the back burner still, we have to get these other committees working. In what way am I involved? While we try to involve the whole Board in everything it starts with the executive committee of the Board. Therefore, I am very involved in working with the Executive Director.

One Chair responded:

Well I'm very involved because I'm the Chair. I work with the CEO in long-term, short-term and other planning. We have begun work on the non-capital campaign activity. At the risk of sounding immodest, when I took over the job in December there had been almost a total absence of planning for life after the capital campaign. We developed a strategy, bounced it off our Board at the retreat in February, turned the responsibility over to the Executive Committee, . . . and I put together some papers for purposes of discussion but I'm very involved. We've put together the agenda for the Foundation. The capital campaign strategy is in and done and canned. In the non-capital campaign activity I intend to be very involved. What we've done is taken non capital activities, like the financial aid programs, that's number one that we need to make a start on through phone-a-thon, parents-phone-a-thon, and planned giving, etc. We need to strategize and set the timing for these.

Question six - Chair:

Please explain two or three major activities carried out by the Foundation and, of these, which do you consider to be the most successful? Are there any activities outside of these mentioned that have not been that successful?

All three Chairpersons indicated that the campaigns, the investment policies, and the gift-in-kind programs had been most successful at each of their Foundations. However, they each indicated that the Alumni was the weakest part of their strategy. One chair indicated:

This one is a tough one everywhere. We work at it but I don't think our college has been successful in developing alumni involvement in the same way that the universities have. We are finding more and more university graduates coming to the college and because they are used to being involved with their alma mater, there is the opportunity to keep building because this is such an important area.

Question seven - Chair:**Do you make a personal monetary contribution to the foundation?**

All three chairpersons indicated they make a personal financial contribution. They each stated that whether Board Members make a contribution was a matter of personal choice. All three felt the Director's time and contacts were far more important to the Foundation than their dollars. The three Chairmen felt that Foundation staff should not be expected to give since they give a great deal of time and commitment to raising funds. One chair stated:

I think it is a personal choice. I think the Board of Directors and the Board of Governors should, as they are able, to make a personal contribution. I don't think it's something that you can push too much. These people are giving of their time and therefore I would tend to lean toward personal choice. But from my experience most of these people are prepared to give. Staff members are in a different situation altogether. I think most of the staff work extra hours and should not be expected to contribute beyond the time they give extra to their employer.

Question eight - Chair:**Has there been a turning point in the growth and development of the Foundation, and how would you explain that?**

Each Board Chair felt the turning point in the growth and development of their Foundation was when they started to implement a major capital campaign.

Comments from one of the Board Chairs:

I think the turning point was the residence campaign; it profiled the Foundation very well. The campaign was a major turning point because

every Member of our Board was on the campaign team and six out of the 11 board members were leaders on the campaign cabinet. When the campaign started it was a very exciting turning point and the results were almost simultaneous. We raised three million dollars in less than three years.

Question nine - Chair

Since your involvement with the Foundation, in what way, if any, have your views changed about the importance of a Foundation to a Community College?

One of the Board Chairs felt his views had not changed. Another answered that the Foundation was becoming more important each day. With funding cutbacks, all the Colleges will have to initiate fund raising through Foundations. One Board Chair indicated he was:

firmly convinced the College made a very important decision in setting up the Foundation. It has reaped many good rewards and will continue to do so in years to come.

Question ten - Chair:

What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the Foundation?

Do you think it is possible to overcome these barriers?

One board chair indicated sparse funding to the Foundation from the college was a barrier. A second barrier is the lack of time volunteer Board Members can commit to reach the Foundation's goals. One Chair felt the barriers were government funding

cutbacks which increased competition as a result. Whereas another board chair identified similar barriers, he also felt that finding projects that would appeal to the funders could be a barrier in the future.

Question eleven - Chair:

What changes would you like to see made in relation to the Foundation?

Two Board Chairs indicated there should be greater sensitivity to those who are contributing and the need for more volunteers to assist with the workload, while the third board chair felt that the changes he sought he had already implemented as chair.

Question twelve - Chair:

What advice might you give to a person in your role at another Community College?

One chair stated:

You need to recruit high profile Business Leaders and Community Leaders. You really work hard on the planning process in early stages, and try to give everyone on the Board meaningful roles. You must keep expanding work at the committee level, so you don't do that much at the board itself. Keep the work at the committee levels. It's very important to work closely with the President of the College, but it is also very important to work closely with the Board of Governors. We have to strengthen our relationship with the Board of Governors.

Another Chair commented:

The Foundation Board must always be appropriate and above all credible in their request for donations. Make sure the project is well understood.

While the third Chair stated:

Make sure that the best lines of communications are put in place. I think that can become a challenge with part-time Directors and a busy CEO. The CEO must be aware of what's going on at the college. For example, just last week I sent a letter to an important Realtor and outlined the reasons why she should be sitting on our board. I mentioned the fact that we'd serviced the real estate industry for 18 years through the training. I didn't realize that just prior to my sending the letter to her, the college had cancelled the course. Board members have to be kept informed of changes within the College.

All three Chairpersons indicated that communications between the Foundation and the College are critical in allowing both organizations to do their job. A liaison between both boards has to be in place.

SECTION II - PART ii

QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY OF THE ROLE OF BOARD CHAIR

Question one - Chair:

What impels you to commit yourself to work for the Foundation?

With so many organizations in need of volunteer leadership and financial support, what is your motivation for working with this Foundation?

Although each felt they were helping the College, the answers were also very personal in nature. While one chair felt he had a desire to assist his "Alma Mater," the

second chair had experience being involved with another association. Now that I am semi-retired and I do have time, it is a learning experience for me and I enjoy that aspect. The third chair felt he gained by becoming a better business person which adds balance to his life.

Question two - Chair:

How many hours per month do you devote to this position?

The first Chair felt his commitment was in the range of two to fifteen hours per month depending on the need. The second chair indicated he spends approximately a day per week or twenty-five to thirty hours month.

I have two other corporate boards but this is my biggest job. As chair you tend to be more involved. The third chair stated it was fifteen to twenty hours per month and when the campaign is relaunched it would be double that figure.

Question three - Chair:

How many Board Members are there and how many of them are actively involved in fund raising?

Each Chair provided the following in answer to this question of the number of Board Members on each Board and the percentage of the Board Members that were actively involved in fund raising. The first Chair indicated they have sixteen Board Members with approximately one-quarter involved in fund raising. The second Chair indi-

cated they have ten to fifteen Board Members with six to eight actively involved in fund raising.

The third Chair indicated:

We have eleven on the Board right now. All of them are involved with the campaign in one way or another, although some are more involved than others.

Question four - Chair:

What percentage of your Board makes an annual contribution to the Foundation?

The first Board Chair felt there was one hundred percent participation by the board members to the campaign although they were not currently involved in an annual giving program. The second Chair stated that the question was difficult to answer because the Board Members' commitment to the capital campaign has been one hundred percent over five years. The number also involved in annual giving was not known by the chair. While the third chair also indicated the board members' involvement focused on the capital campaign rather than annual giving.

Question five - Chair:

What is the Board's criteria for Board Member participation?

Each chair indicated as paramount strong community representation and commitment to the overall goals of the College and the Foundation.

Question six - Chair:

Give examples of ways in which your Board was motivated to work on behalf of the College.

Each chair felt it was their responsibility as Chair and the responsibility of the College President to motivate Board Members. They also felt it was the Board Member's own personality and experience that drove that commitment.

Question seven - Chair:

How well informed is the community about the importance of the College?

Each Chair stated that their communities were very well informed about the importance of the college, particularly citizens aware of community issues and events. One Chair stated Chamber of Commerce Members were likely to be more aware of the college's importance to the community.

Question eight - Chair:

How would you evaluate the support for the Foundation by the College community - Administration, Faculty and other Staff?

Each Chair indicated support by Administration, Faculty and Staff was very good to excellent. When asked if they had any comments that were not addressed in the inter-

view, the following comments were elicited: Chair of Foundation for College C did not feel he could make any further comments. Chair of Foundation for College K said the following:

The one comment I would make is that we are very, very fortunate to have such a strong staff leader as, because without her a lot of things wouldn't happen and I know the whole Board feels that way. I think it is terribly important to have her type of person because the foundation tends to be off to one side, it needs someone in Senior Staff to keep promoting the name of the foundation with her peers around the campus. And she does that. So I would say that is an important strength. As a Chairman, when I took on the job I asked her if she was going to continue in her job because if she wasn't I might not have taken on the job as Chairman.

Comments from the Chair of the Foundation for College R were:

I think you are on a terribly important mission. If there are Colleges out there who don't have Foundation Boards they should not be so naive to think that it's as easy as turning on a light switch. It doesn't work that easily. I think the work you are doing is incredibly important.

SECTION III - PART i

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF THE FOUNDATION

Question one - Executive Director:

As Executive Director, how do you view your role with the Foundation and its fund raising activities?

The Executive Directors saw their role as motivators, coordinators, planners, coaches and facilitators to the Board of Directors. The President articulates the College vision and the Executive Directors have the responsibility to translate that vision into reality through the work of the Board. One of the Executive Directors explained it this way:

The Foundation has no vision of its' own, the College provides the vision as articulated through the President. I report to the President directly, I have been able to convince the Foundation Board that their role is to support me. In so doing they support the College, the President and the College's vision through advocacy and fund raising. What we have done has been to eliminate from the Foundation all government's responsibilities. To make it in essence a large advisory committee with special functions and special recognition within the College structure but with no direct governance and no real powers over me other than those I allow them to have, because I don't want to turn off my key volunteers. I will do what they suggest, and I will ask them to open doors and so forth. But when you get right down to it, I work for the College and the trade off for their not having governance is a level of comfort that few other foundations really have, fewer meetings and a more clearly defined narrow role, that enables them as busy people, to do other things and this allows me to get as much as I can out of them.

Another way of describing the role as stated by another Executive Director:

My role is to be the coordinator of all of the Volunteers, the Directors, my staff and the staff and President of the College. My role is to ensure that they understand the mandate of the Foundation and support the mandate of the Foundation, so that when we're in an opportunity to raise funds or raise awareness, I can count on them to have the understanding of what we need to do through the Foundation's activities to generate support for the College. So it really means that I have to motivate them, and provide some training and some guidance to them, but at the same time I'm the catalyst. I see them as really accomplishing the goals of the Foundation, because I have brought them together with members of the outside community but it's me that makes that happen. I'm not the one who is ultimately in on the "end call" for example, making the "ask" or getting the gift. Rather I make sure that I stay behind the scenes and I make everyone else look like they know exactly what they are doing and ultimately they get the recognition and acknowledgement, and the success of helping the Foundation to meet its goals and ultimately have those goals benefit the College.

The third Executive Director added these comments:

The traditional role of the Executive Director is to be an ambassador, to be a lobbyist, to know the community, to be visible in it, to make the contacts that network not only in the good times when you're not asking for money and when you are asking for money . . . The images are really simultaneous images . . . One can't be separate one from the other. Whatever it is, the fund raising activity is still supporting the College and therefore the integrity of the approach has to be equivalent. I think the role of the Executive Director is to have a very good sense of the community, both locally and externally, to keep the pulse of the College activities locally and broadly . . . to ensure that there's a link with what the Foundation is doing and what the College is doing.

Question two - Executive Director:

Your Foundation is one of the leaders in the province, in terms of successful fund raising. Why do you think it has been successful? What are the secrets of the success of your Foundation?

Each Executive Director spoke about the history of their Foundation and how they had dealt with the nuances of fund raising over a period of time. First the Executive Directors indicated their success came from being focused. They followed the recognized format of the donor's cycle, they did extensive friend raising before they ever started to solicit funds. They claimed the secret to fund raising is knowing when not to ask for money. One Executive Director indicated that the recession was so extreme when he became executive director that he devoted his efforts to friend raising and assisting other community efforts. Then when the time was right and when he felt they had overcome

“ a pretty bad reputation that we had acquired by the end of the 1980's... we were able to do that in record time... you have to get out into the community and lead volunteer for other organizations before you ask them to do anything for you.”

Secondly, the Executive Director of College K, spoke of working with her President who brought an awareness to the position. This working relationship strengthened relationships between the College and the Foundation that facilitated an independence and freedom for her work with the community. Thirdly, she spoke of the importance of key Volunteers from the community who recognize the importance of the College and how the Foundation can strengthen the College through the Volunteer participation. She felt their Foundation's success had also come as a result of her friend raising experience with the community. Another facet of the success of the Foundation mentioned by the third Executive Director from college C, included having a physical building owned by the Foundation which established a presence in the mind of the community. As well, the involvement of extremely influential corporate leaders particularly with the capital

campaign and being on the board of the Foundation, established a community perception of the importance of the Foundation. The length of service of the Board Chair, who had committed for thirteen years to that role, as well as the ongoing continuous support of key board members for many years, established a continuity that was critical to the success of the foundation.

One Executive Director commented :

Executive Directors in the past have been connected with the community and have been very involved on many scenes with the community, politically and supportively from different boards. When you have an Executive Director of the Foundation that is also on other boards and organizations that helps maintain the reputation and the profile of the Foundation.

Question three - Executive Director

Please give me examples of an important difference at the College brought about through Foundation support?

Two of the Executive Directors stated that the following examples had made a difference at their College: 1) the Scholarship and Bursary Program; 2) procedures developed by the Foundation to facilitate College departments in their specific fund raising activities; 3) successful ventures by some departments motivated others to support their department fund raisers; 4) the 14-15 Volunteers as a base from the Foundation Board, coupled with the College Board of Governors, provided a larger pool of people to influence the public relations in the community ; and 5) the financial benefits achieved through

planned investments by knowledgeable committees maximized the dollars contributed. One Executive Director pointed out the residence built as a result of a successful capital campaign had been an important support for students. Another Executive Director pointed out the Foundation would have been extremely beneficial to the college as a result of the private sector support they received, however, their partnership with the Government had been put on hold due to political decisions. As a result, the proposed campus that was to be built as the object of the campaign, would have to rely on the Foundation to an even greater extent in the future if the government did not provide the support they had guaranteed. As the Executive Director stated:

We are factored into their plans and were we not favoured into the plans, [sic] millions of dollars of construction would not take place. If indeed we do get cut down by millions of dollars when the announcement comes, our money is all the more important because instead of 14-15% of the project total it may wind up to 20% of the project total and that's a critical difference.

The third Executive Director of college R spoke about the importance of having Volunteers who have become Board Directors. Their leverage, influence, contact and support have made an important difference to their College in many ways. Aside from providing the financial support and the student opportunities, both financial and through employment, this difference has also enhanced the image of the college because so many individuals have shown the flag for the College in boardrooms and corporate offices both locally and nationally.

Question four - Executive Director:

How do you go about getting donations? Do you meet personally with prospective donors?

The Foundations directed their solicitation in two different ways. The first Director explained his staff-driven campaign, whereby his volunteers open doors, then the donations are personally solicited by the Executive Director along with the President or a Key Volunteer. They research the relationship between the Donor and the College, then use that in the proposal. Their case is much stronger when weighed against proposals from other groups that are relative strangers to the company they are soliciting.

The Executive Director of another Foundation indicated that the solicitation takes place through Volunteers and the President. The Director conducts background research and prepares the case. Then the lead volunteers or the president, rather than the director, are sent to solicit the Donor. The Director thought it was more appropriate for the head of the institution to meet the head of the company or corporation.

Question five - Executive Director:

In what way are you involved with the Foundation planning and goal setting?

As the Executive Directors explained, they develop the framework of the plan, then they suggest what the major objectives should be. These are usually built on what the

Foundation is already doing . . . At this point, the Board considers the suggestions and the Board develops their objectives as a result of these discussions. As one Executive Director commented: “It comes through me and it is vetted by the Board”.

There are two kinds of planning and goal setting activities . . . the capital campaign is one goal setting and the other is the strategic planning process. One Director wanted his Board to focus on the capital campaign initially but to have goals and objectives following the campaign so when it was over, as he said:

When we come out of the capital campaign I don't want them to say “Well we've done our job and that's that” so this gives them a specific purpose and a mission. . . . I make sure and point out what their role should be and in some cases maybe there is no role, but at least they will know that in certain activities for financial aid they have a certain part to play.

Question six - Executive Director:

Please explain two to three major activities carried out by the Foundation, and of these, which do you consider to be the most successful?

In answering this question, two of the Executive Directors pointed out the Scholarship and Award Program as one of the most successful activities initiated by the Foundation. As stated by one Executive Director:

We present over 500 awards per year and we have an annual investment value of over \$600,000 in scholarships and awards. So that program has generated for us a number of donors who are now able to move up the donor scale to greater contributions. . . We feel it is a breeding ground.

Another Executive Director also indicated, “The awards and bursaries are really up there on a continuum as being most successful.”

Other projects that have been successful for their Foundation have been the equipment campaigns which raises significant “gifts-in-kind” of equipment that the college could not afford to provide. Most of those gifts have been initiated by alumni which creates an even greater commitment and support for the institution in the future. A highly successful residence campaign was also mentioned as an example of an excellent project.

The third Executive Director discussed specific examples of successful projects as the result of the following initiatives: “ Community relations; a capital campaign and special events hosted by the Foundation. . . . To my mind, the most successful thing the Foundation has accomplished is raising the image of the College . . . It’s not a fund raising thing, it’s an image thing but without it we wouldn’t get the funds.”

Question seven - Executive Director:

Are there any activities outside of these mentioned that have not been that successful?

One Executive Director stated the Foundation had not had any failures to date, but the delay in the government not completing their commitment to the capital campaign has

caused a serious problem. He went on to say:

The effect on the fund raising is obvious, in ten months you lose your momentum, you lose volunteers interest. You have to rebuild your case to take into account the changes that will have to be made if the funding is less than originally stated and the changes that have come into place with the cutbacks in operating expenses and the dropping of programs and the rearranging of the college's priorities. You have to realize that there will be others in the fund raising environment that were to have been yours, but the time frame has past. We were to have launched in 1995 to achieve our major campaign. It is now 1996 and while everyone has been delayed, we know of others who are getting out there into the fund raising. There are organizations who have had operations harmed in their budget and they will be out there getting funds, which really doesn't bother me to the extent of people giving. But, since busy people volunteer for a lot of organizations, and many cleared their calendar for me and now we will have to start all over again getting volunteers.

The other Executive Directors admitted having weaknesses, but not specific failures to speak of. One Director felt the area of planned giving needed a great deal more work because they had only just scratched the surface. The other Executive Director indicated that although they had staged special events in the past, they have not had the support of the College nor did the result justify the time and work involved in special events.

Question eight - Executive Director:

Do you make a personal monetary contribution to the foundation?

Should board and staff members be expected to make a contribution, and at what level?

In answer to this question each Executive Director answered with a strong affirmative response. When asked if they felt the Board and Staff Members should be expected to make a contribution, they each indicated “absolutely” that both board and staff must support the foundation. All must exemplify leadership by supporting the foundation.

Question nine - Executive Director:

Has there been a turning point in the growth and development of the Foundation, and how would you explain that?

One Executive Director explained that initially what was now the Foundation had begun as a resource development office in the College. With the creation of the foundation, the change was extremely swift and positive. As she stated:

For me, my department has always been very small and very minimally resourced. The added benefits of gaining volunteers that supported the objectives of the foundation, and now have assisted me in meeting those objectives has been a major turning point in terms of our development and awareness in outside communities.

