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ABSTRACT

As the nation’s community colleges are learning that they cannot continue to depend on traditional resources to fulfill their commitment to serving emerging community needs, the approach to garnering private philanthropic support is becoming a focus of more presidents that includes investing in fundraising for their institutions on behalf of the students and communities they serve.

The purpose of this study was to identify underlying themes of chief development officer leadership competencies based on the American Association of Community Colleges’ (AACC, 2006) six leadership competencies. The three groups participating in the research (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) were currently serving Michigan’s 28 community colleges. Participants were asked to rank the AACC leadership competencies they thought were most important as it related to the chief development officer’s position and performance. Findings from the quantitative research revealed that that presidents believe Communication is the most important as it relates to the chief development officer, whereas the chief academic officers ranked Community College Advocacy the highest, and the chief development officers ranked Collaboration as the highest level of importance. The chief development officer’s length of tenure did not influence their ranking of the competencies.
Several themes emerged from the qualitative portion of this study, which was conducted with a subset of Michigan community college presidents: (a) communication is a vital skillset for presidents; (b) presidential fundraising preparedness is essential to fundraising success; (c) fundraising requires a dedicated time commitment; and (d) the traditional route to the presidency is evolving. This study identified the importance of the chief development officer position having a broad understanding of the entire college in order to effectively communicate the case for donor investment. This study also affirmed that collaboration, communication, and advocacy are important competencies for those who aspire to become community college chief development officers.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

Serving and educating almost half of the nation’s undergraduate students, community colleges demonstrate a significant role in higher education in the United States. While community colleges are generally viewed as essential contributors to the economic growth of America due to their role in preparing a qualified workforce, they are increasingly being asked to do more with less. According to Sunderman (2007), community colleges are known for their comprehensive mission and open access while offering a wide range of courses that are learner-centered while maintaining a local focus. This commitment has caused increased enrollments, with continued demands for new programming and stronger public support. But while community colleges have delivered on this promise, government funding has not, often trapping institutions between being enthusiastic about their future, and having concerns regarding their economic uncertainty (p. 1).

Community colleges have long operated under the “open-door” philosophy, meaning anyone with a high school diploma or a GED has the opportunity to achieve his or her educational and life goals (Gonsher & Halberstam, 2009). While community colleges are known for this philosophy, admission to the college does not necessarily guarantee admission to a particular program. According to Gonsher and Halberstam,
“most of these selective admissions programs are in the health care or technology fields” whose “competitive programs and admission requirements are often more demanding than those required for admission to the college” (pp. 17-18). Nonetheless, the “open-door” concept has provided countless academic opportunities to students and to those groups that had historically been systematically excluded (Myran, 2009), and community colleges today invest more every year just catching students up on basic skills such as math and reading (Fain, 2012). This was illustrated in a 2012 study released by the National Bureau of Economic Research. The study found that remedial classes represent approximately 10% of all coursework at community colleges: “That means that at an estimated cost to colleges of $3,200 per new student (meaning all new students), remediation’s total bill is nearly $4 billion per year for the two-year sector alone” (Fain, 2012, p. 1).

These economic strains on community colleges have forced some to make hard decisions and spending cuts. Because we know that education can be the single biggest factor in determining employment prospects, how we view funding of our community colleges and where those sources of funds come from are important (Padron & Marx, 2013). According to Sunderman (2007), “Rather than abandon their pledge to broadly serve local needs, community colleges have sought other sources of financial support” (p. 1).

Funding is vital to delivering affordable and valuable post-secondary educational services to a growing number of students as well as to millions of adults and experienced workers. Proponents of community colleges argue that since such colleges
were founded, their hallmark has been their ability to provide a good education at a reasonable cost: “as the costs of attending four-year institutions skyrocket and as jobs require increasingly higher education/skill levels, supporters believe that it is imperative that community colleges remain affordable” (Michigan in Brief, 2002).

Community colleges differ from four-year institutions in both the populations they serve and in their available funding methods. According to the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary (2013), for many students, an associate degree or certificate is not their goal for enrolling in a community college. Some students take non-degree courses, some seek GED/vocational training, and some plan to transfer to a four-year university. Due to these variations, community colleges need to consider their diverse student educational goals and the economic development and workforce needs of their local communities, while aiming to maintain tuition rates below those offered by four-year institutions.

Michigan’s community colleges are governed by locally elected boards and have three primary funding sources: property taxes, state aid, and tuition and fees. Over time, the amount of revenue collected from each source has changed (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013). Changes in available revenue and enrollment have required that colleges shift from what was once primarily state-aid driven budgets to budgets that rely more on local property taxes and tuition and fee revenue. Just in the past decade, Michigan community colleges have seen increases followed by post-recession decreases in enrollment that have considerably affected their resources and the amount of support they need to provide students. The Michigan Legislative
Executive Summary (2013) brief asserts that enrollments in community colleges have steadily increased, though increased unemployment in FY 2008-09 led to a spike in enrollment in colleges, due in part to increased popularity of job retraining programs and other career-focused education. In recent years this trend has leveled off once again, according to the Michigan Workforce Development Agency (2014) that reports the FY 2012-13 enrollments indicate that community colleges have seen a decrease in the number of enrolled students. Interestingly enough, when there is an increase in enrollment, the increase can create a financial problem for community colleges, in that only one of their three primary revenue sources—tuition and fees—adjusts based upon the number of students enrolled. Additionally, enrollment increases require more courses, technology, and staff to support those students, consequently intensifying the need for increased revenue.

**FUNDING HISTORY**

A majority of Michigan’s community college funding allocations has been set using historical standards. According to the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary (2013), historical funding allocations have been determined by various funding formulas, across-the-board increases, and recommendations from the colleges themselves. Originally, funding was conceived to be based on the model of one-third state aid, one-third tuition and fees, and one-third local property taxes. But, as colleges changed in size and in curriculum variety, funding did not always follow these changes. From FY 1984-85 until FY 2001-02, the Gast-Mathieu Fairness in Funding Formula was
used as the standard for state aid allocations to Michigan community colleges. This funding formula calculated the base funding needs of each college using instructional and non-instructional costs and controlling for each college’s available property tax revenue and tuition revenue. The primary goal of this formula was to determine a “target net need,” or the amount of funding the state would ideally need to provide in order to fully fund a college’s needs. However, this full funding amount was not typically provided, and instead prorated appropriations based on the levels of need in each college were used, along with across-the-board increases. (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013, p. 8)

In 2005, a task force was formed to develop new performance funding standards to be used in future Michigan community college appropriations. According to the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary (2013) brief, the task force created three specific Performance Indicators and prioritized the formula with Enrollment, Completion, and Local Strategic Value (p. 9):

- **Enrollment** is determined by the number of Contact Hour Equated Students (CHES) at a college.
- **Completion** is determined by the two-year average of weighted degree completions, with health, engineering, technology, and natural science degrees receiving extra weighting.
- **Local Strategic Value** provides a set of goals for community colleges to attain related connection and interaction with their surrounding communities.

As the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary points out, “The Performance Indicators formula marks a significant shift from the funding practices highlighted in Gast-Mathieu. While Gast-Mathieu primarily focused on factors such as available revenue and
Property Tax Revenue

With the passage of the Michigan Community College Act of 1966, community colleges were authorized to levy local property taxes. According to the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary (2013), these funds tie a portion of a community college’s budget to local sources and allow community colleges to operate with lower tuition rates for in-district students. In FY 2010-11, Michigan community colleges collected a total of $522.9 million in property tax revenue.

Michigan’s property tax revenue has historically increased gradually and has been a source of revenue that is not subject to annual appropriations by the legislature or to fluctuations in enrollment. However, in FY 2010-11 Michigan’s property tax revenue declined drastically. Property tax revenue for Michigan community colleges peaked in FY 2009-10 at $589.8 million and has since declined by $66.9 million or 11.3%. Property taxes are dependent on two factors: taxable value in a district and millages. A millage is a tax rate that is applied to the assessed value of real estate that is measured in mils, applied to the local property values and levied on local properties (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013, pp. 10-11). This decline in local property tax revenue to community colleges, as explained by the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, was due in part to a decrease in local property tax values in Michigan’s community college districts. Unfortunately this is not solely a Michigan trend, but also a national trend in declining property values that accompanied the housing crisis that began in 2007.
While changes in taxable value are the reason behind recent declines in property tax revenue, changes in millage rates have also influenced the amount of property tax collected (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013, p. 12). According to the Activities Classification Structure (ACS) (Michigan Community College NETwork, 2014) report, the average community college millage rate in the state of Michigan is 2.45 mills. This means that for every $1,000 of State Equalized Value (SEV) in a home or property, the property owner would pay $2.45 in tax to the college. The SEV is typically about equal to half of the value of the home (Miller, 2013). But millages require a majority vote and since the 2007 housing crisis, Michigan voter attitudes toward tax increases have become challenging at best.

State Aid Revenue

Historically, Michigan’s state aid funds have primarily been funded by General Fund/General Purpose (GF/GP) revenue. However, according to the 2013 Michigan Legislative Executive Summary brief, in FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13, the School Aid Fund (SAF) was the primary source of revenue for community college state appropriations. The SAF was at its highest point in FY 2001-02 and has fallen and risen sporadically in the ensuing years. For example, between FY 1992-93 and FY 2012-13 appropriations for Michigan’s community colleges have declined by a net of some $43.8 million. This makes state aid the only revenue source for Michigan’s community colleges to have undergone a net decline in funding over the past two decades. When adjusted for inflation, state aid revenue per Fiscal Year Equated Student (FYES—a measure that the
state uses to compare enrollment numbers) declined by 33% between FY 1992-93 and FY 2012-13 (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013).

Tuition and Fees Revenue

Students are now paying more of the cost of their education, to compensate for declining state aid and local property tax funding. According to Mitchell, Palacios, and Leachman (2014), large funding cuts have led to both steep tuition increases and spending cuts that may diminish the quality of education available to students at a time when a highly educated workforce is more crucial than ever to the nation’s economic future. Revenue derived from tuition and fees at Michigan community colleges has increased steadily over the past two decades, though the rate of increase has escalated in the past 10 years. Tuition revenue is based on the college’s tuition rate and the number of credit hours taken by the student. Thus, as the number of FYES increases, the total tuition revenue collected will increase, even if tuition rates are unchanging. In FY 1990-91 dollars, tuition and fee revenue was approximately $1,408 per FYES and has risen to $2,593 per FYES ($4,101 in FY 2010-11 dollars) (Michigan Legislative Executive Summary, 2013). Maintaining a low tuition rate and offering programs choices achieves access, which is a hallmark of community colleges (Vaughan, 2006). Community colleges also differentiate among in-district and out-of-district students. Michigan’s in-district community college students on average paid $90.03 per credit hour in FY 2012-13 (including fees), whereas out-of-district students paid on average $148.12 per credit hour. In short, Michigan community college in-district students pay around 40% less per
credit hour than out-of-district students, bearing in mind that actual costs vary by college (Michigan Community College NETwork, 2014).