The second Executive Director commented, “there was a Foundation prior to my coming but they didn’t do anything.” This Executive Director said when the Foundation Board realized that the key to success was focusing on fund raising and not being involved in other things such as running special events, the Foundation Board began to work to achieve their goals.

The third Executive Director explained that the turning point for that Foundation was the capital campaign for the residence complex. As she stated:

The results of the campaign turned around a lot of perceptions at the College because it was significant from any aspect not the least of which it was recognized throughout the province as the first successful capital campaign in the College system run by Foundation.

Question ten - Executive Director:

Since your involvement with the Foundation, in what way, if any, have your views changed about the importance of foundation to a community college?

The view of one Executive Director, who had only been at the foundation for a short period of time, was different from the others:

She stated:

I think that my view has changed in the aspect of asking and giving from the Foundation orientation rather than the College orientation. This is going to be a hard point to explain but the foundation keeps the college clean in the community, from the ask. In a way that's good because the college continues to be the educational academic clean institution, the foundation is the one that deals with the companies, does the ask, writes the letters, negotiates things, and it can in that way be free to do many more things without worry about the sacrosanctity of the academic world and I think that's good. I think it can relate to private enterprise better in that way because colleges always have a much more public sector mentality, whereas the Foundation is more entrepreneurial, free to act, private sector oriented.

Another Executive Director put it this way:

My views have not changed but I look at the Foundation this way: Foundation is critical only to the extent that the Board of Governors cannot control its membership as much as a private institution or a university does. So if you have people on the Board of Governors interested in

fund raising, you'll find that you have no way of making sure that this will happen. Foundation gives you the vehicle to get a Board full of community fund raisers and of interested people of affluence and influence and all of those things that people can do outside the College system but that we can't do in it.

The Executive Director explained that they truly believed in the value of the Foundation because each time they had been asked to assist another College in establishing a Foundation. It reinforces the Foundation's importance to the College (from her perspective).

There is nothing as important as having a group of volunteers who understand the value of private support to their college, be brought together in some kind of organized fashion, so that they can help generate the necessary resources. This is something the Board of Governors just can't do. It's not something that can emanate out of the President's office, it's not something that the public affairs office can do on it's own. You have to have somebody leading the charge! I don't think it's a coincidence that we've had better results since the establishment of a foundation.

Question eleven - Executive Director:

What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the Foundation?

Do you think it's possible to overcome these barriers?

One Executive Director stated the barriers from his perspective:

Canada's publics, both individually and corporately, lack understanding around the need to privately support post-secondary education.

Another Executive Director indicated a second barrier as the lack of resources allocated to the Foundation which ultimately results in a lack of services and programs

that can be offered to the donor. This situation “hamstrings” the foundation directors because “money begets money.” The third Executive Director denied the existence of barriers, “except what the government throws at us”. All agreed that greater financial resources would assist Foundations to overcome any barriers.

Question twelve - Executive Director:

What advice might you give to a person in your role at another Community College?

All three directors advised knowing and developing a strong relationship with the President. Secondly, making sure the person hired as Executive Director has the necessary skills to fulfill the role. Third, making sure they want to perform the role responsibly.

SECTION III - PART ii**QUESTIONS ASKED SPECIFICALLY OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
THAT WERE NOT ASKED OF OTHER INTERVIEWEES****Question one - Executive Director:**

Please describe the composition of your staff and how the work is organized.

The first Director explained the Foundation included a Scholarship and Awards Officer; an Alumni Officer; the Development Officer and the capital campaign staff each reporting to the Executive Director and is each responsible for an area, except for part-time staff who are additional for the capital campaign initiative. The second Executive Director explained a slightly different set-up as a result of also operating a physical plant which generates revenue. They have a controller and a receptionist who provide service to both the physical resource operation and the Foundation operation. Staff also include a Scholarship and Awards program Officer; the Alumni Officer, the Capital Campaign Assistant and a student working in a co-op placement program. Each of these persons report to the Executive Director.

The third Foundation had downsized the operation as a result of the stalled capital campaign. The office consisted of a special events person (half-time); a secretary who was also responsible for the alumni; and the Executive Director. Personnel were hired by contract on an as-needed basis for the capital campaign and the special events. Each Foundation relied a heavily on volunteers as well.

Question two - Executive Director:

What ongoing training are you, your staff and your board involved in?

Training for staff is mostly done through workshops and seminars sponsored by the college. The Board of Directors training is mostly done by Executive Directors who use material and resources from CASE and CCAE.

Question three - Executive Director:

How is the college community - administration, faculty and other staff involved with foundation activities and fund raising?

Each Executive Director explained the President and Vice Presidents were involved with the “ask” when it was important to do so. Faculty provided valuable information about potential donors, in-depth information for proposal writing and soliciting gifts-in-kind. Some staff had been extremely active in fund raising through bingos, garage sales, lotteries, and extensive monetary contributions. However, as another Executive Director put it; “It is usually the ‘rule of thirds’, one third will be interested, one third will wait and see and one third just don’t care.”

Question four - Executive Director:

Are the Foundation’s operations financially supported by the Foundation?

One of the Foundations supported their operations through revenue generated by the leaseholds of their physical space. Another Foundation generated revenue through a student levy. While the third Foundation sustained their operation through support by the college with the exception of an alumni and a capital campaign that also generated revenue.

Question five - Executive Director:

What coordination efforts take place between the development office and the college's public affairs department?

One Foundation Director stated they operated with a development model not an advancement model, and keeping their public affairs office aware of upcoming announcements but operating separately. Another Foundation operated a joint committee for marketing and communications, with their communications flowing through the committee where each could contribute to the information. Whereas the third Foundation operated intimately with the Public Affairs Department:

"It's like a shoulder to an arm. The images cannot run one against another. . . the integrity of information must be totally complete."

When asked if they had any other comments the Executive Director of College Foundations stated the following:

In a funding sense, governments in the United States are much slower to fund but when they do it is much surer because it is bonded or has the full support of some organization behind it. Whereas here they are much quick-

er to make funding promises but are quick to take it back. This causes a great deal of cynicism among the public that you don't encounter in the United States. If a state bond issue passes, it may take fifteen years for that money to come but once it's there it's there. You can go and match and feel confident that it will happen. If the public essentially hears charities, not just colleges, but any charity, cry wolf, you will have this grand scheme with the architect's renderings, etc. and it never gets built. Hospitals do the same thing, and social service agencies, then everyone looks for a way not to have to give, and the government is giving people a way to lower their sights. If you're unsure, you'll give a one thousand dollar gift instead of a ten thousand dollar gift. Then where is the other nine thousand dollars to come from? So the government is not doing anybody a favour. The Canadian government does not even care from what I have seen. The government in the United States is much more regulated, and it is not as vulnerable to political involvement. Here is a great disappointment that has created a cynical public and has led people to devalue their gifts.

The executive director of another college foundation provided these insights:

You didn't ask how the foundation board actually functions. There has been so much information on how boards operate. A number of boards have adopted various models. A lot of the colleges have looked at the Carver model. Our foundation took a look at it but the foundation board felt that it was too hands-off as a functioning board. My directors are more hands-on, although they don't come in here and lick stamps and envelopes. But I discuss with them all elements of a program or activity, they don't just deal with policy. If all they dealt with was helping me to revise our investment policy on an annual basis, they would be more of a hindrance than a help. I think the role the board plays is important. You must have a very specific knowledge of that because that is what helps recruit your directors. The recruitment process is absolutely key because then you get board members who will be hands-on operators.

The executive director of another foundation indicated that the solicitation is done through the volunteers and the president. The director does the research and sets everything up and then they send in the lead volunteers or the president rather than the director soliciting the donor. The director felt it was more appropriate for the head of the institu-

tion to meet the head of the company or corporation. The executive director felt those are the two people that should be getting together.

SECTION IV - PART i

QUESTIONS ASKED OF THE COLLEGE FACULTY WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FOUNDATION

Each of the three successful Foundations selected by the criteria for interviews had one Faculty Member elected to the Board of Directors to represent College Faculty.

Question one - Faculty:

As Faculty on the Board of Directors of the Foundation, how do you view your role with the Foundation and its fund raising activities?

Two of the Faculty Members in speaking of their involvement with fund raising, stated how they concentrated on their own discipline in seeking funding support.

Professor of college K stated:

I do an extensive amount of fund raising to subsidize the operating funds because there is no travel or promotional dollars within my program area. It is very difficult for any program to be run nationally and stay national without that kind of support from the industry. So I'm in constant contact with the industry to try to get operating dollars.

Professor of College C indicated he had been involved with the Foundation raising funds and obtaining gifts-in-kind to support his program discipline. He had only

recently (within the last two years) been appointed a Member of the Board of Directors of the Foundation. Although he participated in fund raising from the vantage point of soliciting funds to support his program area, he had not understood the broader vision of the Foundation until he became a Board Member.

It has just opened my eyes to what's going on and some of the other possibilities. I think that is the only real change from my being involved with the Foundation as a Faculty Member and now being a Board Member . . . It is just an awareness of some of the other things that go on that the Foundation is doing and all the possibilities of what others can do with the Foundation.

As a result of his new awareness, he felt he had a role to play in making the internal College Community aware of opportunities provided by the Foundation. He could increase awareness of the Foundation and how the faculty could take advantage of the Foundation to support the College and their program areas.

The third Faculty Member of the Board from College R saw his role in a very different light. He understood his role was to inform the Members of the Board of the Foundation about what was going on at the College from a professors' vantage point.

My role is to bring them (Board of Directors) what is going on in the faculty and staff and student body because they come from outside that community and they are not necessarily familiar with the reasons they are raising the funds.

Question two - Faculty:

Your Community College Foundation is one of the leaders in the province in terms of successful fund raising. Why do you think it has been successful? What are the secrets to the success of the Foundation?

The professors shared how success resulted from commitment that the Colleges had made to the fund raising initiative. The Professor from College R explained their success succinctly:

Commitment. The biggest reason can be summed up in one word - commitment. College R made a commitment to fund raising and started the Foundation, hired a full-time fund raiser and that person happens to be very good.

The other two Professors also spoke of the commitment by their Colleges, but they came from a slightly different vantage point. They believed that College commitment exhibited by partnerships with the private sector resulted in their foundation being successful. Professor from College C stated:

I know I use the Foundation and its' capabilities when I'm talking to Donors. . . The fact they can get a tax receipt has been a big benefit. The majority of Donors that I've been talking are past graduates. That's where we get most of our donations. . . by contacting them and letting them know that they can get a tax write-off for the equipment they donate on behalf of the companies they work for . . . They are very supportive and the companies like the fact they can get involved, help the College and benefit their bottom line.

Professor from college K agreed. He outlined how his College had forged a unique partnership with a major industry. This partnership benefitted the Foundation by attract-

ing national commitment from industry for scholarships, student placement and employment, equipment and major cash donations.

Beyond the...facility which represented 5.5 million dollars in national fund raising support for jobs and placements, awards and operations support are where the fund raising comes into play.

Question three - Faculty:

Please give me examples of an important difference at the College brought about through Foundation support?

A common theme was echoed by all three professors. Not only did the Foundation make a difference, it did so in such a way that the opportunity to work with the Foundation resulted in significant improvements for his faculty. Some faculty, according to the professor, were either unaware, disinterested or did not put forth the effort to assist themselves and their departments through the Foundation. Professor from College C explained how his work with the Foundation resulted in a very profitable situation that would assist other faculty if they did the same.

It's very easy for me to look at, because it's embarrassing for me in some ways. When I go to divisional or college-wide meetings and I hear people complain I have to bite my tongue. I have too much equipment and the thing I want to say is that I have no place to put it. But I don't say that publicly because a lot of people would get upset because they don't realize the potential of working with the foundation. For our programs we've been able to basically keep up to date, industry has been very supportive because they are working with state-of-the-art equipment . . . we have not fallen behind in the technology like other areas have and that's basically due to the donations we are getting. It makes things very enjoyable so far as teaching . . . the majority of donations we have received in the last ten years have been from the more recent graduates. So I think they appreci-

ate the fact that they are working on new equipment. The partnership of working through the alumni and filtering through the foundation a lot of the people who donate now, are donating because when they're in the program we let them know they are working on the equipment as a result of donations . . .

The professor from college K pointed out how the relationship with donors is so unique because through the foundation, they are offered the opportunity to provide a simple scholarship or take advantage of setting up an endowment which creates opportunities forever. Through the foundation they value and nurture our donors using promotions and events, we celebrate our partnerships. We've created the largest auto show in Canada. It is a student lab and a showcase which is ongoing and profiles our donors for all to see.

Question four - faculty:

How do you go about getting donations? Do you meet personally with prospective donors?

Each faculty member indicated their approach and level of involvement varied considerably. The faculty member from college K had an integral involvement with the donors, particularly the major industry donors, as the relationship building with these donors continued on an ongoing basis after the major campaign. The donors support for student placements, equipment, service to the industry through trade shows and demonstrations, built the rapport with the donor. In the case of the faculty member from college C, the relationship building was important but the focus was more on the students and the alumni to reciprocate in providing gifts-in-kind and opportunities, which as the faculty

member emphasized to them was their responsibility as others had done for them when they were students. The fund raising in terms of cash donations took more of a back seat to the solicitation for equipment and sponsorship for special projects and experiences. The faculty from college R did not participate in fund raising on a personal basis but he felt his role was to inform the Board and other solicitors, the importance of what the donations were applied toward.

Question five - faculty:

In what way are you involved with foundation planning and goal setting?

Each faculty indicated they are somewhat involved but would like to be more involved if they had more time. The answer did not appear that their lack of involvement was due to any other reason than lack of time. One of the faculty stated as a result of the interview questions, he will be paying more attention to his role on the foundation Board.

Question six - faculty:

Please explain two-three major activities carried out by the foundation and, of these, which do you consider to be the most successful?

The faculty from college R outlined the major special event that drew crowds and created profile for the college aside from raising funds. As the object of the special event was one of the major resources (seafood and wine), it linked the local economy with the

event and enhanced the ownership of the project by the local citizens particularly local merchants and vineyard owners. The faculty from college K outlined how through the support of a major local industry supplier, his students had a tremendous opportunity of working with one of the donors who, along with the college, initiated a partnership dealing with computer software for the auto industry. This partnership resulted in students working on a state-of-the-art computer lab prototypes. This would have been impossible for the college to supply on their own.

The students are involved in strategic planning, marketing, accounting and financing to perform real business experiences that is not simulated. The second example is of an endowment that provides funds for operating CAI (computer assisted instrumentation) for promotions for auto shows and conventions and conferences. The third example outlined by the faculty from college K was the endowment created by the automobile industry which resulted in funds generated to send graduating students on to university to further their education.

The faculty from college C outlined the major events as being the major capital campaign that created a residence as well as the major capital campaign that created a whole physical wing devoted to students with special needs. Those are really positive issues . . . You just can't say enough about being able to put up a residence when no one else will support you (government) and to put on an addition in tough times . . . to serve a special group, this really touches home. The foundation also worked to support special

initiatives created by the faculty when faculty turned over their wages for assisting the private sector to be invested in bonds that generated income for the department's capital budget.

Question seven - faculty:

Are there any activities outside of these mentioned that have not been successful?

One faculty alluded to the Nevada lottery tickets that he felt uncomfortable in supporting. He explained that it was not a failure, as they raised a great deal of money, but it was the philosophy of doing this type of fund raising that concerned him. The faculty from college C also spoke of a lottery ticket sale that he was not sure of the benefit. He felt that the other projects were far more beneficial in many ways.

The faculty from college K outlined that if the researcher had asked that question earlier:

I would have said the "aftermarkets" segment of the auto industry had not been that successful and had not "come to the party" to coin a phrase from marketing. But since then in the last two years that particular component of the industry has probably been more active with respect to curriculum development and support. They are just realizing now that we have been sending graduates over the past ten years into the "aftermarkets". To clarify, the "aftermarkets" includes all companies that provide products and services related to a vehicle after the car is sold. Many of these companies are huge, some are small but generally it is a very fragmented sector of the industry. . . .Although we were unsuccessful until the last few years that in addition has been very impressive.

Question eight - faculty:**Do you make a personal monetary contribution to the foundation?**

The answer was a very strong positive response. When asked if Board and staff members should be expected to make a contribution, and at what level, the faculty each felt it was a personal choice although they felt the board should contribute and as in the words of college C faculty:

I think the onus should be on the faculty who should say "yes" they are doing good things and I want to be involved with that . . .

Question nine - faculty:

Has there been a turning point in the growth and development of the foundation, how would you explain that?

The faculty each felt that the turning point was the appointment of the executive director and the initiation of a capital campaign.

Question ten - faculty:

Since your involvement with the foundation, in what way, if any, have your views changed about the importance of a foundation to a community college?

Each faculty answered they had become aware of the breadth of activities and initiatives of the foundation and spoke about the importance of fund raising to the college in the future:

As an academic manager, I can only see our budget spiralling downwards. So the only way we're going to survive, even remaining status quo, which is frightening in itself, is to form a greater partnership with the community and start developing linkages with our corporate client.

Question eleven - faculty:

What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the foundation?

The statement by the faculty member for College K said it best:

It's difficult to say on one hand that your operation dollars are shrinking yet there's a need to develop bricks and mortar on your campus in order to stay strong and to attract students. Those are very difficult "sells" to the community. It's a fierce competition for discretionary dollars, it's the competition for public relations, it's finding the gatekeepers within those corporations so that we can tap into their support mechanisms and get them to thinkCollege first.

Question twelve - faculty:

What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the foundation?

The faculty each felt the barriers could be overcome with hard work and good communications.

Question thirteen - faculty:

What changes would you like to see made in relation to the foundation?

The changes the faculty felt would improve the functioning of the foundation were enhanced communication between the college and the foundation This would include

various means of communication with a particular emphasis on the communication between faculty and foundation staff responsible for alumni development.

Question fourteen - faculty:

What advice might you give to a person in your role at another community college?

Faculty gave the following analysis.

The faculty from college K offered that the importance of being unique cannot be overstated. If you're seen as just another college with a template curriculum you can't offer anything different than anyone else who is knocking on the same door. So I would say from a competitive standpoint you have to start finding niches, unique programs that provide a graduate profile that is different and special, because without that you will have to join the long line up of people that are asking for the same dollars and you won't thrive or survive.

The faculty from college R indicated that he had not realized what his role was at the foundation until the research question was asked of him. This has been a very valuable exercise in articulating my role with the foundation and trying to decide how I could be more effective. His advice was for faculty to learn more about the goals of the foundation and then articulate the goals you wish to strive for and you will be of more value to the board and the foundation operations as a whole.

I have done some of this by the seat of my pants as I've gone along, but being able to articulate some of these goals now will enable me to have a better stab at fulfilling some of them.

College C faculty Board Member stated something that is probably more true than many would like to believe:

I would suspect that most of the faculty don't know what the foundation does, or how it benefits them. When new equipment comes in they just expect it and don't have any idea how it got there, what the implications are for it being here or what the involvement was . . . so if I were to talk to faculty at another college . . . It's basically the more you get involved the more the benefits will come back to you and your students. It's easy to sit back and bitch and complain about what you don't have but there are other ways around the problem. The foundation has made teaching in my program just great. I'm one of the few people I know who looks forward to coming to work. Instead of saying "oh damn do I have to . . . I just can't wait to get here" . . . When students come back and tell you how happy they are in their jobs. I just look and say . . . boy I want to do this again next year.