Other Revenue

Other revenue sources can be defined as the inflow of resources or other enhancement of net assets of an institution or settlements of its liabilities from delivering or producing goods, rendering services, or other activities that constitute the institution's ongoing major or central operations. Other revenue examples include revenues from fees and charges, appropriations, contributions and other non-exchange transactions, and auxiliary enterprises (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014).

The federal government has played a large part in the indirect funding of community colleges. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the GI Bill, made it possible for many returning World War II veterans to attend colleges, universities, and community colleges. The 1952 Veterans’ Readjustment Act extended the benefits of the GI Bill to soldiers returning from the Korean War (Blank, 2012). Most recently, the Post-9/11 GI Bill provides financial support for education and housing to individuals on or after September 11, 2001, or individuals discharged with a service-connected disability. The Post-9/11 GI Bill also offers some service members the opportunity to transfer their GI Bill to dependents (“Education and Training,” 2010).

In early 2012, Michigan’s 28 community colleges joined with other key partners to create a statewide network to improve the support and services to active military and veteran populations. The primary goal of the Consortium of Michigan Veteran Educators
is to increase the number of service members and their families, who take advantage of the educational benefits that are available to them such as the G.I. Bill (Consortium of Michigan Veterans Educators, 2013).

According to Blank (2012), the Higher Education Facilities Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1963 outlined specific federal funding for community colleges. The Higher Education Act of 1987 gave community college students a cost of living allowance for financial aid approximately equal to that of students of four-year institutions living in dormitories. Also, the Perkins Act of 1991 allowed for articulation agreements between community colleges and high schools, making it possible for high school juniors and seniors to take community college courses.

Pell Grants are also another source of financial aid for students provided by the federal government. According to the Michigan Legislative Executive Summary (2013), 153,629 Michigan community college students were awarded a total of $506.9 million in Pell Grants in 2010-11, making, on average, about $3,299 per Pell Grant recipient. Students are able to use these funds for tuition and fees or other expenses associated with attending college (p. 16).

Another nontraditional source of funds is proceeds from selling or leasing college real estate. But as Cohen and Brawer (2008) point out,

One of the more effective, and rapidly expanding, ways in which colleges are offsetting increasing costs is to augment their budgets by establishing their own foundations to serve as vehicles for receiving funds from alumni, other donors, and philanthropic agencies. Because the foundation is legally and organizationally independent, it is able to promote the wellbeing of the college without the statutory limits placed on the college’s governing board and staff.
Most of their funds are distributed for scholarships, student and program support, and equipment. (p. 175)

**CURRENT TRENDS IN OTHER FUNDING RESOURCES**

According to Miller (2013), fundraising from private sources has become progressively crucial to the well-being of community colleges’ financial stability (Boyd, 2010). Funding has decreased from traditional sources, and tuition rates have climbed. While the country’s community colleges are grappling with trying to fulfill their mission of access and affordability, they are also confronting budget constraints. Although universities have been raising private funds for decades, community colleges are relatively new to this arena and many are still learning how to raise meaningful support (Jones, 2010).

A review of literature about philanthropic fundraising for community colleges suggests that it did not begin until the 1980s and 1990s, when public funding began to decline as a percentage of total revenue. In fact, the literature shows that most two-year colleges have not made the investments in fundraising that four-year institutions made decades ago (Summers, 2006). Robertson (2011) has noted that as state revenue declines, more of the financial burden is being placed on hard-pressed students and their families. Fundraising and establishing scholarships through the college’s foundation is one way to help. Fundraising and building relationships with industry can also help provide for a college’s technology needs. According to Lanning (2008),

The most compelling reason to enhance our efforts in raising private dollars for community colleges is the need of the student themselves. About half of community college students still have unmet financial need after all financial aid
is considered. Textbooks, supplies, housing, transportation, child care, and health care now make up nearly 95 percent of a community college student’s financial burdens. (p. 2)

Hay (1987) found that the two most important uses of philanthropic funds were to provide student financial aid and to provide money for faculty and staff development. Patnode (1991) suggested that two-year colleges should diversify their fundraising campaigns to include items such as funds for disabled students, the library, athletics, campus radio or television stations, academic divisions, senior citizen funds, the performing arts, museums, or similar facilities on campus. According to Jackson and Glass’s (2000) study, community colleges should lead in entrepreneurial or economic development efforts by forging partnerships for increased financial support, but should also receive corporate gifts from business/industry in recognition of the college’s role in workforce training and retraining.

Community colleges are beginning to focus more effort on developing the rationale for philanthropic support as an essential source of new revenue to help meet the education and training needs of their communities. Haire and Dodson-Pennington (2002) explained, “Through collaborative partnerships the college positioned itself as a viable investment for both private and federal funders, and the college is viewed as a trustworthy partner for fundraising initiatives” (p. 66). Brumbach and Villadsen (2002) reported that partnerships also occur when community colleges leverage public funding with private resources and develop partnerships that go beyond immediate funding to create a longer term, value-added relationship. Hall (2002) also highlighted the
reciprocal relationships as a way to strive toward both attracting resources from the community and supporting the community, similar to legislative or external affairs.

Having a strong alumni-relations and development program has proven to be an asset to colleges (Pastorela, 2003). In fact, in a 2003 study, Anderson emphasized, “Alumni associations can serve a variety of functions, including supplemental funding, providing scholarships, lobbying with state and federal agencies, student and faculty recruiting, participating on college advisory boards, and acting as liaisons between the college and community” (p. 107).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Community colleges with their unique, multiple missions have a distinct focus on accessibility and affordability. According to Miller (2013),

There are any number of alternative revenue sources community colleges may pursue, but like many institutions of higher education, they may be influenced by the draw of potential donors and focus their external efforts on fundraising. However, they do so out of a necessity to maintain affordability and accessibility because they are reticent to implement dramatic increases in tuition. Not all colleges will have the same capacity for fundraising. (p. 4)

Yet as Ryan and Palmer (2005) suggest,

With the right leadership, all colleges have at least some capacity to secure private funds. Success depends on the extent to which fundraising is viewed as part of the institution’s overall community relations effort, the ways that fundraising tasks are assigned and coordinated, and the strategies used to ensure returns on investment in fundraising campaigns. (p. 43)

This is also true among Michigan community colleges, which are the focus of this study. In 2013, Miller collected data from the IRS 990 reports for 27 of the 28 community college foundations in Michigan (Wayne County Community College did not
have IRS 990 forms available online). In Miller’s report, Contribution and Net Asset data were collected from fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2011 to demonstrate the change in activity over that period of time:

The average yearly contributions nearly doubled during that period from $381,897 in 2003 to $636,830 in 2011. As one might expect, the average net assets also grew over that time period reflecting the increase in foundation and fundraising activity. Thus, the average community college foundation’s net assets more than doubled from $2,887,212 in 2003 to $5,994,830 in 2011. (GuideStar, 2012; Foundation Center, 2012)

According to Miller, the figures vary among community colleges. For example, not all community college foundations have large net assets. This inconsistency is suggestive of the varying degrees of effort positioned on fundraising across the community colleges. Despite this difference, 27 of the 28 community colleges in Michigan appear to have experienced an increase in philanthropic activity. It appears that Michigan community colleges are shifting their behaviors in an effort to engage in pursuing alternative revenues.

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

The importance of fundraising is supported by the American Association of Community Colleges (2006), which has outlined six leadership competencies. Among those is resource management, which includes “taking an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources” (p. 4).

In 2003, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation awarded the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) a grant titled “Leading Forward” to address the national need for community college leaders. The AACC began Leading Forward's work by
hosting a series of four day-long leadership summits with a variety of constituent groups to build consensus around key knowledge, values, and skills needed by community college leaders and to determine how to best develop and sustain leaders. The constituent groups included experts in community college leadership from AACC affiliate councils, college and state "grow-your-own" programs, colleges in underserved areas, and university programs convened between November 2003 and March 2004 (AACC, 2003).

In July 2004, ACT published an AACC-commissioned report, *A Qualitative Analysis of Community College Leadership from the Leading Forward Summits*. It provided AACC with a wealth of qualitative data, providing a broad picture of the competencies that are required of community college leaders. These data were refined and contextualized to fit more closely with the community college environment, resulting in *A Competency Framework for Community College Leaders* (AACC, 2005). By the fall of 2004, AACC had designed a survey to ensure that the critical areas of leadership competence required by community college professionals had been addressed. The survey was distributed electronically in December 2004 to all participants in the leadership summits and to members of the Leading Forward National Advisory Panel. Out of 125 surveys, 95 were returned resulting in a response rate of 76%. This response was accompanied by positive support for the six competencies for community college leaders. One hundred percent of the respondents noted that each of the six competencies was either “very” or “extremely” essential to the effective performance of a community college leader, thus affirming the validity of the Leading
Forward competencies. Respondents also provided suggestions for minor modifications, which were reviewed by AACC staff and integrated into the competencies where appropriate (AACC, 2005).

The Competencies for Community College Leaders are collectively organized in six general areas, as seen in Figure 1, with more specific behaviors, values, and attitudes described for each area.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDRAISING

Because their historical funding base is predicated on state and local taxes along with tuition and fees, community colleges have generally been perceived as able to “make do” with existing resources. For years, community colleges have responded to budget cuts by reducing costs, becoming more efficient, and making tough decisions about program and service priorities in order to live within their means and not overburden students with tuition and fees. A growing number of community college leaders understand that the needs of their communities for workforce and economic development have outstripped the prevailing revenue model. Community colleges have emerged as the primary providers of talent and intellectual capital for their communities and are expected to meet workforce needs through locally designed and delivered education and training.
Organizational Strategy

An effective community college leader strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends.

Illustrations:

- Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to monitor and improve the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.
- Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders to solve problems, make decisions, and plan strategically.
- Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization; to changing demographics; and to the economic, political, and public health needs of students and the community.
- Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.
- Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources and assets.
- Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.

Resource Management

An effective community college leader equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.

Illustrations:

- Ensure accountability in reporting.
- Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of reporting systems and databases.
- Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition, and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies.
- Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.
- Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.
- Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems and that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.
- Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.
- Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.
Communication

An effective community college leader uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission.

Illustrations:

- Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences, appropriately matching message to audience.
- Disseminate and support policies and strategies.
- Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.
- Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies and stakeholders.
- Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.
- Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.

Collaboration

An effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of all students, and sustain the community college mission.