SECTION IV - PART ii

QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY PERTAINING TO THEIR ROLE AS FACULTY ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FOUNDATION THAT WAS NOT ASKED OF ANY OTHER INTERVIEWEE

Question one - faculty:

How would you describe the importance of your involvement with the college foundation in relation to your other duties?

The answer was a very high priority by the faculty member from college K who described it as:

...dramatic imbalance. No other faculty or academic director networks with the industry as much as I do . . . So I would say this role is a significant demand on my overall workload, an imbalance which is unique to the rest of the college.

The faculty member from college C felt he had not put enough focus on the communication with the foundation and the college faculty, and he will be putting more emphasis on this area in the future. While the faculty member of college R felt that it was a low priority in relation to his other duties:

I am a teacher first. I have a real responsibility to the classroom and a real responsibility to my students.

Question two - faculty:

Do you feel that your involvement with the college foundation has been beneficial to you and your colleagues at the college?

All three faculty felt they and their colleagues had benefitted. The faculty member from College C stated he feels his department has gained so much that he feels almost guilty because he and his department have benefitted so much. He is trying to lead by example and the word of the importance of the foundation is beginning to spread. The faculty from College R stated it had been an extremely beneficial experience because he is a lifelong learner and:

...just hanging around with these people and by learning what the foundation does, just rubbing elbows with people that I would never have anything to do with before is beneficial...yes, the experience is valuable mostly for what I have brought to the foundation but also for what the foundation has been able to do for the College.

The faculty member from College K stated:

...absolutely, when I see the kind of events, the kind of speakers and the

luxurious office I'm sitting in entirely financed by the private sector, it has been beneficial to me and to the College, the results are tangible and ongoing.

Question three - faculty:

Do you feel a responsibility to solicit donations because you are on the board of directors of the foundation or would you do it as a matter of practice anyway?

Two of the faculty responded “yes” to both questions saying they were doing it anyway, while one faculty from college R indicated he did not solicit gifts.

Question four - faculty:

What is the relationship between the college faculty and the foundation?

All three faculty said it was distant at best. Because it is an arm's length relationship, the faculty are basically:

Largely unaware of the existence of the foundation, what it does and how valuable it is to the college.

Each recognized it was their role to bring the College and the foundation in closer communication and awareness.

Question five - faculty:

How do you view the role of the college public relations to the foundation's fund raising goals and activities?

The faculty indicated public relations was absolutely vital. Stated the professor from College K:

If we can't sell ourselves as being a leader in that area, we're in serious trouble when it comes to explaining to potential clients and partners what we can do for them and what the benefits are if we can create a synergy.

The faculty were each asked if they had any other comments they wished to share.

The faculty member of College C indicated:

We need the people at the college to learn what the foundation does and what it can do. When I attend the awards ceremony every year I am astounded at the number of faculty who aren't there.

College R faculty member stated the following:

In one of our recent meetings at the foundation, the President was speaking of the cutbacks. When he finished his talk it was a very unhappy situation, and when he finished, it was a very down situation. He asked me if I had anything to add. I was very grateful he asked because I was able to convey to them something that the President couldn't "Yes, times are bad, and yes people are nervous" but the faculty felt that the President had handled this in a classy way, and no one blamed anyone, there is a sense that we're all in this together. The morale is as good as could be expected. I was able to convey that to this group of business people and politicians who sit on our foundation and I felt that I was doing something as valuable as I could do at that time. Maybe just being there for those moments when somebody on the Board say "what does faculty think?" of where should we put our energies? What does the College R family think? It is those moments, reaction rather than proaction that makes my role valuable to the foundation.

SECTION V - PART i**ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED WITH BOARD OF GOVERNORS LIAISON TO THE FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS****Question One - Governor:**

As the Member of the Board of Directors of the Foundation representing the Board of Governors of the College, how do you view your role with the Foundation and its fund raising activities?

Each Member of the Board of Directors was a liaison member with both the Board of the Foundation and the Board at the college. Two of the three members were senior bank managers and the other member was a senior executive in the health care industry. Each person outlined how they had become involved with the college initially and how they had developed a special relationship with the Foundation as a result of being a member of the Board of Governors at the college. They each viewed their role very seriously and felt a great commitment to the College and to the Foundation. One Member stated:

The role is very much a support role to the management of the Foundation and one in which you want to participate with the management within a campaign.

Another Member who had been involved with the college for several years in an advisory capacity stated:

It wasn't the first time I was asked to join the Board. I was well connected and I think that was the influence they wanted. Beyond that I was asked to

join the Foundation so it was a natural fit to act as liaison with the Foundation. Hopefully I can bring to the Board a certain amount of reality and pragmatic approach to what is and isn't possible.

Question Two - Governor:

Your Community College Foundation is one of the leaders in the province in terms of successful fund raising. Why do you think it has been successful?

Each member spoke of the fund raising initiatives and how they had been successful because theirs was a very worthwhile cause. These initiatives were well planned and well executed. As one Member stated:

Any fund raising is only as good as the cause itself . . . I think a lot of people were sympathetic to the fact that the region badly needed a good college, and they saw and still see the college as very integral to the fabric of the community.

These thoughts were echoed by another Member:

We are not going to the community simply to raise funds. We have a very specific task or project that the funds are going to be used for, and in those cases, people will support them.

Question Three - Governor:

Please give me examples of an important difference at the College brought about through Foundation support?

All three members spoke enthusiastically of how the Foundation had raised the

profile of the College. Foundations raised funds to provide scholarships and bursaries that has given many students access to a college education - something which would not have happened without that support. Governors also spoke of community support for campaigns, results of which provided much needed and accessible facilities to enhance the community's infrastructure. For example, the goal of one college's Foundation fund raising was a major facility - a world class greenhouse. As he said:

The Foundation raised the funds, which in turn would benefit the college, which in turn would benefit the students, which in turn would benefit the industry, which in turn would benefit the community. So everybody wins with this kind of success.

Question Four - Governor:

How do you go about getting donations?

Each member of the Board spoke about soliciting donations on behalf of the Foundation by personally visiting the prospective donor, providing them with campaign literature and giving the donor time to consider the request. Then undertaking a visit to answer any questions and finalize the donation. One of the interviewees proudly boasted of how he had raised over \$450,000 by making the calls personally. Governors spoke about their strategy of working with peers in the corporate sector as they shared their understanding of the necessity for solicitation of this nature. One Governor replied:

If I'm talking to corporate donors, such as the bank, the majority of management staff or the senior managers know what the corporate donation policy is. If I'm soliciting my colleagues from other banks, their corporate donation policy is similar to ours . . . And you make the approach to the senior individual and you get their buy-in and it's pretty much a done deal from there.

Question Five - Governor:

In what way are you involved with Foundation planning and goal setting?

Interviewees spoke of how the Foundation's administration and College worked out the plans, the goals and the dreams from the strategic planning done by Foundation staff. They then present their planning strategies to the Board for approval. One Governor discussed his involvement in planning the cultivation of the sector he represented. Another Governor spoke of being involved as the liaison in strategic planning. For the most part, however, they were involved with setting the strategy for cultivating the potential donors. Staff at the College and Foundation on the other hand, were responsible for planning and goal setting.

Question Six - Governor:

Please explain two or three major activities carried out by the Foundation and, of these, which do you consider to be the most successful?

One Governor spoke with pride of the residence complex and the special needs centre built for college students as a result of the campaigns carried out by the Foundation. Another, discussed special events that had increased prestige and accorded recognition to the College. The third interviewee spoke of a world class diamond showing that highlighted the talents of the local artisans and students as well as pointing a great deal of media attention toward the College.

Question Seven - Governor:

Are there any activities outside of these mentioned that have not been that successful?

None of the interviewees had any recollection of unsuccessful activities.

Question Eight - Governor:

Do you make a personal monetary contribution to the Foundation?

Each of the interviewees made personal financial contributions as well as corporate financial contributions.

Should the Board and staff members be expected to make a contribution, and at what level?

In principle, one of the interviewees believed staff should make a financial contribution, but the other members did not share this opinion. They all agreed that Board Members should contribute financially, although this should be left up to individual discretion.

Question Nine - Governor:

9. Has there been a turning point in the growth and development of the Foundation, and how would you explain that?

One interviewee felt the turning point was the hiring of an experienced and professional executive director - two qualities needed by the Board of the Foundation. Another person pointed to the first major capital campaign, whose great success had been a 'real shot in the arm' for the College and the Foundation. According to the third interviewee, the turning point was just about to happen when they were 'all dressed up with nowhere to go' because the government pulled their matching funding out of the project. This Board was in the process of determining where to go from there.

Question Ten - Governor:

Since your involvement with the Foundation, in what way, if any, have your views changed about the importance of a Foundation to the Community College?

One member indicated that the Foundation was simply going to continue to grow and develop. He stated:

...the Foundation is going to be bigger simply because government cutbacks aren't going to just impact on the College, but they are going to impact on every sector of public institutions and it is going to mean there will be more campaigns in the market.

Similarly another interviewee stated:

It was important that the key partnership is maintained in tact. In other words here we have a situation in which a lot of excellent work was done, . . . with the momentum built, and one of the partners has caused the whole thing to be put on the shelf. Therefore, the provincial government has caused this to be quite damaging.

Question Eleven - Governor:**What barriers exist to achieving even greater goals for the Foundation?**

The major barrier that each of the interviewees spoke about was the economic environment in which they worked. The importance of the relationship with the community was reated by all three interviewees, particularly the importance of what the college can do for the community. One member stated:

I think in a lot of ways the Foundation and the College are very closely tied together and with government cutbacks . . . the role of the Foundation is going to become even more important. Also the challenge for the Foundation is going to be bigger simply becasue goverment cutbacks aren't going to just impact on the College. They are going to impact on every sector of public institutions and it is going to mean there will be more campaigns than ever.

Question Twelve - Governor:**Do you think it's possible to overcome these barriers?**

One member stated it:

Anything's possible. I mean our corporate logo is 'everything's possible and with the right attitude and the right energy, human beings can achieve anything.' I always look at these things in a positive light. People change outcomes and attitudes are important.

Question Thirteen - Governor:**What changes would you like to see made in relation the the Foundation?**

One of the members indicated that the public awareness could be enhanced even more if the Foundation staged a major campaign every few years instead of an annual campaign that did not create the profile and commitment that a major campaign does. Another member stated that the Foundation was functioning extremely well and he did not have any changes to recommend at this time. The third interviewee suggested that the college Board of Governors should be more cognizant of the activities of the Foundation and she would work toward the goal of making the Board of Governors aware of the activities of the Foundation.

Question Fourteen - Governor:

What advice might you give to a person in your role at another community college?

One member stated:

Just make sure that the vision and the goals of the College are clearly in sync with the vision and the goals of the Foundation. This College has just gone through an extensive review of the mission and values statements and I have been very very impressed with that. As long as the Foundation has the same goals and standards and the same vision and we are walking down the same road in tandem and there is no conflict between the College and the Foundation. This is very important.

The second interviewee provided the following advice:

Get involved. Getting involved gives you more insight into the community in which you operate. Communicate. If you agree to work with someone do your fair share; don't leave it to someone else. Support a team atmosphere amongst both the executive, the management and the Board.

The third interviewee restated most of the comments of the two previous speakers.

SECTION V - PART ii**QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY PERTAINING TO THEIR ROLE AS MEMBERS
OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE COLLEGE AND LIAISON TO
THE FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS****Question One - Governor:**

Can you give me an example of ways in which the College has benefitted from the Foundation?

One member spoke of the important contribution to the student life as a result of both previous campaigns staged by the Foundation. Another spoke of the ability of the Foundation Board to focus on the changing needs of the College and to provide support in areas that the College had felt unable to achieve without the outside support of the Foundation. The third member indicated that the prestige and profile of the individuals on the Foundation Board enhanced the profile and prestige of the College. He also felt the spin off benefits to the community by the College allowed for opportunities of joint venturing with the private sector that would not have been recognized without the support of the Foundation Board Members.

Question Two - Governor:

Was the Board of Governors involved in the Foundation's needs assessment and goal setting?

The first member stated that the Board of Governors may not be integrally involved with the needs assessment and goal setting but they are certainly aware of what

the Foundation is pursuing and have recognized that by approving all the plans that have been brought forward. The second member spoke about the goal setting having been done by other members of the Foundation Board as he was not available and did not wish to comment on this question. The third member indicated she did some work with the priorities and goal setting but had not been involved in the recent discussions due to time conflicts.

Question Three - Governor:

How did you view the importance of the Foundation?

The importance of the Foundation can not be undersated, according to the interviewees. For example if the Foundation does not succeed in the current fund raising efforts, it will impact quite dramatically on the college's financial resources as the commitment has been made and the plans are in effect to build the facility which is the goal of the current fund raising efforts. This argument was also expressed by the other interviewees as each indicated the Foundation had formed the basis of support and strength that was needed by the College to carry out its mandate.

Question Four - Governor:

Did you think the College's public relations had been enhanced as a result of the Foundation's activities?

Each interviewee deemed the Foundation had made the College much more visible in the external community. They also felt that the internal community had a greater awareness of the needs of the college as a result of the fund raising by the Foundation.

Question Five - Governor:

Do you believe the Board of Governors of the College view the support of the Foundation as a high priority?

Each interviewee indicated the Board recognized the importance of the Foundation and deemed it is a priority whenever the question came up for discussion.

Further comments:

One member stated:

I have been very impressed. I have been on many committees in a lot of organizations. I have been very impressed with the quality of the people on both the Board of Governors and the Foundation Board. I have been very impressed with the commitment of these people and the smart business acumen of these people. I like the way they work in a team approach this is not at all a contentious group, both groups work together. Mind you there is a lot of time spent and a lot of energy involved, as well as a lot of hours but I've been very impressed with how they work as a team.

A second interviewee stated:

I have enjoyed both being on the Board of Governors and on the Foundation Board. I think it's very good to see how they work together. I think the Foundation has been a blessing to the College, because what has happened is the Foundation has been able to pull the fund raising out of the day to day administration of the College It has permitted the educators

to educate and the people familiar and well connected to work with the College to raise the necessary funds.

The third interviewee stated very similar sentiments. She felt the Foundation was critically important to the College and to the community. The business community had grown to know and understand the needs of the College and the students have benefitted in the end.

SECTION VI - PART i

QUESTIONS ASKED SPECIFICALLY OF COMMUNITY DONORS THAT WERE NOT ASKED OF OTHER INTERVIEWEES

Question One - community donor:

What is the extent of your familiarity with the college?

The community donors were each significant members of the community. All three were presidents of their companies and played a major role in their communities. They have each lived in their communities for an extensive period of time and each have been involved in the corporate world beyond their community. Two of the three community donors have been integrally involved with the college, one having been named Fellow of the College because of his extensive involvement over the years on the board of the college and then of the foundation. One donor - the president of a large corporation - was

not only on the board at the foundation but had also been a Continuing Education student of the college and was heavily involved in various aspects of the community. The third community donor had an awareness of the college, particularly because his company did a great deal of retraining through the college but he was not as closely associated with it as the other two gentlemen.

Question Two - community donor:

What do you know about the college foundation?

All three donors were aware of the foundation and its goals and objectives. Two of the donors had a more intimate knowledge of the foundation while the third donor was aware of the executive director and the capital campaign, but was not as thoroughly knowledgeable of the daily workings of the foundation as the first two gentlemen.

Question Three - community donor:

What is your understanding of the college foundation's needs for community and other support?

Each donor was very cognizant of why the college needed community support. As one donor put it:

This is our greatest challenge. In more opulent times the community and business sector have adopted the belief that the college was fully supported by the government. I think this is our biggest problem to overcome.

Another donor stated:

...with government grants cut back there is a limit as to what you can charge the students.

Question Four - community donor:

To what extent should the community support the college?

The donors felt that the college was a very important asset to the community and it should be well supported. The point that one donor made was that the community is no longer the adjacent geographic community to the college but the broader community, nationally and provincially, that needs the college to produce highly qualified skilled workers to provide the productivity necessary to keep our economy strong.

Question Five - community donor:

What charitable needs do you or your company support and what is the basis for that support?

One community donor, who was president of a corporation, explained that:

As a member of the Imagine Campaign (national campaign initiated by the Centre of Philanthropy starting at 1% of the corporate pretax dollar goes to charity,) his company was major donor of the university, the college, the science centre, United Way, the Salvation Army and a number of other charities. The second donor, who was also president of his company, explained their contributions go to some arts organizations, the university and the college as well as the symphony and the Henley Rowing Association. The third donor, who is recently retired but still an active donor, explained that his involvement is not as extensive as it was as pres-

ident of a large organization, but that he was still a major contributor to the college and other related interests such as a safety program for children.

Question Six - community donor:

Why did you donate to the college foundation?

The response spoke to what the donation was used for and what benefit could be derived from the contribution. One donor spoke of the fact that his corporation felt it:

...was a sustainable type of thing...It's something concrete that will provide lasting benefits...it was seen as something that would broaden the base of college C...And in turn broaden throughout the whole geographic area of the province.

The project was selected from a number of projects as having the greatest impact for the dollars given. The donor who is retired looked at the utilization of the funds:

I look at what percentage of my donation gets to the bottom line. I don't want to contribute to organisations where my donation is diluted to the point that very little actually gets to be distributed.

The third donor stated similar comments to the former.

Question Seven - community donor:

What approach was used by the foundation to solicit funds from you or your company?

The donors were each solicited personally followed by a request in writing. As one donor explained:

It's following the protocol that is important at this level, you know, to touch base and let people know that something is happening and to follow the chain of command. Then that enables a division president like myself to send it into the corporate office where all of the proposals are considered.

Question Eight - community donor:

How does the community view the importance of the college foundation?

This response shed some interesting light on the topic after having heard from the college president, chairman and executive director of the foundation. Previous comments about the importance of public relations were reinforced by the comments of the community donor.

I think the college is being viewed in a better light. College R went through so many growing pains and there was a certain lack of leadership for a number of years. . . .because of the current president's leadership and the fact that the executive director has gotten out into the community and done a lot of public relations with various organizations, he has brought them up to date on what College R is doing and how they are doing it. So I think from the point of view of the community at large, the relations have gotten a lot better . . . so I think it's improved quite significantly in the last two or three years.

The second donor related how he felt the community viewed the foundation in these comments:

I think they should be impressed. It's got a good record. I think ... it's related to the leadership in the college. The foundation has to carry itself, it has to be successful . . . it has to be funded out of what it does, I think it's a good way of doing business. I think the community recognizes that.

However, the third donor felt that the foundation at college K was too young and the community does not really recognize it as yet. The donor for College foundation K stated:

I believe it's very very important that the foundation be more fully recognized in the future. This is an area where we can have tremendous growth and particularly in the area of alumni. It hasn't been tapped yet.

When the donors were asked for further comments, the following information was shared:

The president is very important. College C has a good president and he provides good leadership. You've got to be politically astute and he spends a lot of time picking the right people. He will only ask the right people to help him that he knows will do the job. I think that is a very important part of fund raising. It seems to me that that's being done.

The third donor for College R gave his insights this way:

My involvement with College R has been pretty much through the capital campaign. I have not been involved with operating the college or the foundation at all. I only know something of the foundation from discussions with the executive director.