Illustrations:

- Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.
- Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.
- Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.
- Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.
- Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.
- Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.
- Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.
- Facilitate shared problem-solving and decision-making.
## Community College Advocacy

*An effective community college leader understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.*

**Illustrations:**

- Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.
- Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college, seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.
- Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.
- Advance life-long learning and support a learner-centered and learning-centered environment.
- Represent the community college in the local community, in the broader educational community, at various levels of government, and as a model of higher education that can be replicated in international settings.

## Professionalism

*An effective community college leader works ethically to set high standards for self and others, continuously improve self and surroundings, demonstrate accountability to and for the institution, and ensure the long-term viability of the college and community.*

**Illustrations:**

- Demonstrate transformational leadership through authenticity, creativity, and vision.
- Understand and endorse the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.
- Self-assess performance regularly using feedback, reflection, goal-setting, and evaluation.
- Support lifelong learning for self and others.
- Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.
- Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.
- Understand the impact of perceptions, world views, and emotions on self and others.
- Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.
- Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching-learning process and the exchange of knowledge.
- Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.
- Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publication.

Source: AACC, 2005

*Figure 1. AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders.*
Rather than “making do” with scarce resources, some community college leaders are identifying what they “should do” for their regions. The result is an ever-widening gap between available traditional resources and the funds required to meet community and workforce needs.

The need to increase new revenues to community colleges has never been greater. Community college leaders are seeking alternative revenues in order to accomplish their diverse missions. Increased lobbying at the state level has been one immediate response to recent budget cuts, but sources of additional private funds have been slower to develop (Kruse, 2010b). Yet there is growing recognition that expecting more public tax support is not a sufficient or sustainable scenario.

Fundraising for community colleges is a revenue enhancement strategy that is proving to be successful among the nation’s more successful community colleges. In order to be effective in the realm of fundraising, community colleges must include key partners such as the community college president, chief development officer, various college employees, and foundation board members (Carter, 2010). Further, qualified and competent employees must be hired to achieve the goals of the foundation and the institution. Due to the changing demographics, needs, and expectations of donors, today’s community college fundraising staff, including the institution’s president, must possess characteristics and capabilities that were not previously expected of community college leaders.

The literature indicates that successful fundraising in community colleges involves the president who can facilitate coordination by placing the
development/foundation office either as a stand-alone department or in an institutional advancement unit that often also includes public relations, grants management, planning, and other offices that connect the college with external stakeholders.

According to Kruse (2010a), chief development officers need to be a key part of the leadership team to bring visibility and credibility to the fundraising efforts, to gain knowledge and focus of primary college issues, and to provide the necessary linkages at all levels of the organization to respond appropriately to long-range planning and opportunities as they develop. They must be entrepreneurial, possess analytical skills, and be able to relate to and communicate with individuals from different cultures (Hall, 2010). Additionally, “presidents must be flexible, progressive, supportive of the community college foundation goals and its staff, and actively engaged in fundraising activities” (Carter, 2010, p. 10).

The Role of the Chief Development Officer

Chief development officers promote the mission of the institution with one foot in the academic realm and the other in the surrounding community. They raise money, communicate with various external constituencies, and link alumni to their alma mater (Kozobarich, 2000). According to Croteau and Smith (2012), little is known about the chief development officer from the standpoint of leadership and the important competencies necessary for success, but that is changing (p. 28). Jerold Panas (1988), in *Born to Raise*, lists what he believes to be the top 10 characteristics of a successful fundraiser: impeccable integrity, good listening skills, ability to motivate, high energy,
concern for people, high expectations, love of the work, perseverance, presence, and quality of leadership (pp. 212-213). Kathleen Kelly (1998) cites a 1994 study by Margaret Duronio in which the top five characteristics of a successful fundraiser are integrity, honesty, commitment, intelligence, and outgoing personality (p. 88).

In more current research, Jon Derek Croteau, senior partner with Witt/Kieffer Leaders Connecting Leaders, an executive leadership search firm, and Zachary A. Smith, assistant vice chancellor of development for the University of California at Riverside, in 2012 interviewed 10 chief advancement officers in higher education and identified the following 14 common characteristics and abilities/skills (Croteau & Smith, 2012, pp. 192-196):

- Intellectual curiosity
- Effective communication skills
- Self-awareness
- An ability to think critically
- Tenacity
- Thoughtfulness about organizational culture
- A focus on excellence
- An ability to motivate, inspire, and influence
- An ability to tolerate ambiguity
- An ability to accept responsibility and lead by example
- A belief that talent management should be a high priority
- A passion for the mission of the organization
• Strong interpersonal skills
• An ability to think strategically

The Role of the President

Community college presidents are leaders of their institutions, and as such, are vital to the success of the college’s fundraising efforts—often with little or no formal training in this specialized area (Satterwhite, 2004). The literature indicates that given the historic reliance on public funding and without backgrounds in fundraising or public relations, community college leaders may not be prepared for the increasing need to raise funds for their institutions (Weinrich & Reid, 2003). According to Eddy and Rao (2009), the current environment in higher education is allowing the opportunity to transform from the academic CEO to a “fundraising” CEO primarily because community college leadership is in a state of transition. One study predicts that as many as 84% of present community college presidents will retire during the next 10 years. Several plans of action are under way to handle this changing of the guard, including more leadership preparation programs offered by such organizations as the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Council on Education, and the League for Innovation in the Community College.

This quest for new revenue also affects universities. In order to fill these CEO positions with experienced fundraisers, college boards and regents at universities are changing their practice of hiring presidents from academic backgrounds to hiring those with fundraising and public relations skills in their backgrounds (Milliron, de los Santos,
& Browning, 2003). Pinchback (2011) states, because fundraising at community colleges
is still a fairly new undertaking, many administrators have had to alter their views on
fundraising. The majority has had to teach themselves how to fundraise or have taken
part in formal training such as conferences and seminars. But many community college
leaders still have yet to comprehend the importance of fundraising. According to Ryan
and Palmer (2005), with the right leadership, all colleges have at least some capacity to
secure private funds. Success depends on the extent to which fundraising is viewed as
part of the institution’s overall revenue strategy, its community relations effort, the
ways that fundraising tasks are assigned and coordinated, and the strategies used to
ensure returns on investment in fundraising campaigns (p. 43). A community college’s
efforts to raise funds may include campaigns detailing a case for support, special events,
planned giving, unique solicitations, or annual programs (Seiler, 2012).

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this study was to identify and articulate underlying themes of
chief development officer leadership competencies based on the American Association
of Community Colleges’ (2006) six leadership competencies. According to Croteau and
Smith (2012),

> Leaders in any industry must possess a certain level and scope of competence to
be successful. However, in higher education, shared governance and faculty
tenure are the underpinnings of a distinctive culture that drives its operational
processes. Therefore, it is important to have a greater understanding of the
competencies that are important for chief advancement officers who want to
lead effectively within their own units and their campuses as a whole. (p. 20)
Community, state, and federal leaders are recognizing the importance of community colleges to our nation’s long-term economic well-being. Community colleges provide hope to those who pass through their doors, offering the necessary education and training to compete in a 21st century global economy. Yet the very essence of the community college is being threatened due to the decline in traditional funding sources. These trends have prompted community colleges to look for new revenue sources—particularly fundraising—as sustainable alternatives in the face of declining public resources and to keep the cost of tuition affordable for students. As pressures mount on institutions to develop new and creative revenue sources, and community colleges transform themselves to become more viable in the future, the leadership skills of the chief development officer will need to change as well.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The research questions for this study were the following:

1. What are the similarities and differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer, and the chief development officer regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?

2. Is there a relationship between Michigan community college chief development officers and the number of years in their position regarding their perception of the relevancy of the six competencies?
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Fundraising will be successful to the extent that it is viewed “more as a process than a structure, one that builds upon relationships and is embedded in the whole organization” (Jackson & Keener, 2002, p. 3). Involving the development staff in strategic planning efforts is critical and allows for reducing the risk of “soliciting and accepting gifts that shift priorities and siphon resources from high priority subjects to lower priority ones” (Hall, 2002, p. 52). Those community colleges that are lagging in the external funding arena are now seeking information and the crucial skill sets of chief development officers that are necessary for success in a progressively more competitive market for external philanthropic funding. Because of its regency, no research has yet been conducted on the perspectives of current leaders regarding the six AACC leadership competencies and their characteristics as they relate to the skill set of the community college chief development officer.

GAPS IN THE LITERATURE

While the role of the chief development officer within the community college has grown in recent years, the literature lacks a discussion of the specific role and the importance of the position including the leadership competencies needed for this position and successful fundraising. Thus, a specific study related to the community college chief development officer in Michigan may yield unique findings and perspectives.
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

_Advancement:_ A systematic, integrated method of managing relationships in order to increase an educational institution’s support from its key outside constituents, including alumni and friends, government policy makers, the media, members of the community, and philanthropic entities of all types.

_Development:_ Development at educational institutions encompasses a sophisticated and comprehensive program of annual giving, campaigns, major gifts, and planned giving. Sources of funding include corporations, foundations, trustees, alumni, faculty and staff, parents, and current students (CASE, 2004).

_Fundraising:_ The solicitation or asking of gifts (Worth, 1993).

_Chief Development Officer:_ The individual who heads an organization’s development program, with either this title or another, such as vice president for development, vice president for external affairs and development, or chief development officer (Temple, Seiler, & Aldrich, 2011).

_Chief Instructional Officer:_ The chief instructional officer (CIO) also refers to vice president of instruction or chief academic officer (CAO).

_Community College:_ The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2012) classifies these as institutions where all degrees are at the associate's level, or where bachelor's degrees account for less than 10% of all undergraduate degrees also referred to as two-year institutions.

_Philanthropic Support:_ A gift given by a private source in an effort to enhance the well-being of humanity (Stewart, 2006).
Private Funds: Contributions, gifts, and grants received from private sources by a foundation as reported on IRS Form 990 line 1a (GuideStar, 2008). These funds include individual donors, corporations, and private foundations but not contributions, gifts, or grants from public or government sources.

Resource Development: Refers to all dynamics of a continuing fundraising program such as annual giving, special gifts, planned gifts, and public relations (Temple et al., 2011).

DELIMITATIONS

Because this study focused on responses of community college presidents/chancellors, chief academic officers, and chief development officers from within the state of Michigan, the generalizability of the results to other settings may be limited. In addition, participants’ responses will be reflections of their personal education, experiences, and insights from the vantage point of their positions as presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers, and, therefore, may not be generalizable to the entire population of their community college peers.

LIMITATIONS

Because convenience sampling was used in the quantitative phase of the study, the researcher cannot say with confidence that the sample is representative of the population (Creswell, 2002). In the quantitative phase of the study, there is a potential risk of a non-response error, i.e., problems caused by differences between those who respond and those who do not in the event of a low response rate (Dillman, 2000).
to the nature of qualitative research, the data obtained in the qualitative phase of the study may be subject to different interpretations by different readers. Because of the interpretative nature of qualitative research, the investigator may unintentionally introduce bias into the analysis of the findings. The study has a limitation to validity and reliability only to the particular population on which this study focused. As noted, only Michigan public community college presidents/chancellors, chief academic officers, and chief development officers were studied. This sample, then, excluded private community colleges as well as four-year institutions.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study used a mixed methods design, which is a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and “mixing” both quantitative and qualitative data at some stage of the research process within a single study in order to understand a research problem more completely (Creswell, 2002). The rationale for mixing is that neither quantitative nor qualitative methods are sufficient by themselves to capture the trends and details of the situation. When used in combination, quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other and allow for more complete analysis (Green, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

**ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY**

This research study is structured into five chapters. Chapter One presents the introduction, statement of the problem, significance of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, definitions, delimitations, limitations, and organization of the study.
The literature review in Chapter Two presents a historical review of higher education fundraising, community college fundraising and its organizational structure, leadership roles in fundraising, including the chief development officer, and leadership competencies. Chapter Three explains the research methods applied. It includes the research design, a description of the participants, instrumentation used, data collection procedures, data organization, data analysis, and summary. Chapter Four contains the results of the quantitative and qualitative research, treatment of data, description of respondents, statistical and sorting, classification methods used for analysis, and a summary of findings. Chapter Five presents the study summary, conclusions, and implications of the results and recommendations and guidance for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The following review of literature will provide the reader with a historical foundation of higher education fundraising, community college fundraising including the organizational structure of the development office, and characteristics of successful community college foundations and resource development offices.

Private funding is critical to the future of the American community college. As funding from the state continues to erode, more of the funding burden is placed on the students, threatening the community college hallmark of fulfilling their mission of access and affordability. The community college has long been associated with being all things to all people with the variety of services they provide to students and the communities they serve (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). Not only do community colleges provide an educational starting place for students, they also provide continuing education to community members and serve as economic development centers for the communities they serve. As community colleges search for additional sources of revenue to meet community needs, fundraising efforts have become a component of the fiscal stability plans (Miller, 2013).

The role of the chief development officer and the development office is to pursue commitments for financial resources (Satterwhite, 2004) in order to raise and
increase outside financial support for the institution (Sturgis, 2006). It is critical for chief development officers who lead community college foundations and resource development offices to possess the necessary leadership competencies in order to raise private funds for the learners they serve. Therefore, developing an understanding a chief development officer’s leadership competencies, characteristics, and skill sets is important in order to be effective in maximizing fundraising.

**HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF FUNDRAISING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

In their complete history of higher education fundraising in America, Croteau and Smith (2012) write that Harvard, founded in 1636, was the first higher education institution to receive a philanthropic gift. This gift was donated by its namesake, John Harvard, who not only donated cash, but also approximately 400 books from his estate. This gift also marked the beginning of donor named gift recognition in the American higher education philanthropy realm and initiated what would ultimately become the world’s largest higher education endowment. During the colonial period, there were varying degrees of oversight from the British and America’s population grew, but the majority of the wealth was still concentrated in England. Not too soon after John Harvard made his gift, three men, William Hibbens, Thomas Weld, and Hugh Peter, traveled to London on behalf of the college to raise more needed funds. This was a first in fundraising strategy used by an American higher education institution. Interestingly enough, these men created and developed the first fundraising brochure, known today as a “case statement” which was presented to prospective donors in London (pp. 6-7).
Private schools do not receive public funding and have a long history of fundraising experience (Cook, 1994), whereas public institutions have historically relied upon state government funding (Archibald & Feldman, 2006). During the 19th century, competition for external dollars intensified as private institutions and other non-profit organizations became more skillful at the processes and strategies involved with fundraising (Miller, 1994). According to Worth (1993), it was also during this time that the first alumni associations were created with a sole mission in mind “to perpetuate memories and intellectual interests among graduates” (p. 19).

Croteau and Smith (2012) describe early alumni fundraising efforts as “a way for associations to give back to a school and its students, often in the form of scholarships” (p. 9). As many institutions began to grow and prosper, they started to build their endowments by soliciting alumni on a regular basis and, thus, “as the number of alumni grew larger, the funds they contributed grew as well. These organized campaigns rapidly replaced the occasional individual appeals” (Cohen, 1998).

Because of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 that granted public land for states to establish land-grant institutions, land-grant public institutions increased and fundraising methods moved from the traditional private institutions into public institutions (Croteau & Smith, 2012). According to Worth (1993), since private institutions were dominant on the East Coast, a great number of public institution fundraising initiated in the Midwest.

The review of literature suggests that throughout the first half of the 1900s, much of fundraising strategy for higher education was provided by paid consultants
including any campaign fundraising; however, the actual fundraising efforts were conducted by campus leaders, faculty, and, at times, volunteers (Worth, 2002). The era of the consultant fundraiser, as noted by Kelly, was from 1919 to 1965. It wasn’t until after 1965 that the significance of having fundraisers on staff became evident (Cohen, 1998). Croteau and Smith (2012) suggest:

As institutions continued to open across the country, more-sophisticated methods of fundraising emerged. But there were still no formal development programs. Most fundraising responsibilities continued to fall on the shoulders of faculty, university presidents, and paid consultants. However, methods including the development of prospect rating systems and donor contact lists, and advanced methods for soliciting gifts, took hold as more people on campus participated in philanthropic endeavors to raise highly sought-after funds for various projects and programs. (p. 9)

The 20th century saw public colleges and universities experiencing unprecedented growth. In order to meet operational cost increases related to their growth, colleges and universities became more dependent on revenue from the federal government (Lucas, 1994). Pocock (1989) reports that private giving to universities increased tenfold in the years 1910 through 1950. It was not until about the middle of the 20th century that the legitimacy and profession of higher education fundraising became more credible based on the art and science of fundraising (Croteau & Smith, 2012). In fact, it was during this time that higher education organizations began by adding full-time development and advancement staff to their operations, based on the groundwork laid by Charles Sumner Ward (Croteau & Smith, 2012). Ward, a YMCA executive, is credited with developing fundraising techniques that encompassed careful organization, selected leadership, aspects of team competition, powerful publicity, a
large gift to be matched, careful records, reports of meetings, and a definite time limit (Cutlip, 1990).

For the past 30 years, state funding for higher education has been decreasing and “aggregate state effort has fallen by 30% since the late 1970’s” (Archibald & Feldman, 2006, p. 618). With the continued decrease in state funding, many public institutions now look to private fundraising to offset these losses in public funding. This shift to a greater reliance on non-public sources of revenue has grown for public institutions, requiring a special focus on the fundraising capacity of the institution. During the mid-1970s, and by the early 1980s, public institutions initiated fundraising programs and were seeking opportunities in the private sector to assist with financial needs. Steadily, over the past three decades, public institutions have matched private institutions in their reliance and commitment to fundraising from the private sector (Cook, 1997).

COMMUNITY COLLEGE FUNDRAISING

As discussed in Chapter One, Michigan’s community college funding was originally conceived to be based on the model of one-third state aid, one-third tuition and fees, and one-third local property taxes. On a national level, when community colleges were forming, they made modest demands on public funds and received funding support through the public K-12 school budgets. However, after community college districts began to form, this changed. According to Cohen and Brawer (2008),
community colleges received state assistance, while the majority of the funding came from local taxes.

Much of the pre-World War II era saw state funding remain low and student tuition and fees providing the bulk of community college funding. Over time and especially more recently, community college funding has shifted dramatically as local taxes and state aid have declined as a percentage of overall revenue resulting in “an increased dependence on tuition as a source of revenue” (Cohen & Brawer, 2008, p. 158).

According to Akin (2005), the percentage of revenue from states in 1965 increased from 34% of the total budget to 60% by 1980. However, priorities have shifted; there are now more demands for state revenues and greater challenges to meet legislative funding requests (Ehrenberg, 2006) and, unfortunately, state financial support for higher education has become a lower priority. To illustrate this decline, Michigan’s FY 2001-02 state aid share of total operating revenue for community colleges totaled $316.4 million, or 30.3% of total community college operating revenue. By FY 2009-10, declining state revenue and ensuing budget reductions reduced state aid to approximately 18.9% of the total operating revenue sources for community colleges (Bowerman, 2011).

Wayne County Community College (WCCC), based in Detroit, Michigan, has been one of the most severely affected by the economic crisis that began in 2008 (Stoll, 2010). In fact, WCCC raised its tuition by 16% to $79 per credit hour in 2010 to replace its shortfall in state funding. It was also during this same time period that the school
reached its capacity enrollment and turned away eligible students in the fall of 2010. To add to this funding crisis, Michigan’s home value revenues plummeted by 20% between 2008-2010 resulting in dramatic decreases in local property tax revenues, and federal funding to the state’s community colleges was also indirectly cut due to a $72.1 million reduction in the job-retraining “No Worker Left Behind” program in Michigan (Stoll, 2010).

To offset these funding declines, many colleges have also initiated activities to provide additional revenues. According to Tony Zeiss (2003), president of Central Piedmont Community College in North Carolina, increased lobbying has been one immediate response to recent budget cuts (2003). Other activities include grant writing, patents, real estate, and private donations in order to make ends meet. Administrators at these schools say it is the only way they can compete with other higher education institutions (Damast, 2007). Unfortunately, sources of additional private funds have been slower to develop at community colleges (Zeiss, 2003), resulting in community colleges being the last segment of higher education to engage in fundraising endeavors (Akin, 2005).

Community College Foundations

The 1980s and 1990s marked the beginning of private fundraising in the community college sector due to a decline in public funding (Jones, 2010), and saw the majority of today’s community college foundations being created (Keener, Carrier, & Meaders, 2002; Kerns & Witter, 1997). Tracing the history of community college
foundations is challenging because information about their operation was not
catalogued and organized on a national level (Jenkins & Glass, 1999). According to Gray
(2008), Midway Junior College in Kentucky was the first to have organized fundraising
dating back to 1906. Gray also states that while 18 community colleges reported having
established foundations before 1960, it is believed that Highland Community College
Foundation located in Illinois established its foundation in 1962 and is the oldest non-
profit corporation supporting a public community college (p. 15). Angel and Gares
(1989) have noted in their research that between 1966 and 1987 almost 600 new
community college foundations were created.