DISCUSSION AND OBSERVATIONS

Observations from the interviews

This section builds on the interview responses previously presented and takes into account the similarities and differences of the three foundations.

1. Presidential Leadership and Commitment:

Although from the survey data it would appear that the Presidents of College C, R, K, committed up to only 10% of their time to fund raising, the comments from other college interviewees indicated the presidential commitment and leadership were very important to the success achieved by the respective College Foundations. The research repeatedly made the point that McNamara (1989) stated:

The success or failure of private fund raising in a community college may not depend solely on the president, but he or she certainly is the pivotal point around which an effective fund raising program turns. Without strong presidential leadership and commitment, little can be accomplished.(p. 160).

While Robinson(1989) reinforced those comments with:

It is probably not an overstatement to suggest that no college or university can afford to have less than 60 percent of the chief executive's time devoted to meaningful development of the institution's major constituencies.(p. 18).

Each of the College Presidents saw their role as that of a strong advocate and spokesperson for their College and the Foundation. They each felt they provided leader-

ship by articulating the college mission to the external community and acting as motivators to the Foundation Board of Directors. Each President understood the importance of cultivating donors and provided linkage to their community through the college resources they made available to support their community as explained by College President K in making the theatre available for community use. The research further emphasizes the preeminent role of the President as outlined by McNamara (1989), when she states:

The president's commitment to the program is crucial because he or she represents the basic philosophy of the institution through which every major decision is made. The public's perception of the president will have a significant influence on attracting major donors and excellent members for the community college foundation's board of directors.(p. 161).

All college presidents gave of their time and their personal financial resources. This type of leadership was important for others to follow and which Simic (1993) reinforced by these comments:

Prospective donors look to the leaders of an institution to see if their personal commitments match their fund raising rhetoric. Before your institution can look to others to give, you must make sure it looks to itself first. You need to set an example and encourage others to do the same.(p.193).

The presidents also personally solicited corporate donors and encouraged college employees to support the work of the foundation. According to Keener(1989)

The college staff and the community representatives are joined in tandem to achieve objectives. Thus, the staff members must not only perform effectively, they must also elicit participation from other college employees and community members (p. 154).

College C President appeared to have the greatest experience with foundations. He

was responsible for creating one of the first college foundations in Ontario in 1983, well in advance of other colleges in Ontario. The College C Foundation was based on the California model of college foundations. However, during the interview the President of College C appeared to understate his involvement with initiating the College Foundation. The interviewees of College C held this president in extremely high esteem and commented generously on his initiative in creating the original foundation.

The President of College K on the other hand indicated through his interview that he did not perceive himself as having the skills in fund raising of that of his predecessor. From College K President's comments, the previous President of College K had demonstrated strong advocacy and communication skills. This appeared to put a great deal of pressure on College K President to perform at the same level of competency and enthusiasm as his predecessor. The President of College K felt there should be professional training for any president in order to assume the role of solicitation and advocacy with confidence and vigour. However from his interview he appeared to understand the process when he stated:

Fund raising is a long-term, interactive process, and large gifts come only with long-term relationships and great attention to the concerns and dreams of the donors. Fund raising is not a "get rich quick" scheme, nor is it a one-shot deal or a big campaign (College K Presidential interview).

The President from College R faced a definite challenge when he first took office after his predecessor had left a rather negative image for the college in the community. The President of College R had to demonstrate strong advocacy skills to change this

image. In order to establish a strong foundation and a positive fund raising program required a great deal of personal time commitment. At the time of the interview, the comments from all the interviewees from College R indicated this president was able to change the perception of the college community and general support for College R in the community.

All three presidents appeared to recognize the importance of building and maintaining ties with their respective communities, as well as motivating and challenging the members of the Board of Directors at the Foundation. They all recognized their role in representing their institution and the foundation. They all supported the function of their foundation and provided adequate resources which supported well qualified full-time and part-time staff to operate an efficient and profitable foundation. The importance of this commitment to the foundation by the president was reinforced by Simic (1993):

The fund raising office must be organized and run to enhance giving to the institution and to fulfill the stewardship obligation to donors . . . Although these services can be performed equally well by a successful fund raising office within an institution or a separate foundation, I believe that maximum effectiveness is achieved by setting up a separate fund raising foundation. The external operation offers advantages that have major, long-term benefits for an institution (p.185).

2. Efficient Full-time Executive Directors of Successful College Foundations

All three college foundations hired full-time executive directors to manage and maintain the work of the foundation. All of these Executive Directors were seen by their Board and President to be instrumental in the successful operation of the College

Foundation. Ryan's (1989) comment:

To create the cooperation necessary to build communities, community college presidents and trustees will be looking for competent chief advancement officers(p. 23).

Ryan's comment is typical of the literature that pointed to the importance of a member of staff being responsible to facilitate the relationships between the college and the external environment.

McNamara(1989) went on to comment:

The need for the chief development officer should report directly to the president and have the skills, ability, and professional background, is critical to that person being able to carry out their responsibilities(p. 161).

The Executive Director of College R had been hired by the President because of his background and expertise in fund raising. The Chairman of the Board of Directors of the College R Foundation found his salary to be excessive, the other members of the board of directors and the community donor were extremely generous in their praise for the College R Foundation executive director's ability to operate the foundation and to solicit funds from the corporate community. Although this Executive Director spent a great deal of his time "friend raising", it appeared to pay big dividends in changing community support as expressed by the community donor and members of the Board of Directors throughout the interviews. This Executive Director was credited with characteristics of successful officers as outlined by Ryan(1989):

...possess the traits of a successful teacher: knowledge, expertise, and experience...they should be well prepared; they should be enthusiastic; they should present their messages in a clear, concise, and stimulating manner...they should strive to attain for the college: positive public image; adequate public support; fair representation in the media; supportive corporate and individual giving; and appropriate student enrollment (p.25).

College R Foundation was faced with the challenge of withdrawal of government commitment for a matching grant. The plan to acquire similar resources from other sources was being introduced to the Board of Directors at the time the interview was conducted with the Executive Director, as one of the Foundation Board Members pointed out during his interview:

Effective fund raising requires long-range planning, solid institutional commitment, an adequate budget, talented leadership, enthusiastic volunteers, skilful management, and teamwork. (Interview with College R Foundation Board Member).

From the comments in the interviews with the President and Board Members of College K Foundation, it would appear that the executive director of the College K Foundation was credited with being an integral part of the success of that College Foundation. College K Executive Director had been an administrator at the college prior to the formation of the college foundation. She then assisted the president and future board directors in establishing the legal and the operational framework which ultimately became the operating procedures for the creation of the foundation and its board of directors. This Executive Director was recognized for her ability to work with the President and the Board Members in creating a strong presence with the college community as well as the

external community. She had prior experience in fund raising and from comments of board members and the President of College Foundation L, this Executive Director appeared to exemplify the attributes identified by Ryan(1989). Her energy and enthusiasm, her leadership ability and her commitment were characteristics that were recognized by the Board Chairman and other members of the Foundation, during their interview.

The Executive Director of College C had just recently taken over that position. She had been a full-time administrator at the College and had been selected to become the executive director after the previous executive director had taken a sabbatical leave from the position. She had exemplified strong management skills necessary to operate a complex department at the college and it would appear from comments made by the President and others that these same qualities were being recognized in the job she had been doing for the Foundation. The Executive Director had worked with the external community in her capacity as a member of the senior management team of the college prior to her taking on the role of Executive Director of College C Foundation. When interviewed, this Executive Director appeared confident that the role she was assuming would be challenging but would also be very rewarding. The operation of College C Foundation through the Board of Directors had been extremely successful over a long period of time. The Executive Director was confident that without significant changes being made, the operation would continue to be successful well into the future.

All three Executive Directors appear to demonstrate the characteristics as outlined by Ryan (1989):

...a visionary view of the future, a problem-solving orientation, a willingness to experiment, an impatience with bureaucracy, an encouragement of risk, a trust in subordinates, and a penchant for simplification (p.27)

3. Strong and Committed Foundation Boards

All three Foundation Boards reflected the type of composition and operating principles which were recommended in the literature by Kopecek (1988) and Sharron(1982a).

Woodbury (1989) expressed it as:

...the reason the colleges should extend their outreach beyond their own board of governors, is most community college boards represent a broad cross-section of the community. And while there may be members from the corporate sector, rarely are they present in sufficient numbers to provide access to the many CEO's with whom the college must communicate. Thus, when the college builds a foundation board, it should include members who are, or can provide access to, corporate leaders(p. 173).

The foundation board of directors were comprised of key community leaders who demonstrated a strong commitment to the college and its mandate. The Board of Directors of College C had the greatest length of service to the college. This Board had been in place for over ten years and had the good fortune of being led by a Chairman with leadership skills, commitment to the College and had demonstrated a high regard and respect for the leadership of the College President. Michael Worth (1985) pointed out the importance of this relationship between the chairman and the president:

Usually, fund raising leadership cannot be separated from a more substantive involvement with the institution . . . This means that members of a foundation or advisory board must be consulted and kept informed concerning the institution=s plans and goals. Such boards must recognize and respect that the final authority for academic programs and institutional policy, including that of fund raising, lies with the legal governing board. And the

governing board must recognize the institution=s volunteer leaders as full partners and be willing to benefit from their wisdom as well as their work and wealth . . . Achieving a balance of involvement with respect for defined roles requires skilful leadership by the public college or university president and the development office (p. 7).

The members of the boards represented a wide variety of businesses and the professions. Most Board Members were also involved with a cross-section of community initiatives and represented influence and affluence which facilitated fund raising from the corporate as well as the local community. This profile of successful board members was supported by the literature. Research indicates that foundation board members must be peers of those they solicit and must be involved with the “asking”. The commitment of the foundation board members is critical in the raising of funds.

As McNamara(1989) puts it:

...people like to give to people. The right people asking people who like to give will result in a successful institutional development program (p. 165).

All three boards were similar in make up with the exception of College C Foundation which had been together for an exceptional length of time. The community donors and the members of the board of governors who sat on the college foundation board, reflected the types of individuals that the research by Sharron(1982a), and Kopecek(1988), indicate would be beneficial for the college foundation board to have. These characteristics were: affluence and influence; involvement with the local community; and a strong commitment to the goals of the college with an appreciation for the role of the college president.

These boards represented the type of board needed for a strong foundation according to Worth (1985):

...governing boards of public institutions have a dual role - to serve both as advocates for the institution and as agents of the state, protecting the public interest and holding the college and university accountable for its use of public funds(p. 7).

4. The Importance for a Strong Case Which People Will Support

Each college foundation had established a strong case for support which included a scholarship and an endowment campaign. The number of students requiring financial support in each college foundation jurisdiction studied, was higher than the provincial average, according to the statistics provided by the Ministry of Education, Ontario Government. The case for donor support at College C Foundation, along with scholarships and bursaries, was to finance a major new facility with equipment and services that would serve students with special needs. This cause was seen as extremely beneficial to the students, the community and society in general.

According to Woodbury(1983):

...the foundation exists to provide the means by which the college can benefit from those things it needs but cannot provide with tax dollars..The primary purpose of establishing a community college foundation is to provide an effective vehicle for local solicitation of funds to help support programs and facilities at the college not adequately funded elsewhere(p. 12)

Neither the previous, nor this current fund raising goal for College C, was supported by tax dollars. The previous campaign for College C Foundation was to build a resi-

dence on campus. This residence allowed students to remain in their locale while gaining a college education.

Both campaigns were successful because the goals were each seen as important to the community and to the students, commented the Chairman of the fund raising campaign and member of the Board of Directors of College C Foundation during his interview.

The case for the College R Foundation campaign was to build a facility on the campus that would provide the necessary space and equipment needed to initiate new programs that were being sought by students for future employment opportunities. The same was true for College K Foundation. The programs that were to be established were aimed at providing students with knowledge and skills to meet future employment opportunities.

The importance of these goals were stated repeatedly throughout the interviews. Comments such as, investing in our own. and “giving back” were common phrases used by interviewees. Even the title of one of the campaigns Investing in Our Northern Heritage, connected the goal with the community. The title of the special needs campaign, called Unleash the Potential...Create a Lifetime of Opportunities, spoke of the commitment to a social need which, through this campaign, was addressed by the college through the support of the community. Camper, Trautmann and Adina Wiesenfeld (1989) stated:

Successful pursuit of corporate support requires community colleges to vigorously affirm their partnership with community institutions, agencies, and industries. Colleges must declare with pride their record in serving social and economic interests in their communities (p.185).

5. The Importance of Good Public Relations

The importance of good public relations and good will can not be overstated. College R Foundation was an example of the need for strong friend raising initiatives. The poor image of the college in the community was such that when the Executive Director began to establish the fund raising activities with the Board of Directors, much of the time and effort of the Executive Director and the President had to be devoted to establishing good communications and good will within the local community. A great deal of time and energy was consumed to correct the situation created by the President's predecessor.

The opposite situation appeared to be true for both other college foundations. The College C Foundation appeared to be seen as an integral part of the community from comments made by the interviewees of that foundation. The College K Foundation had not been in existence that long but had established a base through the automotive industry that had worked with the college over a period of time to establish a partnership that was seen as beneficial to the college, the community, the industry and most of all the students according to the interviewee comments of Community Donor and Board Members.

The importance of a good public relations program by the college was apparent in comparison to the rather poor public relations situation in the case of College R. The time

and commitment required to turn this situation into a positive was reinforced by Hudson(1989) who stated:

Public relations is a relatively small investment in the institutional budget, but it can pay major dividends in positive positioning among the community college constituencies(p. 98).

6. The Importance of the Involvement of College Employees

The involvement of the college employees in the foundation initiatives is very important. All three college foundations were supported financially by the employees of the institution. The importance of this type of commitment was recognized by Woodbury (1989) when he stated:

The fact that loyal staff support the college financially is an impressive asset when you are soliciting community gifts (p. 177).

With gifts-in-kind, the type of solicitation varied with the faculty represented on the board of directors of each foundation. Commitment to fund raising was most obvious by the Faculty Member of the Board of Directors at College K Foundation. He had been involved with the foundation and fund raising for a period of time and felt it was most beneficial to his students and his program. The Faculty Member of the Board of Directors of College C Foundation also stated he found fund raising and commitment by his former students to be extremely beneficial to his program. At one point in the interview, this Faculty Member indicated that he was so successful in gaining “gifts-in-kind” that there were times when he could not get anymore equipment into the physical laboratory space on campus. This Faculty Member felt a little guilty that his commitment was primarily

focused on his own discipline. He felt he had neglected to share the benefits of supporting the Foundation and the fund raising efforts with his colleagues. However, he indicated when he completed his interview for this study, that he was going to make a point of informing his colleagues of the benefits of supporting the Foundation. Many of his colleagues were actually already supporting the initiative of the Foundation, but mostly the case for the special needs campaign.

SUMMARY AND MAJOR FINDINGS

Economic pressures are forcing community colleges in Ontario to generate an increasing portion of their revenue from alternative funding sources. One of these alternative sources is the community college foundation. Although a relatively recent means of generating additional revenue in Ontario colleges, it is similar to a recent expansion of foundations in American community colleges as outlined at the beginning of this study, by Byron McClenney, President, Community College of Denver, who stated that the growth of foundations in American colleges has increased rapidly as colleges have experienced large decline in state funding between 1990 and 1995. As a result, the foundation as an alternative revenue source has become a much more important resource for American community colleges as evidenced in McClenney's speech to The Further Education Funding Council on February 27, 1995 in Toronto, Ontario. Further evidence of this growing concern in the United States for revenue generation was the Legislative Alert issued by a Kinnard Wright and Susan Kelley of the National Council for Resource Development. Wright and Kelley wanted to create an awareness among their colleagues of the pending legislation which would have a dramatic effect on funding for colleges in the United States. Therefore they issued the alert on August 18, 1995 to generate a reaction to this legislation. In order to determine the success achieved by Ontario college foundations, this study sought to learn the scope and form of soliciting the private sector for fund raising by three foundations using Mucklow's (1990) formula for success.

The results of the study indicate that of the 25 colleges in Ontario, 11 have established foundations to raise funds from the private sector to augment resources at the college. Of these, five foundations have acquired assets exceeding one million dollars between 1993-95, while five foundations have acquired assets exceeding \$300,000. Using Mucklow's formula, these results were comparable to the results of the national survey done by Angel and Gares (1987) study of 1,222 American community colleges that had 649 affiliated foundations, and were similar to the results of the (1985) study by Piland and Lowden (1992). In Angel and Gares study, of the 649 foundations, 31 per cent had assets of more than \$100,000, 11 per cent had assets of more than \$500,000 while 7 per cent had assets of over one million dollars. as reported in New Directions for Community Colleges (Angel and Gares, 1989)(p. 7).

During 1993-95, 10 colleges without foundations raised funds from the private sector to support colleges in Ontario. There was one college which did not raise funds from the private sector. Three colleges were in the process of formalizing their foundations at the time of the study. Of the ten colleges which raise funds without foundations, two colleges were able to acquire assets in excess of one million dollars, two colleges had assets greater than \$500,000 while, more than one-half of the colleges raised assets less than \$500,000.

COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN COLLEGE FOUNDATIONS IN CALIFORNIA AND ONTARIO COLLEGE FOUNDATIONS

Studies Done by Angel and Gares (1987), and Shaw (1996) and Piland and Lowden (1992)

Assets acquired by college	> \$ 100,000	> \$500,000	> \$ 1 million
Angel and Gares 1987 study	31%	11%	7%
Shaw's 1996 study of 11	36%	18%	45%

A study of California community colleges by Piland and Lowden(1992), Trustee Quarterly (Summer, 1992, p. 6-15) entitled California Community College Foundations; Fund-Raising Efforts, would appear to demonstrate similar trends to this Ontario study. However a direct comparison could not be made between the studies because the inflation rate, the time frame and the value of the dollar differ in each country. In this research study, of the 25 Ontario colleges surveyed, 11 colleges have established foundations since 1980. Three colleges were in the process of establishing foundations when the study was conducted. Although the results varied between colleges throughout the province, the trends were similar to the California college foundations studied by Piland and Lowden (1992), who observed:

Results from the survey were as varied as the colleges themselves. Substantial disparities were found in amounts of money raised and the length of the foundation existence, with no clear cut pattern emerging (p.7).

One of the first college foundations established in Ontario was modeled after the California community college foundation. This information was provided to the researcher during the interview with the president who established that foundation in

Ontario. The relevance of comparing the trends with the California college foundations and that of Ontario appeared to be reasonable although a direct comparison could not be made again because of the inflation rate, and the value of the dollar differing in each country.

**American college foundations in California and
Canadian college foundations in Ontario**

Assets acquired	Piland and Lowden's (1992)	number of	Shaw's (1997)	number of
	Study	foundations	Study	foundation
< \$50,000	23.07%	12	0%	0
\$50,000- 99,000	7.69%	4	0%	0
\$100,000-	34.61%	18	36.36%	4
\$500,000-	23.07%	12	18.18%	2
> \$1 million	11.53%	6	45.45%	5

In Piland and Lowden's (1992) study, 50 foundation directors were surveyed and the results achieved for the study was a 96% response rate. Although the number of college foundations differ between Ontario and California, the response rate for the survey was comparable. Piland and Lowden (1992) found that:

While the mean was \$458,303, the low ranged from \$0 to a high of \$4 million, with the median falling at \$180,000. The foundation that raised the \$4 million has been in existence for eight years, while the foundation that did not raise any money has been established for 18 years. Of the 46 community colleges that responded to the question, 12 raised under \$50,000, four raised over \$50,000 but less than \$100,000, 18 raised over \$100,000 but under \$500,000, and 12 raised over \$500,000. Six foundations raised over \$1 million (p.7).