In the 1970s, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (now
called the American Association of Community Colleges) encouraged community
colleges to develop fundraising initiatives (Carter, 2010). Wattenbarger (1982)
recognized that soliciting funds through the foundation was a way to protect donors and
their specific interests while holding the college accountable. In a similar study, Robison
(1982) reported raising money was vital to the community college foundation as this
accomplished both monetary and non-monetary goals. According to Gray (2008), “Non-
monetary goals include making facilities available for community activities or helping to
attract new businesses to the community. Monetary goals include providing funding for
such things as student scholarships, educational programs, and capital equipment”
(p. 18).
Characteristics of Successful Community College Resource Development Offices and Foundations

In 1982, Robison interviewed several foundation directors who were identified by colleagues as leaders of successful community college foundations. Robison found the following characteristics were consistent among these successful foundations: (1) presidential understanding and support of fundraising, (2) a commitment from the college’s board of trustees, and (3) the inclusion of community members on the foundation board who represented and had access to centers of influence and wealth within the community such as bankers, lawyers, presidents of corporations, and other well-recognized community leaders (p. 37).

In a more recent study, Jones (2008) researched characteristics that determined successful fundraising among community colleges. Jones interviewed the chief development officers at 12 institutions with a track record of successful fundraising programs based on endowment-per-student and outright gifts. Not surprisingly, Jones found that the most influential characteristic was an overall commitment to institutional fundraising. This commitment, as defined by Jones, is a president who is personally involved in the fundraising process and one who is willing to designate resources for development work.

Community colleges also have a unique opportunity to demonstrate to local businesses and industry the essential role the college plays in preparing the workforce and contributing to economic and community development. Many corporations and foundations understand the need to contribute and create scholarships as a way to
ensure a broader pool of potential workers (Grover, 2009). Angel and Gares (1989) suggest that successful community college foundations have a concise and compelling case statement associated with the college’s needs (p. 12). As noted by Gray (2008) in her dissertation, “This clearly identifies the needs of the college to potential donors” (p. 19). Temple, Seiler, and Aldrich (2011) also note that the case for support is the urgent call for a solution to a problem.

The number and composition of development staff is often cited as characteristic of fundraising success. The literature indicates that when a community college has at least one full-time staff member solely designated to manage the efforts of fundraising, it is successful (Gatewood, 1994; Hunter, 1987; Thomas, 2008). Size of the college also matters (Keener et al., 2002; Loessin & Duronio, 1993) but as Worth (1993) states, it may have more to do with resources that are allocated to staff and the fundraising budget. The old saying “it takes money to make money” is true when it comes to fundraising. As Skari (2011) discusses in her study of community college alumni donors, four-year institutions have larger endowments because of their longer history of fundraising, and thus they are able to fund their fundraising operations from their endowments, not from the institution, allowing fundraising operations autonomy from the institution. Because community colleges are new to fundraising, many have small endowments and are unable to generate sufficient revenues to cover operations (Hedgepeth, 2000). This becomes a problem, as “institutions take budget cuts, less money is available to support college programs. With less money left to spend on
cultivation and solicitation, institutions realize fewer private gifts, further reducing the amount of money left to spend on generating private gifts” (Skari, 2011, p. 17).

Alumni Relations

According to Lyons (2007), the oldest, continually active community college alumni program started in the mid-1970s at Northampton Community College in Pennsylvania, with many alumni efforts at community colleges emerging within the last decade. In the past, community colleges have not relied on gifts by alumni to support their alma mater (Keener, Ryan, & Smith, 1991), because historically fundraising was seen as an unnecessary role (Glass & Jackson, 1998a). Pokrass (1989) theorized that because community colleges themselves are relatively new, their alumni are not sufficiently well established in their careers to be able to offer significant support to these institutions. Akin (2005) noted, “In addition to coming from different backgrounds and approaching higher education with differing expectations, alumni who continue their education and graduate from four-year institutions usually transfer their allegiance to those institutions.”

But the perspectives on community college alumni and fundraising are changing. In her dissertation examining characteristics of community college alumni donors, Skari (2011) found evidence of a linkage between “completion and giving.” Skari’s research showed students who completed their associate degree prior to transferring to a four-year institution had a greater likelihood of giving. Additionally, a student’s positive experience that included participation in extracurricular activities, coupled with
productive relationships with staff and faculty, also led to a greater likelihood of giving.

Skari suggests that

community colleges can influence future giving today by ensuring a quality academic environment for students. Opportunities for students to develop connections and become engaged, both inside and outside the classroom, not only support retention and completion efforts, they fortify the social exchanges relationships that can generate private gifts. (p. 142)

Organizational Structure and Institutional Strategies

There has been no research that has suggested organizational structure ensures success for community college resource development operations, “especially given the uniqueness of local influence” (Garcia, 2009); however, Glass and Jackson (1998a) contend, many community college resource development operation structures “depend[s] on size, location, competition, and [the] market of the institution” (p. 721). This is evident in Garcia’s (2009) research, wherein she focused on the need for community colleges to expand their fundraising efforts to counteract decreased public funding so that they functioned more like fundraising efforts at traditional four-year institutions. While Garcia’s study was limited to community colleges located in the state of Texas, the findings of this study related to the age, location, and size of the community college, and the effects that these factors had on successful fundraising. However, the author makes it clear that all indications point toward a greater need for research on fundraising at community colleges (Garcia, 2009).

In 2002, Brumbach and Villadsen explored different organizational models used in community college fundraising and found that there are four typical organizational structures for the resource development operation:
• Line Model: development functions as an equal partner with branches of college administration

• Centralized Model: development function reports to vice president for advancement who reports to president

• Staff Model: development director serves as assistant to the president

• Decentralized Model: public relations, alumni, contracts and grants, fund raising, legislative relations dispersed with several supervisors (p. 81).

Ciampa’s (2009) qualitative study focused on the community college chief development officer of the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. This research focused on the community college chief development officer and their relationships, commitments, expectations, and responsibilities. The research found that the community college development offices should follow the centralized model (Ciampa, 2009). In a similar study, Duronio and Loessin (1991) found that fundraisers preferred a centralized structure to be the most effective. Interestingly enough, however, these researchers “...found no proof that one structure is superior to the others” (p. 210). They added, “In community colleges, centralization often occurs simply because one person performs multiple duties” (Glass & Jackson, 1998a, p. 722).

The size of the community college often dictates the type of development office structure, which may explain why some larger community colleges implement a decentralized model, similar to universities (Garcia, 2009). Evans (1993) observed, “In a decentralized program, development efforts are divided by units, schools, colleges, or other programs with development officers reporting to the deans or program directors of the units they serve” (p. 280). Evans noted that regardless of the model used, the
following issues must be considered: “commitment to the unit, goals and planning, evaluation and compensation, training and career development, and major gift management” (pp. 281-282).

Akin (2005) has defined four strategies for tailoring fundraising to the community college setting, and these strategies consistently appear in the literature about community college fundraising. The strategies identified include integrating resource development with institutional planning, staffing foundation boards with individuals who are interested in the college and are able to solicit donations, building relationships with the community, and providing strong presidential leadership and support to fund-raising efforts (pp. 68-69). These strategies are further described below.

Institutional Planning

Seymour (1966) found successful fundraising strategic themes include focusing on clear organization and leadership, articulation of the mission, and effective planning. The fundraising process must start with a well-defined plan (Seymour, 1966). In a similar study, Dove (1991) adds to these necessary organizational requirements the need for a strong institutional mission and vision, a strategic plan, and clearly articulated objectives.

In a more recent research, according to Anderson (2003), integrating resource development with institutional planning is to form a link between the college mission, the college foundation mission, and the strategic plan. Interestingly enough, flexibility is
vital in the strategic plan, as this permits the college to benefit from potential opportunities (Wenrich & Reid, 2003).

Boards

Community college boards of trustees’ responsibilities include promoting and representing the college in a positive way to the local community as well as establishing the mission and goals and setting policy. According to Southerland and Graham (1994), governing board members may or may not completely see the importance and worth of fundraising to the college. Many are not active in the fundraising arena and commonly agree that any fundraising is the responsibility of the college foundation board (pp. 5-8). While every board member may not understand his or her respective role and the importance of private fundraising for their institutions (Jackson & Glass, 2000), “each board member has his or her own sphere of influence outside the organization and comes into contact with a broad array of ‘movers and shakers’ within the community” (Ringle, 2008, p. 16).

Foundation board members, as noted by Taylor (1994), are the driving force behind a successful foundation. In her 2010 Donor-Focused Fundraising Model: An Essential Tool in Community College Foundations’ Toolkit, Carter cited Smith (1994) as well as Zimmerman and Lehman (2004), stating that:

Foundation board members are dedicated and well-trained board members who help the president and development staff, identify, cultivate, solicit, and steward donors. The board members have experience serving on other nonprofit organizations’ board, have skills that complement the needs of the community college foundations and have access to individuals who can contribute to the community college foundation (Smith, 1994). These skills are necessary for the
board members to perform their responsibilities, which include making contributions themselves, asking others to contribute, engaging new board members, and supervising the organizations’ fundraising efforts. (p. 10)

Relationships

Babitz (2003) parallels community colleges’ fundraising success to friend-raising:

“The purpose of friend-raising is not necessarily to immediately raise funds, but is instead designed to make potential donors aware of the college, its mission, and the benefits the college provides to the local community” (Phillippe & Eblinger, 1998, as cited by Akin, 2005). Hodson’s (2010) research showed the importance of the president, academic deans, and development staff forming an effective team to foster relationships with potential donors by communicating the college’s story, and then asking them to invest in the institution.

In her case study, Brunen (2012) explored prior experiences of presidents in fundraising to determine if experiences had any impact on the ease with which presidents engage in external relationships with key constituents. For this case study, Brunen selected three current community college presidents serving public, single-campus two-year colleges with institutionally affiliated foundations. Based on interviews, the researcher found valuable fundraising skills and competencies recommended for today's leaders included personalized communication and the ability to build lasting relationships with a variety of constituents (Brunen, 2012).
College President

According to Babitz (2003), “College presidents are the central link between trustees and the foundation and are the most vital and visible fundraising presence” (p. 8). In addition, they perform six necessary activities relative to fundraising:

(1) develop institutional vision, (2) ensure chief development officer qualifications, (3) maintain strong ties with the foundation board, (4) understand the development process, (5) cultivate/solicit major gift prospects, and (6) attend activities (Babitz, 2003).

Rowland (1986) emphasizes that there must be a special operational relationship between the president of an institution and the chief development officer. Because the president is, by virtue of his or her position, the college’s chief fundraiser, it follows that a special functional relationship must exist between the president and the institutional fundraising office. As chief executive of the institution, the president reflects the goals and objectives of the college and, in fact, plays a major role in defining them. In addition, the president is the major interface with all of the institution’s various publics. For these reasons, it is imperative that the chief development officer and development office staff work closely and in concert with the president on all institutional advancement programs in order to be effective. So central is the role of the president to the success or failure of the fundraising program that his or her lack of participation and support can undo any efforts made in this direction (pp. 11-12).