In the Ontario study, the mean was \$869,000.64, with all the foundations raising at least \$100,000. The median of the Ontario college foundations was \$837,220. Although

the results of the Ontario study were higher than the California foundations, the numbers of college foundations in California, was greater and the time frame in which the California study was conducted 1990-91 was not the same as the Ontario study. Therefore, these studies were not parallel and no conclusions can be drawn. However, it would appear that the Ontario college foundations having built their organization following the California model, have established a relatively good organization in order to achieve the results necessary to be successful.

The results of the Ontario study in comparison to the comprehensive study done by Angel and Gares (1987) which surveyed 1,222 community colleges, with at least 649 affiliated foundations, show the survey results were not that dissimilar to that the of Piland and Lowden (1992) study. The report of their study by Angel and Gares (1989) indicates:

...that by 1987 community colleges of all types and sizes had established foundations. . . fully 82 percent (649) of the 793 public and private community colleges reporting claimed to have a foundation, and of those that did not, one-third were considering establishing one(p.8).

Comparisons can not be made with this Ontario study because they are not parallel to the Angel and Gares(1987) study, plus the Canadian dollar is substantially lower in value to the American dollar and therefore the results are not comparable. However, it is interesting to note that the results of the Ontario study are not that dissimilar to the Angel and Gares(1989) study either.

This research was to determine the form and scope of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges when scope is defined as results, staffing

and purpose, and the form is defined as foundations or other funding sources. Of the 25 colleges in Ontario, members of the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario between 1993-95 who were surveyed to determine how they raised funds from non-governmental sources, 11 college foundations and 10 colleges without foundations raised funds from the private sector to augment resources of the college. Twenty-one colleges raised funds to support the resources of the college.

Discussion of the Ontario College Foundations Based on the Characteristics of Successful College Foundations in the Literature

The three foundations selected for further research using Mucklow's formula were analysed according to the criteria established by the literature. The following are the characteristics of successful foundations according to the standards set by American colleges and the attainment of these criteria by the three Ontario college foundations chosen for further analysis.

The characteristics used to assess the potential for successful foundations were:

- level of assets acquired from private sector fund raising per FTE
- nature and extent of involvement with the foundation by the president of the college
- level of staffing and executive directors responsible for foundation operations
- prestige, connections, number of board members of foundation, and the length of time the foundation has been established

- college employee involvement
- allocation of resources raised
- donor recognition programs
- professional association
- alumni involvement
- level of funds raised vis a vis potential wealth of community
- extent of public relations developed with potential donors
- planning and meeting objectives outlined by board of directors.

The three foundations selected for further research were analysed according to the criteria established by the literature. The following are the characteristics of successful foundations according to the standards set by American colleges and the attainment of these criteria by the three Ontario college foundations chosen for further analysis.

1. Level of funds raised according the number of full-time student equivalent enrolled.

Criteria as determined by Luck (1974); Silvera (1974); Sneed (1978); and Mucklow (1990).

All three foundations raised an average of \$148 per student when using Mucklow's (1990) formula of total assets acquired in 1994-95 divided by the total FTE. In the Angel and Gares (1981) study of American college foundations Community and Junior College

Journal, (November, 1981) which:

...represents a cross section of colleges . . . that are considered to be successful based upon their foundation assets and annual dollar support (p. 7), \$313 per full time student, was the highest level of assets attained by any of the college foundations. With foundations in the Angel and Gare's study achieving less in terms of a dollar figure per student, it would appear that although Ontario college foundations have not been in existence as long as the foundations in Angel and Gare's study, value of assets attained by Ontario colleges are beginning to follow the pattern similar to that set by their American colleagues.

2. The nature and extent of involvement with the foundation by the president of the college.

Criteria established by Smith, (1986); Robison, (1989); Duronio & Loessin, (1991); Sims, (1973); and Tolle, (1966).

It is probably not an overstatement to suggest that no college or university can afford to have less than 60 per cent of the chief executive's time devoted to meaningful development of the institution's major constituencies (Robinson, 1986 p.18).

All three college presidents saw their role as articulating the college mission and envisioning its goals as motivators and communicators. The importance of establishing the foundation with the long term in mind and understanding that the need to build a strong board was extremely important to each president. The literature suggests:

...a well chosen foundation board gives both the college and the community confidence that the resources of the college are being well managed. The people who serve on their boards are not only important in fund raising but provide invaluable linkages between the college and its community constituencies. (Robinson, 1989, p.20).

The only aspect of the Ontario foundation survey results which was not consistent with the American literature was the reported percentage of Ontario presidents' time committed to fund raising by the three successful foundations. The survey results indicate the three most successful foundations had relatively limited direct involvement of the president in their fund raising initiatives. Foundations with fewer assets had substantially greater involvement by the president in their fund raising initiatives according to the survey results. Therefore the criteria of presidential commitment to fund raising did not reflect the research results of comparable American college foundations. However, the interviews conducted with board members of the foundation, the executive directors, and the community donors indicated that time may be only one measurement of the commitment by the president. It appears that the quality of time provided and the leadership and personality of the president was more influential to the success of the foundation than the actual time spent by the president in fund raising. Although the survey results of the president's time committed to fund raising indicate only 0-10% time committed, it would appear that each president played a significant role in the success of the college foundation. In the interviews, the leadership of the president at each college foundation investigated was described as being influential in the success of the foundation. Each president was in office when the foundation was incorporated and took a personal interest in the creation and development of the foundation. As well each president played a key role in the solicitation of funds for the foundation and acted as a mentor or resource for the staff, particularly during the creation and initiation of the campaign by the foundation. The commitment on the part of the president was described in each interview conducted.

Therefore, it can only be surmised that the percentage of time as estimated by the president did not correspond to the nature of the president's influence on the success of the foundation.

3. Level of staffing and executive director responsible for foundation operations;.

Criteria determined by Miller (1991).

More than one half of the foundations had full-time staff. Six of the foundations had executive directors. Of these, the three most successful foundations each had a full-time executive director, full-time support and part-time clerical staff. The foundations with fewer assets tended to hire less full-time and more part-time staff to operate their foundation with only three having full-time executive directors. Each of the executive directors were considered to be a significant part of the success that was achieved by the successful foundations according to the members of the board who were interviewed. This was related to the researcher by each interviewee and with such enthusiasm that this researcher deemed it was a genuinely heartfelt sentiment by each interviewee who discussed this point. Each executive director was involved with their board, showed a commitment to the college, and was thoroughly acquainted with their community. They each had a very professional approach to their vocation and appeared to have a strength and ability to motivate staff, board members, and the college community.

4. The prestige, connections and number of foundation board members as well as size of the board and number of years in operation.

Criteria determined by Sprangler (1994); Graham (1994).

Each of the board of directors consisted of members representing the professions, (ie. legal, accounting, banking, etc.) as well as key members from business and industry. Strong connections with national and multinational corporations were also evident. The personal wealth of individuals varied but the commitment shown by the members of the various boards was unquestionably strong with many devoting a significant number of hours to achieving the goals of the foundation. The board members connections and commitment led to large corporate gifts, and they provided sound investment policies for the foundation. The tenure of community members on the foundation board of directors correlates with other research, particularly studies done by Piland and Lowden (1992), Mucklow,(1990) and Kopecek(1988). Of the 11 foundation board of directors, 9 foundations have between 15 and 22 board members. The number of board members outlined in the survey results is an optimal size of board of directors as recommended by other researchers.

5. College employee involvement.

Over one-half of the foundations involve college employees on the board of directors. One hundred per cent of the six foundations with the greatest assets have involve-

ment of the college administrators, with more than 75 per cent of these boards having representation of faculty and support staff as members of the foundation board. Research by Keener (1989) and Mucklow (1990) support the importance of the involvement of college employees in the ultimate success of the foundation. The importance of the employee contribution to the fund raising is integral to furthering the development of gifts-in-kind opportunities, greater liaison with the private sector for student co-operative placements, and ultimately to the employment of the college graduates.

6. Allocation of resources raised and total assets acquired between 1993-95.

Criteria as determined by Luck (1974); Silvera (1974); Sneed (1978); and Mucklow (1990).

It would appear that, although the Ontario college foundations are very much the junior in terms of length of time in operation, the level of assets acquired by those selected for further study in Ontario are of a similar level to the American college foundations selected for similar research. However, Ontario college foundation allocation of resources to scholarships was not consistent with the research. In Ontario only 70 per cent of the foundations raised money for scholarships while 96 per cent of the California foundations in Piland and Lowden's study raise money for scholarships. Similarly in Angel and Gare's 1987 study, the number of foundations raising funds for scholarships was ninety-five per cent. The amount of money raised by each college foundation in Ontario varied considerably. However, with five foundations having assets over one million dollars and four foun-

datations having assets between \$100,000 and \$500,000, although the total assets were a higher percentage in Ontario, the number of foundations and the range of assets in California was greater with the variation from zero to over one million dollars.

7. Donor recognition programs.

Criteria determined by Duffy (1977); Sharron (1978); Mays (1985).

The extent of the donor base for each foundation was extremely impressive with each campaign reaching beyond the local communities into the national corporate sectors. Public relations of this calibre (national corporations, banks and service industries) was attained by the cultivation and solicitation by foundation board members with an appropriate donor recognition program to attract this broad base of support. Each college foundation received in excess of several hundreds of thousands of dollars by national businesses, banks and corporations, and each foundation aligned the donor recognition program to profile the support of such benefactors and did so in such a way as to garner further support from the same donors in the future. Utilizing donor recognition as a means of soliciting support from the private sector appeared to be one of the most distinctive differences between the successful foundations in Ontario colleges versus those which had attained fewer resources. Successful Ontario college foundations have established donor recognition programs. Less successful foundations did not have donor recognition programs in place. Studies by Woodbury(1989), Angel and Gares(1981), Piland and Lowden(1992), shows that donor recognition as part of the cultivation and publicity

process results in greater support for foundations than those which do not cultivate and profile their donors appropriately. This study would support the research on this topic.

8. The association with professional organizations.

Criteria established by Hunter (1989).

The importance of supporting the college foundation staff by providing current and useful information through associating with professional organizations is verified by the survey results which indicate that one hundred per cent of the successful foundations each are affiliated with a professional organization whereas the less successful foundations were not.

9. The involvement and ongoing communication with the alumni.

Criteria established by Porkrass (1989).

The communication with and the involvement of the alumni by one hundred per cent of the successful foundations would appear to correspond with the research by Porkrass (1989). Although Harvard's research in 1975 had been discounted by Sharron (1982a) and others as to the importance of alumni involvement in soliciting support for the foundation, Porkrass points out that the alumni are important to the college foundation in their program for a successful campaign. This survey would support Porkrass's research.

10. Level of funds raised according to the potential wealth of resources in the community.

Criteria determined by Pickett (1977); Leslie (1979); and Duronio & Loessin (1991).

The three college foundations were each located in different parts of the province of Ontario. They were all considered mid-size colleges and each were located in a geographic area that had a significant economic resource base. The size of the community in which each college was located was considered a medium size community with a population in excess of 100,000 people. The economic resource base was distinct within each community. The economy of each area was based on natural resources that supported a strong local economy, not totally dependent on one industry. Each foundation received significant support from local industries, businesses and the professional communities. They provided financial contributions as well as human resource contributions with employees, including CEO's, sitting on foundation boards, campaign cabinets, and college advisory committees.

11. The extent of public relations developed with potential donors.

Criteria determined by Duffy (1977); Sharron (1978); and Mays (1985).

The extent of the donor base for each foundation was extremely impressive. The campaign for each foundation reached beyond the local communities into the national

corporate sectors. Public relations of this calibre (national corporations, banks, and service industries) was attained by the cultivation and solicitation by foundation board members. Each college foundation received in excess of several hundreds of thousands of dollars by national businesses, banks, and corporations.

12. Planning and meeting the objectives outlined by the foundation board and staff members.

Criteria as determined by Sim (1973); Silvera (1974); Luck (1974); Duffy (1980); and Nunz (1986).

The President of College C., stated when asked why his college foundation had been successful:

We were one of the first to take the role of the Foundation seriously . . . to market the college through the foundation. It is successful because the initial Board Members including the Chair were previously on the Board of Governors at the college, . . . the Chair was a very successful businessman and vice president of a corporation . . . the other members of the Board were very successful business leaders . . . they took their mandate seriously from the outset. (Interview with the president of College C, 1996).

Each foundation board had a planning committee in place or one that was struck and was to initiate planning in the immediate future. Some of the board members were more involved with strategizing for their campaign than others. Two of the foundations were concerned that their planning was not as well done as they would have liked. Their campaign strategy had been put together and each had worked towards achieving their goal. However, government funding that was to match the resources they had collected to

date was not forthcoming at the time of the research. This left the foundations with a void in their implementation strategy because they did not have a contingency plan on which to fall back. However, each foundation board was meeting to resolve this concern and to lay out plans for other opportunities for the foundation to reach its goals.

As the importance of the college president's leadership and commitment to fund raising is stated consistently in research done on fund raising, (Kopecek, 1983; McNamara, 1989; Woodbury, 1989; Smith, 1986; and others), it would appear that this is a very crucial element that should be given more serious consideration by the boards of governors in Ontario colleges when hiring future presidents. In Piland and Lowden (1992) the president's involvement in fund raising is considered 'part of the territory' and this responsibility should be recognized as essential to the role of the president(p.7). According to G. T. Smith (1986)," Without strong presidential leadership and commitment, little can be accomplished". Robinson advises, " It is probably not an overstatement to suggest that no college or university can afford to have less than 60 per cent of the chief executive's time devoted to meaningful development of the institution's major constituencies. The public's perception of the president will have a significant influence on attracting major donors and excellent members for the community college foundation's board of directors". (1989, p. 18). Although the data from Ontario college foundations would indicate that the presidents of the successful foundations did not participate as fully in the fund raising efforts as the literature would deem is necessary, the comments from the interviewees would suggest that presidential commitment was in fact crucial to the success of the fund raising efforts.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The previous chapters included an introduction to this study; a review of related literature; a discussion of the methods of collecting and analysing the data; responses to the research questions; and findings from the data collected from the participants in this study. This final chapter offers a summary of observations and conclusions gained through this study, some personal reflections and recommendations for further investigation.

This study investigated the scope and form of solicitation of the private sector by colleges in Ontario between 1993-95. The objective was to identify which colleges used foundations for fund raising, to ascertain how the colleges conducted their solicitation and to search for common patterns and themes exhibited by college foundations which were considered successful. The literature sources provided a theoretical base from which to determine characteristics which were common to college foundations considered successful. From this research, the study ascertained if the colleges operating with foundations followed a similar pattern to those in American colleges which had foundations.

The study design incorporated individual interviews with participants selected from three Ontario college foundations. Following the data collection, interviews were

audiotaped, transcribed and analysed according to the criteria commonly held as indicators of successful college foundations. The implications of this study can provide an important source of information for boards and administrators of colleges who may be considering:

- establishing a college foundation
- alternate means to augment college financial resources
- foundation boards of directors evaluating their current status and how it could be improved.

Overall findings indicate that:

1. Forty four percent (44%) of Ontario colleges solicited funds from the private sector using affiliated foundations to augment the financial resources for the college during the term of investigation 1993-95. This participation rate is higher than Mucklow's (1990) national rate of 31 1/2 % of colleges in Canada which used foundations to solicit funds from the private sector.
2. The Angel and Gare(1989) study revealed 82% of the American colleges of "all types and sizes"(p.8) conducted fund raising through a foundation. This study indicated 44% of Ontario colleges conducted fundraising from the private sector by the use of College foundations.
3. Eighty four percent (84%) of all Ontario colleges conducted fund raising from the private sector during the period of investigation of this study. Twelve out of

twenty five (48%) of these colleges were in the process of investigating the formation of a foundation or had recently created a foundation to support their fund raising efforts as indicated from letters written by the presidents which accompanied their survey results. This finding supports studies done by Sharron (1978); Mitzel (1991); Angel & Gare (1989) and Mucklow (1990) which indicated a trend to establish foundations for the support of College fund raising efforts.

4. The level of funds raised by Ontario colleges with foundations was similar to the success ratio of college foundations in California when compared on a FTE basis .These results support the research by Angel & Gare (1989) and Piland and Lowden (1992).

5. Although the extent of involvement by the three presidents in fund raising by colleges with successful foundations was not initially indicated, the Board Members when interviewed reported that the three presidents were extensively involved. The presidential involvement with fund raising by colleges without foundations was also congruent with the literature. This anomaly was addressed in the previous discussion, it partially supports the conclusions of Clements (1990); Muller (1986); Robinson (1989); and Janney (1994) and it reinforces the importance of the College President to the success of fund raising efforts.

6. Of the three successful Ontario College foundations, all reported a full-time executive director and part-time support staff who supported the operational functions of the foundation. The eight less successful foundations reported that they lacked the leadership of an executive director to guide the operations and to support the Board of the foundation. Similarly, 60% of the ten colleges which raise funds without the support of a foundation reported that full-time college staff are designated with the responsibility for raising funds from the private sector. These findings support the research of Dial (1993); and Hunter (1987) which indicated the significance of having full time staff to direct the fundraising efforts as being integral to the success of those endeavours.
7. The successful Ontario college foundations which were studied have each operated less than 20 years. This finding supports the research of Robison (1982); Sharron (1982); and Degerstedt (1982) which discussed the vitality of the newly formed foundations. The Ontario college foundations reflect the commitment pattern of Board Members as outlined in the research.
8. The Ontario study revealed that successful foundations had strong and committed members of the board of directors. These successful foundations had between 15-22 members on the board with an average term of office of four years. This finding was similar to the recommended number and term length of the successful American college foundation boards as indicated by research of Kopecek (1982); Warnick (1990); and Gatewood (1994).

9. The successful Ontario college foundations reported they involved 10-50 % of the college faculty, staff, and administrators in the fund raising efforts for the college. Similarly colleges which raised funds without foundations reported 10-50% of their staff were involved in fund raising. The strong faculty, staff and administration involvement is critical to the success of fundraising and supports the research of Gatewood (1994); Mucklow (1990).

10. Ontario colleges reported a strategic focus on fund raising for scholarships and bursaries as an integral component of their fund raising success. These findings support the research of Clements (1990); Warnick (1990); Henry (1988) which indicated the importance of a focus directed to scholarships and bursaries for successful college fund raising.

11. Ontario colleges communicate with their alumni associations. Although this support was not deemed significant by many researchers, it did support Harvard's (1975,) research which indicated the importance of involving alumni in successful fund raising endeavours.

The importance of following the identified format which has proven successful was reinforced by the literature review as delineated earlier. The findings of this study show Ontario colleges are continuing their entrepreneurial methods to become less reliant on government support to sustain their operations. The need for Ontario colleges to

support their operations by using foundations to partner with the community and the private sector to reinforce the financial base of the college is especially important when considering: changing demographics; the changing skills required of college graduates; fluctuation of community economic conditions and the changing philosophy of the political parties which form the Ontario government. All of these challenges reinforce the importance of the colleges remaining relevant to the needs of the community.

As the Canadian and Ontario political systems grapple with national debt and the provincial deficit, the financial support for post-secondary education has lost some of its status relative to other pressing societal needs. Recognition by the college sector that they can be masters of their own destiny through the support and involvement of a college foundation appears to be the rationale for a rapid increase in the development of college foundations in Ontario. This study will provide the college decision makers with a benchmark from which to assess their strengths and weaknesses when analysing their potential for fund raising.

The specific characteristics for successful foundations as determined by previous research have been reinforced by this study. These characteristics are:

1. The support, involvement and commitment to the foundation by the college president, the foundation board of directors, and the college community.

2. The commitment of sufficient resources to operate with a full-time staff consisting of a qualified administrator and secretarial support.
3. The need for judicious care and scrutiny in selecting well-connected foundation board members who are known as community leaders and productive fund raisers.
4. The necessity of positive public relations and community involvement with the college and the college foundation.
5. The need for effective communication between the college board of governors and the foundation board of directors, with cross representation on each board by a member of the other board.
6. The recognition by the college board of governors in setting goals and objectives in conjunction with the foundation board of directors to support the college in being a real asset to the community.
7. The realization that the development of the foundation and its fund raising efforts is a long-term strategy which enhance the financial assets of the college and builds partnerships which increases the relevance of the college to the community.

8. The importance of personal contributions (by the president, board members and employees) as a prerequisite to fund raising in leading by example.
9. The recognition that students are an integral part of the fund raising process and should be invited to participate at all levels.
10. The awareness that it is important to create an alumni involvement which grows over time.

CONSIDERATIONS

The results of this study indicate the Ontario colleges which raised funds from the private sector have acquired financial assets similar to the level of funds raised by American college foundations with similar FTE ratios. A study by Mucklow(1990) created a formula which appeared to determine the success of fund raising using the number of FTE' s divided by the dollar value of funds raised over a period of time. This study used Mucklow's formula as it was the only formula in all the literature reviewed which enabled the researcher to compare real data as the basis for determining the success of fund raising over a specific period of time.

EXPANSION OF MUCKLOW'S THEORY

Having completed this research study and looking back on what the literature seemed to suggest, I believe that the definition for success should be expanded. Instead of simply considering the number of full-time equivalent students divided by the total dollar assets acquired during a specific period of time, I feel a much broader definition should be used in predicting potential success for colleges and foundations in fund raising and friend raising endeavours.

Mucklow's formula appears too narrow in two respects. First, the number of students should be expanded to reflect the true size of the college enrollment which includes the large number of continuing education students, part-time learners as well as the traditional full-time students. Second, Mucklow's formula does not make provision for several types of assets in addition to simple dollars collected. The formula should include the material assets acquired by the college through partnership arrangements with business, industry, and the community; the physical assets such as housing, art collections, buildings owned and operated by the foundation, or planned giving through insurance, and bequests and other gifts-in-kind and matching funds which support the college, cash or financial commitment is only a part of the assets which a foundation can acquire on behalf of the college.

Although this study focused particularly on college foundations, findings indicated that significant assets are also acquired by development offices at colleges. College

foundations are arm's-length operations which support the financial goals of the college and development offices are an operational component of the college which are administered under the same crown corporation guidelines as the college they serve. Colleges in Ontario are prohibited from holding legal title to physical resources, whereas the foundation is a legal entity distinct from the college, operated by a separate board of directors and has the ability to hold legal title to physical resources which are utilized but not owned by the college.

The importance of the role of friend raising and fund raising must be shared as an integral part of the responsibilities of board members, college employees, and community volunteers and not just deemed as the responsibility of the president. Interestingly, the survey results indicated that some colleges without a foundation appeared to generate assets equivalent to, or greater than some colleges with foundations. However, these colleges which used the development offices appeared to require much more of the president's time in fund raising than those colleges which undertook fund raising through the support of a foundation. The primary role of the Director of the foundation is to act as an ambassador for the college, as well as facilitating partnerships, and fund raising opportunities within the community.

THE ROLE OF THE FOUNDATION AS A CATALYST

Looking back on the interviews and the discussions that followed them, I realize the role of the college foundation can be that of a catalyst as well as a fund raiser by providing:

- a human face for the college to the external community at large and assist in relationship building;
- a resource to facilitate a greater awareness of the needs of the community to the college;
- an opportunity for others to relieve the primary responsibility of friend raising and fund raising from the president;
- opportunities to showcase the expertise of the college faculty and staff;
- increased professional affiliation and networking with the community and those in the private sector.

The foundation acting as a catalyst, can also increase a sense of pride and involvement of the college community with the local geographic community to create additional prestige and name recognition which can ultimately enhance the profile of the college in the community.

The role of the foundation as a catalyst for friend raising and fund raising requires the following:

- projects and goals that reflect the needs of the community as well as that of the college

- good communications and relationships between the board of directors of the foundation and the college board of governors
- leadership within the college that promotes involvement in friend raising and fund raising by all members of the college community both internally and externally
- knowledgeable, committed, involved and well-connected members of the board of directors, executive directors and staff of the foundation
- strong public relations to create active community support.

The findings of this study indicate that there are three elements which are key to success in fund raising:

- Leadership
- Location by positioning the college
- Linkages

Leadership

Leadership must be a shared vision and mission by the college in supporting the community it serves. True leadership creates a partnership within the institution that generates a sense of pride, ownership, and involvement which results in a commitment by college employees and board members to become true ambassadors for the institution. Leadership is pervasive throughout the college and the foundation by the president, by a strong board of directors of the foundation, and by enthusiastic and committed foundation

staff and college employees. Friend raising results in enhanced public relations which creates the kind of credibility and positioning for the institution that facilitates fund raising.

Location

By positioning the college through programs and services that support the needs of the geographic community served by the college, demonstrating good will is a critical element in the ultimate success of the fund raising endeavours by the foundation and the college. When the college is strategically positioned, it allows the college to play an integral role in the growth and development of the community it serves and ultimately facilitates the role of fund raising by the institution. The significance of this positioning can be judged by examples of colleges which strategically take advantage of supporting their local environmental needs, as in the case of College C with the mining sector, College K with the automotive sector, and College R with the horticultural sector.

Colleges must position their programs and services in order to sustain their support for community liaison which also protects the college from enrolment decline in the face of a vast increase in the number of competing institutions, programs and services. Friend raising and fund raising is becoming a much greater challenge for the college leadership, the development directors and members of the board because the college must be seen as a relevant and an integral component in the growth and development of that community.

Linkages

Another criteria for successful fund raising are the linkages formed through friend raising endeavours such as:

- partnerships in training potential employees for community businesses;
- collaboration with businesses in applied research; and shared use of facilities;
- access to the community through membership and involvement with community organizations to gain a greater awareness of the needs of the business community;
- enhancing the profile of the college which creates a sense of pride in the external community and a greater understanding of the needs of the college;
- the importance of having community leaders as members of the board of directors of the foundation, make friend raising and fund raising more readily accepted because such individuals have a direct involvement and understanding of the needs the college.

Friend raising is a way of creating linkages which serve the needs of the college by sharing the college vision and mission through committed ambassadors.

REFLECTIONS

As a practitioner in the role of executive director of a college foundation for more than nine years, and as someone who has been asked by several colleges to speak to their boards of governors about the role and structure of foundations, I felt it would be benefi-

cial to determine if there were criteria that could predict what makes a foundation successful. My involvement as an executive director of a foundation has crossed the lines between the public and private sectors on many many occasions. In order to build liaison with the community, one has to understand and be sensitive to the needs of the business community, in addition to an appreciation of the role and responsibilities of the public sector. Although the literature would indicate the role of the president is rather hierarchical, the connectiveness between the college foundation and the community must be shaped by the staff and the board of directors of the foundation to create a network of friends within the community which ultimately supports the needs of the college. This will only come about if those "friends" of the college have a thorough appreciation and understanding of the needs of the college.

The importance of this connectiveness must be a priority with the foundation staff and board, for without these relationship, the resources which can assist the college's growth and development would not be forthcoming. The withdrawal of government support for post-secondary education through restructuring of transfer payments has created a huge increase in competition for the private sector support of education. This competition has raised the level of awareness by the public and the private sector of the need for financial support for post-secondary education. However, there is a limit to available financial support. As a result, the importance of board members, presidents and staff connectiveness with the community and the business sector could determine the level of service the institution is ultimately able to provide. Therefore, the importance of friend raising cannot be understated.

Many individuals within the private sector are not aware of the changes in transfer payments by the federal government because the focus of these cutbacks have been profiled in the media as primarily affecting the health care sector. As a result, gaining public attention and recognition of a potential problem in post-secondary funding is extremely difficult when one considers the changing demographics and aging population, and the fear generated by the media with pronouncements of near epidemic cancer disease , heart disease and communicable diseases. This is compounded with the competition by the health sector with a well established medical lobby in Canada, and the tremendous Canadian pride in "accessible" health care. It makes gaining attention for educational concerns very challenging.

However as one can see from the assets achieved by the Ontario colleges with foundations, as well as the colleges that raise funds through development offices, the Ontario college system has been successful in capturing some of the attention of the private sector and the general public.

The results of this study confirm that:

- there is a need to recognize the importance of friend raising and fund raising by colleges in order to sustain their growth and development
- boards of governors should take into consideration the experience of the candidate in fund raising when hiring future presidents
- recognition of the importance of promoting the institution through image building, name recognition, relationship building through partnerships with private

sector, promoting graduates and faculty, as well as profiling institutional goals congruent with community goals

- promote the use of "gifts-in-kind" as well as planned giving opportunities
- recognition of the role of the foundation in facilitating fund raising, friend raising and expanding the impact of the college through relationship building.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

With the growth of college foundations in Ontario in 1993 at 44 % in comparison with the study done by Mucklow(1990), with 25 % of the colleges having foundations, it is apparent this is a rapidly growing area.

1. There is a need to continue the research in this area due to the growth in competition in the not-for-profit sector. The need for further study to facilitate the professionalization of fund raising in post secondary education would allow greater research and further the development of techniques, knowledge and information which would ultimately lead to an enhanced level of success.
2. It would appear the days of government funding being the primary source of financial support for post secondary education is coming to an end. There is growing recognition in the literature that the ability to raise funds and demonstrate strong public relations skills are vital to the role of president. Therefore, there is a need for further research to create valid selection criteria for boards of

governors in selecting presidential candidates which recognizes the person's potential for fund raising and public relations.

3. There are various means of supporting post secondary education by the private sector. The growth of planned giving, the importance of gifts-in-kind (particularly for colleges), and the accelerated participation through partnerships and sponsorships all can be grouped under the guise of fund raising. However, in order for research studies to test the growth in these areas, separate reporting mechanisms for data analysis should be created in order to delineate these different means of support. Professional organizations such as the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education in Canada should agree upon the criteria which would delineate these different means of support, making quantitative research more reflective of reality.
4. As most research in fund raising at the post secondary level has been carried out in the United States, Canadian institutions generally are not aware of the value and role fund raising plays within the post secondary area. It is felt this area and the skills required to perform the role would receive greater recognition as a profession, if there was more research in this area to reflect to reflect the value fund raising has for the institution.
5. With changes in government financial support for public sector organizations, fund raising is becoming an important alternative for Ontario institutions.

Research studies are needed to assess the role of fund raising in augmenting support for government sponsored agencies, such as the health sector, social service agencies, educational institutions, arts and culture, and sports organizations, which have each had a significant reduction in government support, particularly in the last five years.

In summary this study demonstrates that foundations are crucial to sustaining and building on the vital role colleges play in Ontario.

APPENDIX A

COLLEGES QUALIFYING FOR STUDY

Table 23

COLLEGES QUALIFYING FOR STUDY

	FUNDRAISING FROM PRIVATE SECTOR	DISCLOSED DATA	FOUNDATIONS ESTABLISHED	COLLEGES QUALIFIED FOR STUDY	FUNDRAISING THROUGH FOUNDATIONS	NON-FOUNDATION FUNDRAISING	INTERVIEWS
College A	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College B	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no
College C	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
College D	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College E	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College F	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no
College G	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College H	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College I	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College J	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College K	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College L	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
College M	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College N	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College O	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College P	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College Q	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College R	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
College S	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College T	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
College U	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
College V	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no
College W	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
College X	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no
College Y	yes	yes	no	yes	no	yes	no
TOTAL AFFIRMATIVES	24	21	12	21	11	10	3

APPENDIX B

ENGLISH LANGUAGE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

WHAT ROLE DO FOUNDATIONS PLAY IN AUGMENTING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR ONTARIO COLLEGES?

ENGLISH LANGUAGE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

English Language Survey

The questions in this survey should be considered only in relation to private fund raising efforts of the college. Private fund raising is defined as gift income from such sources as individuals, corporations, businesses, foundations, etc. It does not include income from federal, provincial or local governments sources.

The foundation referred to in this questionnaire is a college-affiliated foundation defined as a nonprofit, charitable organization created for the exclusive purpose of benefitting a particular college.

PART I - GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Title/Position _____

2. College _____

3. The student FTE (full time equivalent) enrolment for your college from 1993-95

4. Does your college seek funding from private sector sources?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If no, ...please return this survey in the stamped self-addressed envelope as soon as possible....and thank you for your cooperation with this project.

5. Does your college have an affiliated foundation for fund raising purposes?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, ...please proceed to page 2 and complete only Part II of this survey.

6. Does your college seek funds from private sources but does not have a foundation?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes,please proceed to page 5 and complete only Part III of this survey.

PART II: FOUNDATION QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Structure and function of the foundation:

1. What year was the foundation incorporated as a separate entity from the college? _____
2. Approximately how much time does the president of the college spend on fund raising?
☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %
3. Does the foundation have a full-time executive director?
☐ Yes ☐ No
4. Does the foundation have full-time staff? How many? _____
☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Does the foundation have part-time staff? How many? _____
☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Does the person responsible for fund raising have any previous experience in this field?
☐ Yes ☐ No
7. If yes to #6, please explain _____

B. Board of Director of the Foundation

1. How many members are on the board of directors of the foundation? _____
2. How many members of the board of the foundation are from outside the college jurisdiction? _____
3. How long is the average term of office of each board members? (In years) _____
4. Were any of the board members elected/appointed from the college board of governors?
☐ Yes ☐ No
5. If yes, how many? _____
6. How often does the foundation board meet?
 monthly? ☐ quarterly? ☐ semi-annually? ☐
7. Does the foundation board have an executive committee?
☐ Yes ☐ No
8. If yes, how often does it meet?
 weekly ☐ monthly ☐ quarterly ☐ semi-annually ☐
9. Does the foundation board include faculty?
☐ Yes ☐ No
10. Does the foundation board include support staff?
☐ Yes ☐ No

11. Does the foundation board include other administration?

☐ Yes ☐ No

12. Does the foundation board include students?

☐ Yes ☐ No

C. Programs administered by the foundation

1. Does the foundation administer a planned giving program?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the foundation conduct annual campaigns?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does the foundation administer capital campaigns?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Does the foundation hire external professional(s) to conduct capital campaigns?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Please estimate the level of involvement of your college staff and faculty (worked with and/or contributed to) your fund raising program between 1993-95?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

6. What percentage of the funds raised went into college projects?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

7. What percentage of the funds raised support the foundation?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

8. Does the foundation acquire real estate and other forms of investment?

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Does the foundation have specific fund raising for scholarships, bursaries?

☐ Yes ☐ No

D. Affiliations and Recognition

1. Does the foundation belong to the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the foundation have an alumni association?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does the college send regular communiques to your alumni?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Does your foundation have a formalized program for the recognition of gifts?

☐ Yes ☐ No

E. Financial Data

1. What were the new assets in total dollar amounts for your nonprofit foundation (cash, property, securities, equipment, endowments, etc.) between 1993-95? _____

2. Including salaries, what was the total expenditure of the foundation between 1993-95?

Would you like a report of the findings of this study?

☐ Yes ☐ No

PART III - FUND RAISING QUESTIONNAIRE**E. Form and Structure of Fund Raising for your College:**

1. Approximately how much time does the president spend on fund raising?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

2. Does the college have full-time staff responsible for fund raising?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. If yes, how many full-time staff are responsible for fund raising?

4. How many part-time staff are involved with fund raising?

5. Does the person responsible for fund raising report to the president?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. If no to #5, does the staff member report to the vice president?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. If no to #5 and #6, does the staff member report to someone else? Please explain.

F. Fund raising Format

1. Are members of the board of governors involved in fund raising for the college?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the fund raising involve a capital campaign?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Do you have an annual campaign for fund raising?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Does your college raise funds for scholarships?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Please indicate what percentage of your administrators were involved in (worked with and/or contributed to) Your fund raising program between 1993-95?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

8. Please indicate what percentage of your faculty were involved in (worked with and/or contributed to) your fund raising program between 1993-95?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

9. Please indicate what percentage of your support staff were involved in (worked with and/or contributed to) your fund raising program between 1993-95?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

G. Volunteer Support

1. Does the fund raising program solicit volunteers through the board of governors?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Are volunteers solicited through the advisory committees?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Are volunteers solicited through other sources? (Please explain)

4. Are the funds raised directed to scholarships and bursaries?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5. Are the funds raised direct to buildings, equipment, etc.?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Are the funds raised for other initiatives? If yes, please explain.

H. Affiliations and Recognition

1. Does your college have an alumni association?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does your college send regular communiques to the alumni?

☐ Yes ☐ No

3. Does your college belong to the Canadian Council for the Advancement of Education?

☐ Yes ☐ No

4. Does the college have a formalized program for recognition of donors?

☐ Yes ☐ No

I. Financial Data

1. What were the new assets in total dollar amounts raised through private source fund raising between 1993-95? _____

2. What were the total expenditures for fund raising from 1993-95, including salaries?

Would you like a copy of the findings of this study?

☐ Yes ☐ No

APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM PRESIDENTIAL COLLEAGUE SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE COLLEGES

February 5, 1996

Dear :

The enclosed survey is part of a project to assess the status of fund-raising in colleges in Ontario. Karen Shaw, currently on sabbatical leave from the Cambrian Foundation is a doctoral student at Michigan State University (biography attached). The focus of her research is financing colleges in Ontario, with a particular emphasis on scope and form of private sector fund-raising in the ACAATO colleges. The survey is being sent to all presidents requesting basic information on the scope of fund-raising currently being conducted by each college.

Karen will be requesting interviews at three colleges with foundations. If your college foundation is one selected, I would appreciate if you could accommodate her request. The results of this survey and the interviews conducted will provide current data for colleges interested in establishing foundations in the future.

I would like to ask for your cooperation in this matter and thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the enclosed confidential survey.

Yours truly,

President

Encl.

APPENDIX D

LETTER REQUESTING PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY

Karen L. Shaw

520 Attlee Avenue
Sudbury, Ontario
P3A 5T9

1-705-524-3028 ph.

1-705-524-3717 fax

email kshaw@venus.cambrian.ca

January 5, 1995

Mr.
President
College
Address
City, Ontario
Postal Code

Dear Mr. President:

I am a student of Michigan State University. I am presently studying toward my doctoral degree in higher education. The focus of my research is financing colleges in Ontario, with a particular focus on private sector fund raising in the colleges. The first phase of this research will be to determine the scope and form of fund raising that is currently being practised by Ontario colleges.