The importance of presidential leadership and an effective team was underscored in the research by Wenrich and Reid (2003), who examined the relationship between the college president and the chief development officer. They
found that the president and chief development officer have separate and distinct roles in fundraising. For example, the president steers the fundraising efforts, but both the president and chief development officer cultivate relationships with potential donors and make the ask. But more importantly, as articulated by Wenrich and Reid, it is the president’s job to make sure she or he hires a competent chief development officer because this person will lead the foundation and ultimately help to facilitate cultivation between donors and the president. Wenrich and Reid note that fundraising success involves these two key positions working in harmony.

There are other key players in the fundraising equation as well. Hodson (2010) articulates that faculty can have great influence on the college’s ability to raise funds because they are among the most effective contacts with potential donors and they know student need first hand, thus making them the best spokespeople for the college. Additionally, while deans have performed in an administrative role by serving in an academic capacity, this role is changing due in part because of funding issues (Waugh, 2003). While some prospective donors respond best to being cultivated and solicited by the president, others, particularly those in industry, want to hear directly what is happening in the classrooms and labs by faculty, deans, and students (Hudson, 2010).

LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE CHIEF DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

The role of the resource development officer in community colleges has gained increased attention in recent years, yet research and related literature lacks a more full discussion about this position. In a search for existing research on community college
chief development officers and leadership competencies necessary for success in this position, a handful of related studies were discovered but none specifically focused on community college resource development (Crawford, 1976; Croteau & Smith 2012; Dean, 2007; Lanning, 2007; Murray, 2008; Walker, 2012).

One of the earliest research studies involving a chief development officer was conducted in 1976. This quantitative study collected data from a sample of presidents and chief development officers at both public and private institutions (Crawford, 1976). The purpose of the study, according to Walker (2012), was to outline the characteristics and duties of the chief development officer. The results were demographic statistics such as age, gender, level of education, and experience. Other data gathered included fundraising experience of presidents, the time devoted to fundraising by the president, and an attempt to determine areas of agreement and disagreement regarding the role of the chief development officer. (p. 32)

In his study of higher education fundraising, Lanning (2007) indicated that it was challenging to acquire the necessary knowledge of fundraising by major gift officers with minimal previous experience because most were hired from other non-fundraising fields of employment. Lanning (2007) found that the average male development officer tends to be older with more formal education, while the average female development officer tends to be 41-60 years of age. In addition he noted that female development officers were more likely to possess a Certified Fund Raising Executive (CFRE) credential. The Association of Fundraising Professionals is an international organization providing certification in fundraising and a practice-based credential for career professionals (Certified Fund Raising Executive International, 2009). Interestingly, Lanning developed
a model for skill attainment and a recommended curriculum because his findings indicated that most individuals came to their fundraising positions by accident, with no experience and little preparation.

Through his research, Lanning (2007) identified a list of characteristics leading to expertise in the field of fundraising, but there was no reference or recommendation provided for a development officer to ascend to the role of chief development officer. Lanning identified several traits leading to fundraising expertise, even though the respondents did not exhibit some of those traits themselves.

Dean (2007) explored perceptions of chief development officers concerning major factors of influence that impact increased alumni giving. He found that the factors could be placed in the following three categories: alumni involvement, student experience, and socio-demographic attributes. Based on his dissertation study, Dean was able to create a profile for a chief development officer. This chief development officer had a mean age of just over 50 years, and had been in his or her current position at least five years, and had more than 20 years fundraising experience, 18 of which were in higher education.

Murray’s (2008) research focused on management activities and programs, in addition to the descriptive statistics to construct a chief development officer profile. She found most chief development officers had been in their current position only four years, and that 90% of these individuals supervised the resource development office including alumni relations. Many did not hold any official certification, such as CFRE or
terminal degree. Murray also discovered that the chief development officer was responsible for overseeing other programs such as alumni and public relations.

In his study of the chief development officer in higher education, Walker (2012) surveyed chief development officers at four-year public institutions who were members of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). His survey focused on four research questions designed to discover factors that would contribute to the success of a chief development officer. These include involvement of the president, partnerships with the deans, positive reputation of the resource development office, a chief development officer with an advanced degree, management experience, and a supportive staff.

More closely aligned to this research was a comprehensive study by Croteau and Smith (2012). Through research consisting of 10 case studies of successful chief advancement officers (nominated by their peers), various interviews with industry leaders, review of resumes and professional documents, and surveys of chief advancement officers, the researchers were able to create a leadership competency model based on the results of the interviews and rigorous data analysis that would “provide a blueprint for preparing future advancement leaders for the rigors of the job” (p. 3). The 14 common characteristics and abilities/skills are as follows:

• Intellectual curiosity

• Effective communication skills

• Self-awareness

• An ability to think critically
• Tenacity
• Thoughtfulness about organizational culture
• A focus on excellence
• An ability to motivate, inspire, and influence
• An ability to tolerate ambiguity
• An ability to accept responsibility and lead by example
• A belief that talent management should be a high priority
• A passion for the mission of the organization
• Strong interpersonal skills
• An ability to think strategically (Croteau & Smith, 2012, pp. 192-196)

A review of the literature indicates agreement that successful fundraising begins with hiring an effective chief development officer as an essential first step. This position should be filled by someone who is skilled in matching donors’ interests with the institution’s projects, developing relationships with people of diverse backgrounds, and using online tools in new and creative ways (Hall, 2010). Likewise, Williams (2013) asserts the chief development officer should know how to plan, design, implement, manage, and evaluate the development office (p. 126). Long-term fundraising success requires the attention of someone who is competent to plan, organize, and manage the fundraising process (Temple et al., 2011).

During the annual conference of the AACC Affiliate National Council for Resource Development in 1992, eight panelists under the leadership of Dr. Mary Brumbach,
created a list of tasks and duties of the community college chief development officer using a modified DACUM (Develop A CUrricluM) process. The DACUM process, according to Brumbach (2006), is based on three principles: expert workers are better able to define and describe their job than anyone else; any job can be effectively described in terms of the duties and tasks that successful workers in that occupation perform; and, workers need certain specific attitudes and knowledge to perform each task correctly. (p. 1)

The original analysis was later validated through the Council for Resource Development’s 2005 Senior Symposium on Emerging Issues in Newport, Rhode Island, and at the 2005 annual conference of the Council for Resource Development in Washington, D.C., again led by Dr. Brumbach (2006). Brumbach’s study found that community college chief development officer job descriptions often included a direct reporting line to the president, serving as a member of the president’s cabinet, having influence in goal setting and direction for the college, having responsibility for private and public fundraising, including responsibilities in supervising staff, and preparing for the future. Further, the job analysis task and duties included the following:

• Institutional Duties
• Fundraising Duties
• Management Duties
• Personal/Professional Duties (Brumbach, 2006, p. 15).

The following is a list of attitudes and traits, Brumbach (2006) found in her 2005 DACUM study of chief development officers: visionary, high energy, humor, fun-loving,
persevering, patient, optimistic, sociable, confident, nurturing, kind, high standards of integrity, courageous, risk taking, painstaking, altruistic, assertive, self-motivated, empathetic, intuitive, responsive, orderly, reliable, holistic view, leads by example, social consciousness, passionate, detail oriented, right brain/left brain balance, humility, takes rejection, resilient, healthy, adaptive, flexible, and high tolerance of ambiguity (p. 14).

According to Cook (1994), presidents of public four-year and two-year institutions historically delegated the daily fundraising responsibilities to a professional resource development staff. This allowed the president to pay more attention to academic concerns, public relations, budgets, and other matters. As the job and responsibility of attracting contributions grew, a new position of one individual responsible for all fundraising operations began to emerge (Walker, 2012). As explained by Sturgis (2006), this leadership position has evolved over time and is now viewed as a campus leader because the function became essential to the financial success of higher education institutions.

Croteau and Smith (2012) found that a considerable number of development leaders indicated their entry to the profession was unplanned, and many advanced into leadership positions without any formal training or professional development in fundraising. Croteau and Smith point out that while these development leaders were successful, some still lacked the necessary competence to be effective leaders, often putting the institutions they served “at risk” (p. 2). Chief development officers serve in high-profile, and at times, highly political positions, calling for tact and savvy when dealing with formal and informal leaders within and outside of the institution as well as
donor prospects and other constituents. Thus chief development officers must possess the necessary competencies to “navigate ambiguous, dynamic environments” (Croteau & Smith, 2012). This includes being able to communicate effectively with the college president, various internal and external stakeholders, wealthy donors and faculty, while “focusing on strategic outcomes and objectives” (p. 2).

American Association of Community College Competencies

Within the community college sector, several sources of support for leaders have emerged. In 2005, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) identified six competencies they found essential to community college leadership as part of its Leading Forward initiative. Eddy (2010) explains that this research was the result of a two-year effort to provide a set of competencies that could guide future leaders. In particular, the AACC hoped that emerging leaders would use the framework to guide and measure their own professional development and prepare for high-level leadership positions in community colleges (pp. 1-2). Given the challenges and the importance of fundraising, the following list of competencies may be useful as a framework to prospective community college chief development officers.

A survey conducted in 2004 by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), found that community college leaders in today’s setting must be skilled and well-informed in the areas of educational finances and fundraising, strategic planning, diversity and multiculturalism, cooperation and collaboration, shared governance, state
and federal government mandates, and have a tolerance for ambiguity (McClenney, 2001; Shults, 2001).

It is important to identify what a competency is as it relates to AACC leadership guidance. According to Lucia and Lepsinger (1999), a competency is more than the knowledge and ability to perform a job. Rather, a competency is a combination of related knowledge, skills, and attitudes that come together and have an effect on what a person is responsible for in his or her job. Competencies can be measured against established standards and can be learned. They are different than job descriptions because job descriptions list tasks, functions, and responsibilities (Kools, 2010).

Over the years, researchers have identified and published numerous skills, knowledge, and behaviors demonstrated by effective leaders. More recently, researchers have been searching to determine which of these characteristics the next generation of community college leaders should accomplish (Bechtel, 2010). Hockaday and Puyear (2000) theorized that the leadership characteristics and skills that helped to place community colleges in a strategic position in the past will not change in the future; only the goals of an institution will change. Acknowledging that no two leaders are alike, they identified the following competencies in their study: vision, integrity, confidence, courage, technical knowledge, collaboration, persistence, good judgment, and a desire to lead (pp. 1-2).

In another study, Chiriboga (2003) examined the leadership competencies developed by the American Association of California Community College Administrators (ACCCCA) that were grounded in concepts of basic management. The core competencies
that were identified were also integrated into the ACCCA community college administrators’ professional development curriculum and included areas of budget, finance, legal, and human resources along with shared governance. Interestingly enough, Chiriboga theorized that community college leaders lacked these competencies as the result of their lack of formal business education.

A review of the characteristics and traits identified in the literature on leadership clearly support these qualities and are also reflected in the six AACC leadership competencies below.