Some of the colleges in Ontario have established foundations to solicit financial support from the private sector. The second phase of the research will be to study which colleges have established foundations. Using an established criteria for successful foundations, three Ontario college foundations will be selected for further research. Interviews will be conducted with key informants of three foundations selected. If your college has established a foundation, and it is selected for further study, I will be contacting your office to request an interview.

There has been little research done on fund raising within colleges in Canada. The results of this study will provide current data to decision makers and others who are involved with facilitating college education in Ontario. The study could serve as a guide to those who are considering establishing college foundations in Ontario in the future.

The enclosed survey is being sent to the presidents of all twenty-five colleges in Ontario asking for basic information on the scope of fund raising currently being practised by each college. It would be appreciated if you could respond to this survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than January 19, 1996.

Your participation in this study is very important. The information in the enclosed survey will be kept confidential. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. In reporting the findings, every safeguard will be taken to maintain the anonymity of your college by disguising the names and other data which are provided through the survey.

I would like to thank you in advance for taking the time to complete the enclosed confidential survey.

Yours truly,

APPENDIX E

FRENCH LANGUAGE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Les questions ci-dessous s'appliquent uniquement aux démarches des collèges pour obtenir des revenus provenant **de fonds du secteur privé** qui peuvent être définis comme étant des dons faits par des personnes, des sociétés, des entreprises, des fondations, etc. Les revenus octroyés par des sources gouvernementales fédérales, provinciales ou locales ne sont pas pris en considération.

Le terme **fondation** désigne ici la fondation liée à un collège et définie comme étant un organisme de charité, sans but lucratif, créé dans le seul objectif d'apporter des profits à ce collège.

PARTIE I _ INFORMATIONS GÉNÉRALES

1. Titre/Fonctions _____
2. Collège _____
3. Inscriptions ETP (équivalent temps plein) dans votre collège en 1995

4. Votre collège cherche-t-il des fonds du secteur privé?

___ Oui ___ Non

Si non, veuillez mettre ce questionnaire dans l'enveloppe affranchie qui l'accompagne et l'expédier le plus tôt possible à l'adresse indiquée. Merci du temps que vous y avez consacré.

5. Y a-t-il dans votre collège une fondation dont la mission est la collecte de fonds?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

Si oui, veuillez passer à la page 2 et remplir seulement la partie II du questionnaire.

6. Votre collège cherche-t-il des fonds du secteur privé, même s'il n'a pas une fondation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

Si oui, veuillez passer à la page 5 et remplir seulement la partie III du questionnaire.

PARTIE II - LA FONDATION

A. Structure et fonctions de la fondation

1. En quelle année la fondation a-t-elle été constituée en entité séparée du collège?

2. Combien de temps le président du collège consacre-t-il à la collecte de fonds?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

3. La fondation a-t-elle un directeur à temps plein?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

4. La fondation a-t-elle des employés à temps plein? Combien? _____

☐ Oui ☐ Non

5. La fondation a-t-elle des employés à temps partiel? Combien? _____

☐ Oui ☐ Non

6. La personne responsable de la collecte de fonds a-t-elle de l'expérience préalable dans ce domaine?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

7. Si vous avez répondu oui à 6, veuillez expliquer _____

B. Direction de la fondation

1. Le conseil de direction de la fondation se compose de combien de membres? _____

2. Quel est le nombre des membres du conseil de la fondation qui ne sont pas liés au collège? _____

3. Quelle est la durée moyenne du mandat de chaque membre du conseil (en années)?

4. Y a-t-il des membres du conseil qui aient été élus ou nommés par le Conseil des gouverneurs du collège?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

5. Si oui, combien? _____

6. Quelle est la fréquence des réunions du conseil de la fondation?

tous les mois ☐ tous les 3 mois ☐ tous les 6 mois ☐

7. La fondation a-t-elle un comité de direction?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

8. Si oui, quelle est la fréquence de ses réunions?

toutes les semaines ☐ tous les mois ☐ tous les 3 mois ☐ tous les 6 mois ☐

9. Y a-t-il des professeurs au conseil de la fondation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

10. Y a-t-il des employés de soutien au conseil de la fondation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

11. Y a-t-il d'autres cadres au conseil de la fondation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

12. Y a-t-il des étudiants au conseil de la fondation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

C. Programmes administrés par la fondation

1. La fondation administre-t-elle un programme de dons planifié?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

2. La fondation organise-t-elle des campagnes annuelles?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. La fondation administre-t-elle des campagnes pour des investissements?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

4. La fondation embauche-t-elle du personnel de l'extérieur afin d'organiser des campagnes pour des investissements?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

5. Quel est le pourcentage d'employées et professeurs de votre collège ayant participé (en travail ou en dons) à vos activités de collecte de fonds en 1995?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

6. Quel pourcentage des fonds obtenus a été alloué aux projets du collège?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

7. Quel pourcentage des fonds obtenus est utilisé pour le fonctionnement de la fondation?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

8. La fondation fait-elle des acquisitions d'immeubles ou d'autres formes d'investissement?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

9. La fondation procède-t-elle à des collectes de fonds pour des bourses d'études?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

D. Affiliations

Remerciements

1. La fondation est-elle membre du Conseil canadien pour l'avancement de l'éducation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

2. La fondation a-t-elle une association d'anciens?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. Votre collège communique-t-il régulièrement avec ses anciens?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

4. Votre fondation a-t-elle un système structuré pour exprimer sa reconnaissance aux donateurs?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

E. État financier

1. Quel a été, en 1995, le montant total en dollars des nouveaux éléments d'actif (espèces, biens, titres, équipement, dotations, etc.) qu'a reçus votre fondation sans but lucratif?

2. Quel a été, en 1995, le montant total des dépenses de votre fondation (y compris les salaires)?

Souhaitez-vous recevoir un rapport des résultats de cette étude?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

PARTIE III - COLLECTE DE FONDS

1. Combien de temps le président du collège consacre-t-il à la collecte de fonds?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

2. Y a-t-il, dans votre collège, des employés à temps plein chargés de la collecte de fonds?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. Si oui, combien?

4. Quel est le nombre d'employés à temps partiel qui participent à la collecte de fonds?

5. La personne responsable des collectes de fonds relève-t-elle directement du président?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

6. Si non, relève-t-elle du vice-président?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

7. Si non, relève-t-elle de quelqu'un d'autre? Veuillez préciser.

F. Formes de collecte de fonds

1. Y a-t-il des membres du Conseil des gouverneurs qui participent à la collecte de fonds pour votre collège?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

2. La collecte de fonds comprend-elle une campagne pour des investissement?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. Avez-vous une campagne annuelle de collecte de fonds?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

4. Votre collège collecte-t-il des fonds pour des bourses d'études?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

5. Le programme de collecte de fonds était-il financé au début avec des fonds du collège?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

6. Le programme de collecte de fonds était-il financé au début avec des fonds provenant de la campagne?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

7. Quel est le pourcentage de vos cadres ayant participé (par le travail ou des dons) à vos activités de collecte de fonds en 1995?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

8. Quel est le pourcentage de vos professeurs ayant participé (par le travail ou des dons) à vos activités de collecte de fonds en 1995?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

9. Quel est le pourcentage de vos employés de soutien ayant participé (par le travail ou des dons) à vos activités de collecte de fonds en 1995?

☐ 0-10 % ☐ 11-25 % ☐ 26-50 % ☐ 51-75 % ☐ 76-100 %

G. Aide de bénévoles

1. Votre programme de collecte de fonds fait-il appel à des bénévoles par l'intermédiaire du Conseil des gouverneurs?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

2. Les bénévoles sont-ils sollicités par l'intermédiaire des comités consultatifs?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. Les bénévoles sont-ils sollicités par d'autres sources? Veuillez préciser.

4. Les fonds collectés sont-ils utilisés pour des bourses d'études?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

5. Les fonds collectés sont-ils utilisés dans des immeubles, de l'équipement, etc.?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

6. Les fonds sont-ils collectés à d'autres fins? Si oui, veuillez préciser.

H. Affiliations

Remerciements

1. Votre collègue est-il membre du Conseil canadien pour l'avancement de l'éducation?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

2. Votre collègue a-t-il une association d'anciens?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

3. Votre collègue communique-t-il régulièrement avec ses anciens?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

4. Votre collègue a-t-il un système structuré pour communiquer sa reconnaissance aux donateurs?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

I. État financier

1. Quel a été, en 1995, le montant total en dollars des nouveaux éléments d'actif obtenus par collecte de fonds auprès du secteur privé? _____

2. Quel a été, en 1995, le montant total des dépenses pour les collectes de fonds (y compris les salaires)? _____

Souhaitez-vous recevoir un rapport des résultats de cette étude?

☐ Oui ☐ Non

APPENDIX F

LETTER FROM PRESIDENTIAL COLLEAGUE SUPPORTING REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY TO FRENCH LANGUAGE COLLEGES

30 février 1996

Cher collègue, (Chère collègue,)

Le questionnaire que vous trouverez ci-joint s'insère dans un projet pour l'étude de la collecte de fonds dans les collèges ontariens. L'auteur de ce projet est Karen Shaw, qui est actuellement en congé sabbatique de la Fondation Cambrian et prépare un doctorat à la Michigan State University (voir données biographiques ci-jointes). Les travaux de Mme Shaw portent sur le financement des collèges de l'ACAATO, en Ontario, une importance particulière étant accordée aux possibilités de levée de fonds auprès du secteur privé et aux formes qu'elle peut prendre. Le questionnaire est envoyé à tous les présidents dans l'intention d'obtenir quelques renseignements sur l'amplitude des collectes de fonds auxquelles chaque collège procède actuellement. Les réponses seront, naturellement, considérées confidentielles.

Mme Shaw sollicitera en outre des entrevues à trois collèges ayant des fondations. Au cas où la fondation de votre collège serait de ce nombre, je vous saurais gré de bien vouloir répondre favorablement à sa demande. Les résultats obtenus grâce au questionnaire et aux entrevues fourniront des données qui pourraient être utiles aux collèges intéressés à créer des fondations.

En vous remerciant d'avance de l'attention que vous voudrez bien prêter à cette requête, je vous prie d'agréer, Cher collègue, (Chère collègue,) mes salutations distinguées.

Le Président,

Glenn Crombie

APPENDIX G

**LETTER REQUESTING PRESIDENT'S CONSENT TO
PARTICIPATE IN INTERVIEW FOR COLLEGES WITH
FOUNDATIONS SELECTED AS SUCCESSFUL FOR
PURPOSES OF THIS STUDY**

Sudbury, Ontario
 P3A 5T9
 1-705-524-3028 ph.
 1-705-524-3717 fax
 email kishaw@venus.cambridge.on.ca

February 29, 1996

Mr.
 President
 College-L
 address
 city, province
 postal code

Dear Mr. :

I am a graduate student with Michigan State University, Department of Educational Administration, East Lansing, Michigan. The title of my dissertation is AWhat Role Do Foundations Play in Augmenting Financial Support In Ontario Colleges?@ The purpose of the study is to gather information about the current form and scope of fund raising through solicitation of the private sector by Ontario colleges. Secondly, I would like to ascertain how you see your role as President of College-L and your role and responsibilities of furthering the goals of the College-L Foundation.

I would sincerely appreciate having an interview with you. As liaison to the Foundation Board and the Board of Governors of College-L, you are in a unique position to describe what having an active foundation has done to support College-L in its fundraising efforts. I am interested in the details of the College-L Foundation and in your perceptions regarding the role of the foundation in financially supporting the college's strategies for the future.

If you agree to participate, please sign the attached form and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed. I will conduct the interview with you in a place chosen by yourself. The interview will be audio taped and will be approximately one hour in duration. I will be asking you to describe your role with the Foundation, the history and scope of the fund raising being conducted, how the funds are dispersed and how you see the Foundation developing in the future. You will be given the opportunity to make any comments, additions and deletions once the interview has been transcribed. I will be studying these transcripts, coding the discussion and analysing the data for key concepts and themes.

Any information that you choose to share will be held in the strictest confidence. Records will be kept safely with me during this research project and will be destroyed after one year of completion. In reporting my findings, every safeguard will be taken to protect your anonymity by disguising your name and that of the college.

I would appreciate your time and willingness to share your thoughts and support my doctoral research efforts. If you have any questions, please contact me. Otherwise, would you kindly read and sign the consent statement which is attached and return it to me.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Shaw

Consent Document

Letter to Participant:
(to be returned)

Mr.

I have read the above information describing the research study you plan to conduct and have kept a signed copy for my records. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw at any time without penalty. Meanwhile, I understand that any information I share with you will be held in strictest confidence and that, in reporting your findings, you will take steps to protect my anonymity by disguising my name and other information that could be used to identify me.

With this understanding, I agree to participate.

Signature of Participant

Date

Signature of Researcher Karen Shaw

Date

REFERENCES

- Alfred, R., Linder, V. P. (1994). Rhetoric to Reality. Effectiveness in Community Colleges. Paper presented ACAATO Conference on Governance. Toronto, Ontario, Canada
- Alreck, P. L., Settle, R. B. (1995). The Survey Research Handbook (2nd Ed) Purdue School of Business, Salisbury State University, Salisbury, Maryland. Irwin Professional Publishing, Boston, Mass.
- Angel, D., Gares, D. (1981). Community College Foundation Survey. Community and Junior College Journal, 51(8), (10-11).
- Angel, D., Gares, D. (1989). History, characteristics, and assets. in Alternative Funding Sources. Catanzaro & Arnold (Eds.), San Francisco, Jossey-Bass. No. 68, (pp7-14).
- Applied Research Associates. (1990). Ministry of Colleges and Universities. (1990). "Higher education in Ontario : some vital statistics". Toronto: Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. Coordination of Administration and Policy Formulation of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario. Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Apsey, Gary Ronald. (1993). Marketing Strategies by Higher Education For Corporation Fund-Raising . Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University.
- Association of Canadian Community Colleges (January, 1997). Transforming Community Colleges to Compete For the Future . Workshop by the President's Network, Consortium for Community College Development, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada . .
- Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Conference (1981). Critical Issues in College System Management. Toronto, Ontario, Canada .
- Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario (Dec.3, 1993). The Road Ahead: Understanding the Finances of Ontario's Colleges . Paper presented to the Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Final edition approved by Copex, Toronto, Ontario, Canada .

Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario (April, 1993). The Ontario College Financial Crisis. Paper presented to the Council of Presidents Task Force, Toronto, Ontario, Canada .

Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. (1995) . Aide memoire.

Axelrod, Paul (1982). Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics, and the Universities of Ontario 1945-1980.: University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario, Canada .

Bender, L., Daniel, D. (1986). "Rethinking funding strategies." Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 57(1).

Blackledge, C. H., III. (1988). Characteristics of College-related Foundations and Private Fund-raising in Alabama Public Two-Year Institutions. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Alabama.

Borg W. R., Gall. M. D. (1989). Educational Research An Introduction. Fifth Edition, Longman, White Plains, New York.

Bremer, F. H. (1965). "Philanthropic Support for Public Junior Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas.

Broce, T. E. (1988). Fund Raising—the guide to raising money from private sources. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.

Campbell, G. (1971). Community Colleges in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson-McGraw Hill.

Caton, C. S. (1991). A Preference for Prestige? Commentary on the Behaviour of Universities and Their Benefactors. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada

Clements, M. A.. (1990). An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Development Programs in Public Community Colleges Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Iowa.

Conference Board of Canada (1994, October). 1994 Corporate Donations Budget Outlook - Survey Results, 1994. Education Section 2 (1-5)., Institute of Donations and Public Affairs Research, Ottawa.

Crowson, J. C. (1985). Boards of Directors of Community College Foundations: Characteristics, roles, and Successes . Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mississippi.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (1983). Postsecondary Education Issues in the Eighties. Toronto, Ontario. Council of Ministers of Education, Government of Canada.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (1985). Principles of Interaction: Federal-Provincial Relations and Post-Secondary Education in Canada. Ministry of Supply and Services, Ottawa.

Curti, M., Nash, R. (1965) . Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Curtis, M. H. (1982) . History and Qualitative Methodology . In E. Kuhns & S. V. Martorana (Eds.) New Directions for Institutional Research: Qualitative Methods for Institutional Research. No. 9, (pp.55-62). Jossey-Bass.

Daniels, G. (1995). The Role of the Further Education Funding Council in England. Assistant Executive Director, Federation Education Funding Council, United Kingdom, Paper presented to the Association of Community Colleges of Canada, March, 1995. Toronto.

Davidson, M. M. Wise, S. R. (1982). Fund raising: The public two-year college. In P. S. Bryant & J. A. Johnson (Eds.), New Directions for insitutiional advancement: Enhancing two-year college, No. 15 (pp59-65). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

D Cruz, J. R., Rugman, A. M. (1992). New Compacts for Canadian Competitiveness. Faculty of Management, University of Toronto Paper presented to Council of Presidents, ACAATO, March, 1992 (pp 37-59).

Dial, D. (1993) . The role Status and Qualifications of the Chief Advancement Officer in Selected Institutions of Higher Educaiton. Ph.D. Dissertation, La Sierra University.

Degerstedt, L. M. (1979). Non-profit Foundations Formed by Public Community Colleges: Profile of Their Use for External Funding. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Florida.

Dellandrea, J. S. (1987). Corporate Support and University Development. Ed. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Dempsey, J. R. (1992). An Essay: Reflections of a College President/1989. Community-College-Review; v20 n2 (pp45-49) Fall 1992.

Dennison, J.D. (1980). Community colleges in Canada - the challenge of the 1980's . Journal of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges; V.4;1,2: Winter/Spr'80. (pp 1-15).

Dennison, J.D. (1986). Some aspects of government policy towards community colleges in British Columbia, 1982-86 . Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations; V.1 no.2: (pp 4-16).

Dennison, J. D., Gallagher, P. (1986). Canada's Community Colleges: A Critical Analysis. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press. Vancouver, British Columbia.

Dennison, J. D.; Levin, J. S. (1988). Canada's Community Colleges in the Nineteen Eighties: Responsiveness and Renewal. Toronto: Association of Canadian Community Colleges Press.

Dennison, J. D. (1994). The Case for democratic governance in Canada's community colleges. Interchange : a quarterly review of education; V.25 no.1 : January 1994. (pp 25-37).

Donnelly, J.J. (1980). Cutting the cloth: financial management in times of retrenchment . Journal of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges; V.4; 1, 2: Winter/Spr'80. (pp 17-23).

Duffy, E. F.. (1979). Evaluative Criteria for Community College Foundations. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Florida.

Duronio, M. A., Bruce L. A. (1991). Effective Fund Raising in Higher Education: Ten Success Stories. Jossey Bass Publishers.

Fennell, B. H. (1991). An Analysis of Alternatives for Achieving Fiscal and Taxation Equity in Education Funding in Alberta. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Finance Association (Williamsburg, VA, March 14-17, 1991).

Foot, D. K., MacNiven, M. (1989). Empirical Features of the College System : Background Papers. Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Vision 2000. vol. 1 Toronto.

Francis, D. (1992). Article in the Financial Post, June 9, 1992, (p.2).

Gallagher, P. , Hurt, H. (1992). Community colleges in Canada : a profile . Bookmark; V.33 no.4 : June 1992. (p 174).

Gallagher, P. (1990). Community colleges in Canada : a profile 1990. Vancouver Community College Press, Vancouver, British Columbia.

Garrison, J. R. (1990). A New Twist to Cause Marketing . Fund Raising Management, Vol. 20, No. 12, Feb, (pp40-44).

Gatewood, A. C . (1994) . A Comparative Analysis and Evaluation of Community College Nonprofit Foundations in North Carolina. Volume 55/06 - Dissertation Abstracts, (p.815).

Government of Canada. (1995). British North America Act, 1867. Parliament of Canada, Ottawa.

Government of Canada. (1995). Federal Budget. Announcement by the Honorable Paul Martin, Minister of Finance, Government of Canada, February 28, 1995. Ottawa.

Government of Ontario. (1994). Royal Commission on Learning. Royal Commission established by the Government of Ontario to determine the role of school boards and post-secondary institutions and the accountability of those institutions through outcomes. Queen's Printer. Toronto.

Grace, J. D. (1988). A Question of Characteristics: Elements of Successful Fund-Raising Programs at Two-Year Institutions. Currents; v14 n10 (pp61-63) Nov-Dec 1988.

Graham, M. E. S. (1994) Board of Trustees for Public Two-Year Colleges: Perceptions of Fund Raising From the Private Sector. University of Southern Mississippi.

Hamblin, F. A. (1984). An Analysis of the Policy Formulation Process Leading To The Establishment of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario. Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Harper, W. A. (1976). College foundations bring in the money. Change, 8(7), (pp. 48-49).

Harvard, R. J. (1975) . The Philanthropic Support of Community Colleges in Canada . Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University.

Hildebrande, M. (1994) Cost Cutting and Cost Sharing. Council of President, Public Colleges & Technical Institutes of Alberta. Paper presented to the Association of Community Colleges of Canada, March, 1994.

Henry, E. H. (1988) . The Relative Value and Importance of Perceived Benefits of Active Foundations of Public Community Colleges in the United States. Ph.D. Dissertation. Dissertation Abstract. Volume 49/10 (pp 2944) .

Hoeflich, M. H. (1992) . Prospects for College and University Fund Raising". Academe; vol. 73m no. 1, Jan/Feb 1992, (pp30-32).

Hollingsworth, -P. (1983). An Investigation of Characteristics of Successful Community College Foundations". NT: 25 p.; Graduate seminar paper, Pepperdine University.

Honsberger, H. et al.(1989). Challenges to the College and the College System Background Papers: Quality Papers. Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Vision 2000. Vol. 2, Toronto.

Hunter, C.B.(1987). Fund-raising From Private Sources in Public Community Colleges Using Not-for-Profit Foundation Boards. Ph.D. Dissertation, West Virginia University.

Ingram, Richard T. and Associates.(1993) Governing Public Colleges and Universities, A Handbook for Trustees, Chief Executives and Other Campus Leaders". Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1993.

Ironfield, E. B. (1991). Characteristics of Two-Year Public Colleges and Foundations With Successful Fund-Raising Programs. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Ishoy, V. A. (1972) . Fund raising, a function of development in financing higher education. Ph.D. Dissertation, Brigham Young University.

Jacobson, H. K., et al. (1986). Setting the agenda in fund-raising research: Lessons from contrasting strategies . (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 756)

James,Leslie W. (1993) . Principles of Navigation: Sound Policies and Procedures Will Help Your Foundation Ride the Waves of Change". CASE Currents; vol. 9, no. 2, Feb. 1993, (pp 40-42).

Janney, Scott R. P. (1994). The College President and Fund Raising Effectiveness. Ph.D. Dissertation, Temple University.

Jenner, P. J. (1986). Factors Associated With Success of Resource Development Programs at California Community Colleges. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Univeristy of San Diego.

Johnson, A. W. (1985). Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada. Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State.

Johnson, Edward. (1988). The Role of Private Fund Raising in Enhancing the Excellence and Competitiveness of Arizona s Universities. The Arizona Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. Vol. 2.

Keener, B.J. (1982). The foundation s role in resource development. In W. J. Sharron Jr. (Ed.) The Community College Foundation. (pp. 3-17). National Council for Resource Development, Washington, D. C.

Keener, Barbara J. (1989). The Development Plan. Marketing and Development for Community Colleges, CASE, 1989.

Kennedy, R. D. (1991, April 25) . The Role of Business in Education. Paper presented to the Business and Education Conference at the Conference Board of Canada, Toronto.

Konrad, Abram G. (1993). A Green Paper on Board Governance of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario (Presented to Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario, April, 1993) . University of Alberta.Edmonton.

Knott, R. A. (1992) . The Makings of a Philanthropic Fundraiser: The Instructive Example of Milton Murray. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1992.

Knowles, Tony. (1993). Community college partnerships with business and industry . Manitoba Spectra; V.21 no.1 : December 1993. (pp 26-30).

Kopecek, Robert J. (1988). President's Role in Economic Development . Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council for Resource Development (22nd, Washington, DC, November 29-December 2, 1988).

Kopecek, Robert J. (1982). An Idea Whose Time Is Come: Not-For-Profit Foundations for Public Community Colleges. Community College Review, 10 (3), (pp12-17).

Laughren, Floyd. (1995) Highlights 1995 Ontario Budget Plan. Minister of Finance, Province of Ontario. Presented in Ontario Legislature, (April 28, 1995), Toronto.

Leedy, P. D. (1984) . Practical Research Planning & Design (2nd Ed.), MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc. New York, New York.

Leslie, J. W. (1969). Focus on Understanding and Support: A Study in College Management, American College Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C.

Levin, John S.; Dennison, John D. (1989). Responsiveness and renewal in Canada's community colleges : a study of change in organizations . Canadian Journal of Higher Education; V.19 no.2 : 1989. (pp 41-57). Toronto.

Levin, John S. (1993). The Importance of the Board-President relationship in three community colleges. Canadian Journal of Higher Education; V.21 no.1 : 1991. (pp 37-53) Toronto.

Lewington, Jennifer.(1995). Colleges Paring Instructors, courses; Downsizing expected to leave fewer programs for students, despite increasing demands. The Globe and Mail;January 13, 1995, p. 1. Toronto.

Luck, Michael F. (1974). The Characteristics of Foundations and Fund-Raising in Public Comprehensive Two-Year Colleges. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Illinois University.

Luck, Michael F. & Donald J. Tolle. (1978). Community College Development: Alternative Fund-Raising Strategies. Indianapolis, Indiana: R&R Newkirk.

MacRoy, Charles R. (1970). A Study of Voluntary support of Public Community Colleges in New York State. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York.

McClenney, B. (1995). The Further Education Funding Council, Speech presented to the Further Education Funding Council, February 25, 1995, Toronto.

McMillen, L.. (1990). Gifts to Colleges Rise 8.8% in Year, Reach Record \$8.9 Billion. Chronicle of Higher Education; vol.36, no. 37, May, 1990, (pp26-27).

McMillen, Liz. (1991). More Colleges Tap Fund Raisers for Presidencies, Seeking Expertise in Strategic Thinking About Entire Institution. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Business & Philanthropy Ed. Vol. 35, Sept/1991, (pp35-37).

McNamara, Danette L.(1989). Private Fund Raising. Marketing and Development for Community Colleges. CASE, 1989.

Miller, Michael Thomas. (1991). The Personal Motivation of Chief Advancement Officers. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Ministry of Colleges and Universities. (1985). Vision 2000 Strategic Plan of the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario, Toronto.

Milne, Glen. (1994). The Road Ahead: Understanding the Finances of Ontario's Colleges . Association of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology of Ontario.

Ministry of Colleges and Universities.(1993). Multi-Year Plan Analysis of the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Ministry of Education. (1965) Province of Ontario. An Amendment to the Education Act. Statement in the Legislature by the Minister of Education Introducing the Establishment of Ontario's College System. Toronto, Ontario, (May 21, 1965).

Ministry of Education. (1982). Province of Ontario. A Distribution Mechanism for Allocating Operating Grants to the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Task Force on the Implementation of the Funding Mechanism - Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Ministry of Education.(1982). Province of Ontario. Issues to be Resolved in Refining the Funding Mechanism for the Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Task Force on the Implementation of the Funding Mechanism - Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology.

Mitzel, D. P. (1991). A Study of Factors Affecting the Level of Private Support for Ohio's Public Two-Year Colleges and Campuses . Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio University.

Mooney, C. (1991). The Communication Strategies and the Role Enactment of Selected College and University Fundraisers . Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University.

Mount, J. (1995). Why Donors Give: A Model of Personal Donorship. Laurentian University Press, Sudbury, Ontario, June, 1995.

Mucklow, W. R.. (1990). The Canadian Two-Year College Foundation: Characteristics of Success.Ph.D. Dissertation, Oregon State University. *Dissertation Abstracts*, Volume 51-02, (p391).

Muller, J. (1990). Canada's Changing Community Colleges: Education for Work, Education at Work. Garamond Press Toronto..

Nusz,-P.-J. (1986). Development of Guidelines for the Establishment and Operation of a California Community College Foundation. Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.

Parsons, M. H. (1993). Negotiating the Planned Gift for Higher Education: A Learning Organization Paradigm Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Pascal, C. et al. (1989). Additional Perspectives on the College System : Background Papers. Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Vision 2000. Vol. 2.

Pearson, Hon. L. B. Prime Minister. (1966). Opening Address to Federal-Provincial Conference on Higher Education. Edmonton, Alberta.

Pickett, W. L. (1977). An Assessment of the Effectiveness of Fund Raising Policies of Private Undergraduate Colleges. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. University of Denver.

Piland, W.E., Lowden N. B. (1992). California Community College Foundations Fund-Raising Efforts. Trustee Quarterly, Summer, 1992, (p6-15).

Pokrass, R. J. (1986) . Advancement Strategies for Two Year Colleges . Handbook of Institutional Advancement, A. W. Rowland (Ed.) Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Pollard, John A. (1958). Fund-Raising for Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Patton, Carl V. (1981). Higher Education Revenue Sources. Bulletin-of-the-AAUP; vol. 67, no. 6, December, 1981, (pp387-388).

Petchinis, S. (1971). Financing Post-Secondary Education in Canada. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education.

Phillips, G., Metzler, L. (1991). The Corporate-Academic Relationship: Risks and Returns . Fund Raising Management, Vol. 22, No. 5, July/1991, (pp26-30).

Porter, Michael .(1991). Canada at the Crossroads. The Reality of a New Competitive Environment. A Study Prepared for the Business Council on National Issues and the Government of Canada.

Price Waterhouse Management Consultants. (1993).Human resource study of the Canadian community colleges and institutes sector 1993 . Assn of Canadian Community Colleges (p98).

Reilly, T. J. (1992). Motivations, Bilateral Relationships, and One Million Dollar Contributors: A Case Study of a Southwestern University. Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Arizona.

Report of the Standing Committee of Senate. (1986). Bill C-96, An Act to Amend the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Federal Post-Secondary Education and Health Contributions Act, 1977. Ministry of Supply and Services,. Ottawa .

Report of the Standing Committee of Senate. (1987). Federal Policy on Post Secondary Education . (Leblanc, Hon. F. E., Chairman) . Ministry of Supply and Services,. Ottawa .

Robinson, D. G. The President and Institutional Advancement. Marketing and Development for Community Colleges. CASE, 1989.

Robison, S. (1982). The Development of the Two-Year College Foundation and Techniques of Success . The Community College Foundation. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Resource Development, 1982, (pp31-48).

Rodriquez, L. J. (1989). President s Excellence Club 1985-1989. American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Rorrie, C. C. Jr. (1990).Getting Corporations to Give. Association Management, Vol. 42, No. 2, Feb/1990, (pp90-95).

Rossignol, M., White, P.(1990). Professional Training for the Cultural Sector: Major Issues. Discussion paper prepared by the Task Force on Professional Training for the Cultural Sector in Canada. Montreal. (October, 1990).

Roussel, R. (1994). Modeles De Financement: Options Pour Notre Avenir Le Contexte Institutionnel Actuel Au Quebec. Assistant Director General, Federation des cegeps (Quebec).

Rowen, N. et al. (1989). Challenges to the College and the College System : Background Papers: Responses Papers. Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Series: Vision 2000. vol. 2.

Rowen, N., Honsberger, H. (1989). With the Future in Mind: An Environmental Scan.. Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Vision 2000. Vol. 1.

Ryan, G. J. (1988). Excellence in Educational Fund Raising at America's Community Colleges and a Key Resources Guide for Educational Fund Raising. Monroe Community Coll., Rochester, NY. Office of Institutional Advancement.

Ryan, G. J. (1989). Giving to Community Colleges. Fund Raising Management, Vol. 20, No. 5, July/1989, (pp43-48).

Ryan, G. J. (1989). The Modern Chief Advancement Officer. Marketing and Development for Community Colleges. CASE, 1989.

Ryan, G. J. (1993). Partners in Economic Development: Community College Strategies for Collaboration. American Association of Community Colleges.

Scheier, I. H. Ph.D. Empowering a Profession: Leverage Points and Process. The Journal of Volunteer Administration. January, 1989. (pp50-57).

Schulze, C. J. Jr. (1991). The Role of the Community College President in Successful Fund-Raising. Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College.

Secretary of State 1985. Giving Greater Point and Purpose to the Federal Financing of Post-Secondary Education and Research in Canada. Ministry of Supply and Services, Ottawa.

Seppanen, L. (1991). The Running Start Program: Impact and Benefits from the First Year in Washington Community Colleges. Operations Report (pp91-4).

Sharron, W. H. Jr. (1978). The Development and Organization of the Community College Foundation. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Resource Development

Sharron, W. H. Jr. (1982a). The Community College Foundation. Washington, D.C.: National Council for Resource Development.

Silvera, A. L. (1974). The design and utilization of non-profit foundations affiliated with California community colleges. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California.

Smith, Nanette J. (1989). Organization of the Successful Advancement Office . Marketing and Development for Community Colleges, CASE, 1989.

Sneed, J. J. (1979). Variables associated with the effectiveness of nonprofit foundations affiliated with selected Florida public community junior colleges. Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University.

Spangler, M. S. (1994). The Role of the College President in Facilitating Organizational Growth Through Group Learning: A Qualitative study of the Creation Phase in the Life-Cycle Process of a Community College Foundation. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Suchman, E. A. (1967). Evaluative Research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Task Force of the Administrative Services Coordinating Committee (1995) . The Ontario College Financial Crisis. Paper presented to Council of Presidents Task Force, Toronto, Ontario.

Thompson, D. F. (1992). Ethical Fundraising: An Educational Process. Educational Record; Winter, 1992, (pp38-43).

Teirney, W. G. (1985). Ethnography: An Alternative Evaluation Methodology. Review of Higher Education, No. 8, (pp 93-105).

Tifft, S. E. (1992). Asking for a Fortune . Working Woman; Vol. 17, No. 11, Nov, 1992; (66-70).

Timmer, G. (1990) Integrated Approach to Fund Raising. Fund Raising Management, Vol. 20, No. 12, Feb/1990, (pp47-51).

Tully, S. (1995). Finally, Colleges Start To Cut Their CRAZY COSTS Fortune, May, 1995. (pp110-114).

Wagner, L. (1992). Fund-Raising Research: Prospecting for Gold . Fund Raising Management; Vol. 23, No. 8, Oct/1992, (pp36-43).

Walter M. C., (1993), Effective Presidential Leadership In Fund-Raising: A Case Study of a Community College Foundation. Ph.D. Dissertation, Saint Louis University.

Warnick, L. T. (1990). Selected Characteristics of Successful Community College Foundations. Ph. D. Dissertation, The Union Institute.

Wattenbarger, J.L., Heck, J. (1983). Financing Community Colleges 1983. Institute of Higher Education, Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.

Watts, R., Greenberg, J. (1990). Post-Secondary Education: Preparation for the World of Work. Ottawa: Institute for Research on Public Policy.

West, E. G. (1988). Higher Education in Canada: An Analysis. Vancouver: Fraser Institute.

Wilson, M. (1992). Our Profession at a Crossroads . The Journal of Volunteer Administration, Spring, 1992, (pp43-49).Closing Keynote Speech, 1991 International Conference on Volunteer Administration.

Wise S. R., Camper M.W. (1985). Fund raising for two-year colleges. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), Public college and university development: Fund raising at state universities, state colleges, and community college (pp 137-146). Washington, D. C.: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Wojtas, G. W. (1990). Going the Extra Mile. Fund Raising Management, Vol. 21, No. 1, Mar/1990 (pp46-50).

Woodbury, K B. Jr. (1989). Foundations. Marketing and Development for Community Colleges. CASE, 1989.

Woods, Gordon & Co. (1992). Organization of the Academic Year. A Study Prepared for the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario.

Worth, W.H. (1986). Political primer for college board members . Canadian Administrator; V.26 no.3 : December 1986. (pp 1-5).

Worth, M. J. (1993). Independence or Integration: How Independent Should Your Foundation Be? CASE Currents; vol. 9, no. 2, Feb. 1993, (pp44-47).

Worth, M. J. (Ed.) (1985). Public College and University Development. CASE Currents; Vol. 4, no. 5, Feb. 1985, (1-8).

Wright, K., Kelley S. (1995). NCRD LEGISLATIVE ALERT. National Council for Resource Development, Washington, DC, August 18, 1995, (pp1-2).

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

January 26, 1996

TO: Karen Shaw
520 Attlee Ave.
Sunbury, Ontario
P3A 579

RE: IRB#: 96-031
TITLE: FINANCING ONTARIO COMMUNITY COLLEGES: WHAT ROLE
DO FOUNDATIONS PLAY IN AUGMENTING FINANCIAL
SUPPORT FOR THE COLLEGES
REVISION REQUESTED: N/A
CATEGORY: 1-C
APPROVAL DATE: 01/26/96

The University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects' (UCRIHS) review of this project is complete. I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and methods to obtain informed consent are appropriate. Therefore, the UCRIHS approved this project and any revisions listed above.

RENEWAL: UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year, beginning with the approval date shown above. Investigators planning to continue a project beyond one year must use the green renewal form (enclosed with the original approval letter or when a project is renewed) to seek updated certification. There is a maximum of four such expedited renewals possible. Investigators wishing to continue a project beyond that time need to submit it again for complete review.

REVISIONS: UCRIHS must review any changes in procedures involving human subjects, prior to initiation of the change. If this is done at the time of renewal, please use the green renewal form. To revise an approved protocol at any other time during the year, send your written request to the UCRIHS Chair, requesting revised approval and referencing the project's IRB # and title. Include in your request a description of the change and any revised instruments, consent forms or advertisements that are applicable.

**PROBLEMS/
CHANGES:** Should either of the following arise during the course of the work, investigators must notify UCRIHS promptly: (1) problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects or (2) changes in the research environment or new information indicating greater risk to the human subjects than existed when the protocol was previously reviewed and approved.

If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to contact us at (517)355-2180 or FAX (517)432-1171.

Sincerely,

David E. Wright, Ph.D.
UCRIHS Chair

DEW:bed

cc: Kathryn M. Moore



OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

University Committee on
Research Involving
Human Subjects
(UCRIHS)

Michigan State University
232 Administration Building
East Lansing, Michigan
48824-1046

517/355-2180
FAX 517/432-1171