**Competency 1. Organizational Strategy Competency**

The skills associated with the organizational strategy competency include assessing, developing, implementing, and evaluating strategies regularly; making use of data and proven practices from internal/external stakeholders to solve problems; using a systems prospective to address cultural and environmental changes to the organization; developing a positive work environment; maintaining personnel and fiscal resources; and aligning organizational mission and resources with the future (AACC, 2005). This is consistent with Kouzes and Posner’s (2007) argument that effective leaders need to have the ability to imagine the desirable destination, be forward-thinking, inspiring, and competent (p. 29). Further, leaders must be able to inspire by communicating the vision that excites them and encourages others to be part of the cause.
**Competency 2: Resource Management Competency**

Among the AACC resource management competency skills listed are to ensure accountability, support operational decisions by managing resources, take an entrepreneurial focus to seek alternative funding sources, implement financial strategies to support programs and implement a human resources systems (AACC, 2005). These skills are consistent with Myran's (2003) assertion that transformational leaders must lead those associated with the community college away from their comfortable programs, services, structures, and systems to reinvent the college (p. 9). Myran also suggests that a key community college leadership attribute is the ability to increase the capacity of the organization. This involves developing financial resources in ways that are aligned with the college's mission (pp. 102-103).

**Competency 3: Communication Competency**

Skills described by AACC associated with the competency of communication focus on developing and communicating a shared mission and vision; distributing and supporting policies; creating open communication; conveying ideas and information succinctly through media, and to internal/external stakeholders; being an active listener; and being responsive and tactful (AACC, 2005). These skills are consistent with characteristics described by Eddy (2010), who emphasized “a college president—who must often take the role of chief communicator—must listen to campus feedback and clearly articulate the college’s vision and strategies to fulfill it” (p. 96). Kouzes and Posner’s (2007) research reinforces the notion that innovation requires communication and listening skills (p. 177).
**Competency 4: Collaboration Competency**

AACC defines an effective collaborator as one who can embrace and encourage diversity; demonstrate cultural competence in a global society; has a strong commitment to students, faculty, staff and community; works to build partnerships that advance the mission, vision and goals; and has the ability to manage conflict and change (AACC, 2005). These competencies are reinforced by Weisman and Vaughan (2007), who contend that leaders must have the skills to appreciate multiculturalism, build coalitions, and bring the institution together. Myran (2003) states that “relationship building is at the center of all efforts to enhance and protect the reputation of the college” (p. 100). These personal relationships give community college leaders a way to keep internal/external stakeholders informed and a means to detect changing perceptions of the institution (Myran, 2003, p.100).

**Competency 5: Community College Advocacy Competency**

The AACC leadership competencies define community college advocacy as valuing and promoting diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence; a passion and commitment to the mission of the college and success of students; promoting open access, teaching, learning, and innovation; advocating the mission of the college to all stakeholders; promoting lifelong learning; and representing the college. These competencies are reflected in contemporary community college leadership literature as well. Simone (2003) contends that leaders must challenge themselves, faculty, and staff to meet or exceed the same standard of lifelong learning that is expected of students (p.
Leaders will need to continue to recognize the importance of diversity as Myran (2009) suggests citing the prevalent diversity among community college students.

**Competency 6: Professionalism Competency**

The final AACC leadership competency is professionalism. The skills identified in this competency are transformational leadership style; understand and endorse the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college; regular self-assessment; support of lifelong learning; self-care; courageous risk taking; understanding of worldviews, and promotion of higher standards; (AACC, 2005). The work of AACC emphasizes the continued relevance of these competencies, as described in Vaughan’s (1986) research of community college presidents, which included integrity, judgment, courage, concern, flexibility, philosophy, loyalty, energy level, and optimism. Baker (2003) notes that grasping the significance of organizational culture is critical for college leaders who hope to involve their institutions in a process of transformational change. The organizational culture mirrors the college’s values, philosophy, norms, and unwritten rules: “To understand and manage the organizational culture of their colleges, leaders may need to reconstruct the history of how various college groups and divisions have responded and solved major problems” (Baker, 2003, p. 16). Kouzes and Posner (2007) argue that transformational leaders must model the behavior they expect from their followers.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This review of literature established an historical review of higher education fundraising and provided the background and context for fundraising within the community college, including its origin, organizational structure, fundraising leadership roles, and the chief development officer’s leadership competencies.

Many community college foundations are a relatively recent phenomenon given their establishment within the last 50 to 60 years (Gray, 2008; Jenkins & Glass, 1999; Myran, 2003). While some community colleges have achieved success in fundraising, there is much more to be done in order for this aspect of new resource development to become accepted practice and perceived as an essential focus for community colleges.

Among the attributes of effective practice in community college fundraising are access to and relationships with donors, presidential support, competent chief development officers and a direct reporting relationship with the president. Momin (2003) indicates that for an institution to realize its fundraising potential, the key institutional players—the board of trustees, the president, and the chief development officer—must clearly understand and effectively interpret their roles.

Skari’s (2011) research reveals that alumni who develop relationships with staff and faculty while students are more likely to give back to the community college after graduating. Further, the more the student is engaged after graduation with their alma mater, the more likely they are to give.

Experience demonstrates that traditional sources of funding for community colleges is likely to remain flat or decline as a percentage of total revenue, and this
provides strong rationale for community colleges to focus on philanthropic fundraising (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). But this is perhaps the least compelling reason to fundraise from the donor’s perspective. The more forward-thinking and heroic rationale for donors is that community colleges do not have needs—they meet needs of the communities they serve. To meet these ever-changing needs requires revenue beyond those provided by public taxes and student tuition and fees.

The most successful and ambitious community colleges today are those that have not limited their vision, role, and plans based on the traditional revenue models, but instead have applied a mix of strategies and tactics designed to match the interests of donors with the vision of the college as it seeks to meet community needs through education and training. Philanthropic fundraising requires a team effort, relationship-building over time and remembering that people give to winners (Heaton, 2014).

This current study builds on the competencies identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (2005) by examining the similarities and/or differences in the perceptions of presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers in their viewpoints as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer within the community college. The next chapter outlines the design of this study.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This study used a mixed methods design, which is a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and combining both quantitative and qualitative data at some stage of the research process within a single study, to understand a research problem more completely (Creswell, 2002). The rationale for this mixed method in the current study was to support and further explore the quantitative results pertaining to the emerging role of the chief development officer. By examining the responses from current community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers to determine their views of the leadership competencies, characteristics, and professional skills identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer, this mixed methods approach provides a deeper and more contextual analysis. As Green, Caracelli, and Graham (1989) and Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) emphasize, when used in combination, quantitative and qualitative methods complement each other and allow for more complete analysis.
CRITICAL DISCUSSION

The Benefits of Quantitative and Qualitative Research

According to Charles and Mertler (2002,) in quantitative research, an investigator relies on numerical data and uses post-positivist claims for developing knowledge, such as cause and effect thinking, reduction to specific variables, hypotheses and questions, use of measurement and observation, and the test of theories. The researcher isolates variables and causally relates them to determine the magnitude and frequency of relationships. In addition, a researcher determines which variables to investigate and chooses instruments that will yield highly reliable and valid scores.

Alternatively, qualitative research is “an inquiry process of understanding” where the researcher develops a “complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting” (Creswell, Goodchild, & Turner, 1996, p. 15). In this approach, the researcher makes knowledge claims based on the constructivist (Guba & Lincoln, 1982) or advocacy/participatory (Mertens, 2003) perspectives. In qualitative research, data are collected from those immersed in everyday life of the setting in which the study is framed. Data analysis is based on the values that these participants perceive for their world. Ultimately, “it produces an understanding of the problem based on multiple contextual factors” (Miller, 2000).
The Choice of a Mixed Methods Approach in This Study

The rationale for choosing this approach in this study has much to do with the fact that the investigation rests heavily on the prevailing attitudes and biases of a narrow cross section of community college professionals. Quantitative data provide only a broad brush general picture of the research problem, while the qualitative data drawn from exploring participants’ views in more depth, coupled with appropriate analysis, provide preliminary but useful insights that help to inform conclusions drawn from the quantitative results.

Concerns Given Special Consideration in This Study

In a mixed methods approach, researchers build the knowledge on practical grounds (Creswell, 2003; Maxcy, 2003) asserting truth is “what works” (Howe, 1988). They choose approaches, as well as variables and units of analysis, which are most appropriate for finding an answer to their research question (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). A major tenet of practicality is that quantitative and qualitative methods are compatible. Thus, both numerical and text data, collected sequentially or concurrently, can help better understand the research problem.

Three issues require consideration when designing a mixed methods study: priority, implementation, and integration (Creswell, Plano Clark, Guttmann, & Hanson, 2003). Priority refers to which method, either quantitative or qualitative, is given more emphasis in the study. Implementation refers to whether the quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis comes in sequence or in chronological stages,
one following another, or in parallel or concurrently. Integration refers to the phase in the research process where the mixing or connecting of quantitative and qualitative data occurs.

This study used one of the most popular mixed methods designs in educational research: sequential explanatory mixed methods design, consisting of two distinct phases (Creswell, 2002, 2003; Creswell et al., 2003). In the first phase, the quantitative, numeric, data were collected using a web-based survey and then subjected to an analysis of variance (ANOVA). In the second phase, a qualitative approach was used to collect data through individual structured interviews.

These data help explain why certain external and internal factors, tested in the quantitative phase, may be significant predictors of the insights from community college presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers’ views of the leadership competencies identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer.

**PHASE I: QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

The purpose of this research was twofold. The first was to examine a sample of current community presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers to determine their views of the leadership competencies, characteristics, and professional skills identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer.
The second was to systematically gather insights from the participants that might help to inform hiring committees and fundraising leadership development programs regarding the most important competencies required for community college chief development officers.

The specific research questions guiding the study were:

Research Question 1: What are the similarities and differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer, and the chief development officer viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?

Research Question 2: To what extent do the rankings of competencies differ by chief development officers and their length of tenure?

SELECTION OF SAMPLE

Constructing the sample for this study included a consideration of sample size, sample location, and participant selection. The researcher used the purposive sampling method to identify participants. Purposeful sampling, also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, allows the researcher to focus on a particular population of interest who are believed to be knowledgeable of the research topic (Patton, 2002). McMillan and Schumacher (1997) suggested the purposeful sampling technique also allows the researcher to identify research subjects within a larger population.
The 28 public community colleges within the state of Michigan were selected due to their diversity of urban, suburban, and rural locations; their range of size as defined by the number of students enrolled in for-credit courses in the fall of 2013; and their similarity of revenue structure. Additionally, Michigan’s public community colleges operate within a standard funding structure consisting of state aid, tuition and fees, and local property taxes (Summers-Coyt, 1998).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher defined three community college size categories: large was defined as 10,000 or more students enrolled, medium was defined as 5,000–9,999 students enrolled, and small was defined as 1,000–4,999 students enrolled. As a result, 11 of the colleges were identified as large, 4 were identified as medium, and 13 were identified as small. Michigan’s community colleges consist of 4 rural, 6 urban, and 18 suburban colleges.

The population studied in this investigation consisted of presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers from Michigan’s 28 public community colleges as obtained from the Directory of Michigan Public Community Colleges (Michigan Workforce Development Agency, 2012). The researcher procured email addresses of the selected participants from the Directory of Michigan Public Community Colleges (Michigan Workforce Development Agency, 2012). The sample for this study consisted of a total of 84 participants: 28 presidents, 28 chief academic officers, and 28 chief development officers all currently employed by Michigan’s public 28 community colleges.
These three positions within the college were selected based on their positional relevance to fundraising in the community college. Presidential involvement is crucial for successful fundraising. Glass and Jackson’s (1998b) study examined the literature to determine what specific roles a president must play; what leadership style would best fit those roles; and to what degree other institutional players, such as foundation board members and foundation employees, have in the development process role. Through their extensive review of existing literature, which included case studies and quantitative results, Glass and Jackson determined that presidents have four main leadership responsibilities with regard to fundraising. They must communicate the vision of the organization; garner support from their board, staff, and faculty; lead by example by committing time and money to fundraising efforts; and develop fundraising plans and initiatives. As they fulfill these roles, presidents also need to lead the development team by communicating goals and helping the development team understand their role in the fundraising process (Glass & Jackson, 1998b).

Chief development officers were selected to participate in this study because their primary duties are fundraising. Chief academic officers were selected to participate in this study because they have long been considered the traditional pool of prospects for future community college presidents. According to Mizak (2008), chief academic officers have been the most likely source to fill presidential vacancies—in addition to existing presidents themselves. More recent research indicates that future community college leaders will require a skill set different from their predecessors (Croteau & Smith, 2012), in order to address current community college cultures and the many
challenges facing the next generation of community college leaders (Bechtel, 2010). Mellow and Heelan (2008) state the following as challenges for those in community college leadership positions: the evolving dynamic between government and institutions, the increased politicization of developing curriculum, “the evolving world of work and accompanying pressures of globalization” (p. 135), “the dramatic rise in corporate and business partnerships” (p. 136), “the growing competition of the for-profit sector for public education” (p. 136), and “the emergent need for private philanthropy” (p. 136).

This suggests the possibility that either the next generation of leaders needs to come via non-traditional routes or additional training will be needed for current academics aspiring to ascend into upper administration.

**SURVEY INSTRUMENT DESIGN**

Quantitative data were collected by means of an online survey, and descriptive and inferential statistics were the quantitative methods used to explore the data. Creswell (2009) suggests quantitative studies are most appropriate for research that attempts to identify factors that influence an outcome or factors that are the best predictors of outcomes. The instrument was first pilot tested by three presidents, three chief academic officers, and three chief development officers known to the researcher from various states in the U.S. All were given instructions about how to complete the survey and asked to provide feedback regarding the instrument’s design, appearance, clarity, and length in order to help mitigate threats to measurement validity.
While the primary purpose of this study sought to identify how presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers rate the relative importance of the leadership competencies, characteristics and professional skills identified by American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005), it also considered descriptors factors of respondents that might influence their perception of the relevancy of the six competencies. Thus, quantitative methods and statistical analyses were appropriate for this investigation.

Survey research is regarded as one of the most important methods of measurement in applied social science (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Since 1950, survey research has been the most common method to seek information on leadership (Yukl, 2001). In general, survey research encompasses any measurement procedures that involve a researcher asking questions of responding participants. Surveys collect perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and opinions, and may explore variables and the relationship between variables. This survey instrument used as its basis the leadership competency framework provided by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005). This framework included 45 leadership competencies summarized into six leadership competency areas: Organizational Strategy, Resource Management, Communication, Collaboration, Community College Advocacy, and Professionalism. The instrument contained a 4-point Likert-type scale so respondents could rate the degree to which they felt each of the specific competencies were important to effective leadership of chief development officers. According to Brace (2004), the benefit of employing a Likert-type scale is that it provides a series of attitude dimensions, which
enables respondents to use a point rating to identify how strongly they agree or disagree to each dimension.

Likert scales are assigned scores for the purpose of obtaining a sum score for each respondent called the response average (Brace, 2004). According to Jackson and Furnham (2000), Likert-type scales are typically used in surveys that measure attitudes and beliefs.

The Likert-type scale provided respondents the opportunity to rate each competency on a scale as follows: 1 = Not important, 2 = Minimally important, 3 = Moderately important, 4 = Very important. Employing a balanced rating scale such as this typically provides respondents a sufficient amount of discrimination in their ratings and is easily understood by the participants (Meric & Wagner, 2006).

To gather qualitative data pertaining to this research, open-ended questions were designed. The qualitative data were elicited and collected to gain the respondent’s perspective in order to augment the quantitative portion of the research study. Inclusion of these open-ended questions added additional depth to the research study by soliciting feedback and collecting attitudes, feelings, likes, dislikes, and opinions that could not be measured by a predetermined scale. The researcher made contact with the potential participants via email to set up the interviews. The researcher also used the early email correspondence to inform the participants of the purpose of the study, the way in which the interviews would be conducted, and how the information would be used (see Appendix G). Informed consent information was also provided at this time (Neuenschwander, 2009). A second email was used to confirm the date and to ensure
that the participant had received the questions prior to the interview (see Appendix H). These early steps built a foundation for the qualitative interviews.

**DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES**

Demographic information pertaining to the respondents was gathered during this research. To ensure anonymity, the data were not attributed to any specific person or institution. Demographic information of interest to the researcher included questions regarding gender, age, number of years in current position, total number of years as a community college president, chief academic officer, chief development officer, race/ethnicity, the highest level academic degree attained, and size of their current institution.

**DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES**

The researcher, who was the primary investigator, followed all ethical protocols for data collection. Email communication requesting participation from respondents were submitted to and pre-approved by the Ferris State University Institutional Review Board (see Appendix C).

To stimulate survey responses, potential participants were sent an email message encouraging participation (see Appendix D) three days in advance of the researcher’s survey send date. Three days later, the survey participants received an introductory email message with an accompanying link to the survey (see Appendix E). The researcher’s email message explained the purpose of the survey, the reason for the participant’s selection, and how the participant’s insights could prove to be beneficial to
those seeking to hire and work collaboratively with chief development officers or those preparing for a career in fundraising at a community college. Each recipient of the email message was invited to provide his or her impressions and personal judgments on the relative importance of the competencies identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) as they relate to the chief development officer.

In the survey itself (see Appendix B), general instructions were provided for each section of the survey specifying how to progress through the survey. The researcher provided Ferris State University Institutional Review Board’s contact information (both telephone and email) in the event the participants had any concerns about their rights during completion of the survey.

A link to the survey was included in the email message, along with the request to complete the survey within a two-week period of time, and a randomly generated code was assigned to each potential respondent to ensure anonymity. A reminder email (see Appendix F) was sent seven calendar days after the initial request with the survey link to all participants who had not yet responded, based on the randomly generated code that had been assigned to each potential respondent’s survey.

The following 16-step collection process and procedures were used to initiate, manage, collect, and process data for this research:

1. Requested IRB approval for the use human subjects in the study.
2. Received IRB approval.
3. Obtained copyright approval to utilize AACC survey instrument.
4. Obtained email addresses of community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers for each public community college located in the state of Michigan.

5. Assigned a randomly generated code to each potential respondent to ensure anonymity.

6. Maintained all names and institutions corresponding to each code number in a separate, locked file location to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

7. Conducted a pilot test of survey instrument. Participants were given instructions on how to complete the survey and were asked to provide feedback regarding the instrument’s design, appearance, clarity, and length.

8. Revised the survey instrument based upon pilot test responses.

9. Letter of introduction sent by Dissertation Committee Chair to encourage participation in survey.

10. Conducted an initial emailing of the survey instrument.

11. Sent a reminder email requesting participation in the survey after seven days.

12. Fourteen calendar days after initial contact, sent a follow-up email message requesting participation in the survey to those participants who had not completed the survey.

13. After 16 days from the initial contact, those who had not yet participated were considered non-respondents and the survey was closed.

14. Collected and organized survey responses from participants.

15. Reviewed the survey instruments for completeness.

16. Conducted statistical analysis of the data.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

All data obtained from the respondents regarding the competencies were gathered and entered into variable fields using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences IBM (SPSS software version 21). All responses remained anonymous and were
not associated with any institution or individual. The data collected in this research were
analyzed using inferential statistics (independent-samples f- tests also known as ANOVA
and Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients) and descriptive statistics (mean, median,
mode, range, standard deviation, and correlation), depending upon the nature of the
question.

Reliable research can be replicated. To increase reliability, each respondent in
this study was asked the same set of questions (Fowler, 2002). According to Vogt (2007),
“reliability refers to consistency of either measurement or design. Reliability, and
therefore replicability, is greatly helped by clear operational definitions of the variables
or constructs being studied” (p. 114). Cronbach’s alpha (also known as alpha and
coefficient alpha) is the most common measure of internal consistency (“reliability”),
and is most commonly used for multiple Likert questions in a survey. Researchers
generally apply Cronbach’s alpha when they want to see whether several items that
they think measure the same thing are correlated (Vogt, 2007, p. 115).

To further analyze responses regarding the similarities and differences between
the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development
officer viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the
chief development officer, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. ANOVA is
used to test for differences among more than two comparative groups (Tabachnick &
Fidell, 2007). For this study, an ANOVA was used to determine if there were differences
between the perceptions and opinions of presidents, chief academic officers, and chief
development officers as they relate to the leadership competencies regarding
community college chief development officers. An ANOVA procedure has three assumptions for the three independent variable groups: (a) they are independent of the population, (b) they have equal variances, and (c) they are evenly distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). As the number of cases was not the same for each group, a Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance was used to examine whether the three groups had equal variances. Finally, Tukey and Scheffe’ post hoc tests were run to test for significant differences between the groups. The researcher also used an analysis of variance (ANOVA) on research question 2 that examined the differences between the six competencies as they relate to the length of tenure of the chief development officer.

PHASE II: QUALITATIVE STRUCTURE

The primary qualitative technique utilized was in-depth semi-structured telephone interviews with presidents from five Michigan community colleges. The researcher had a prepared set of four questions that was the same for all participants, but also probed beyond those questions, as appropriate, in an effort to follow a line of conversation. The researcher was able to work through all of the questions so each participant had an opportunity to answer the same core group of questions.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT DESIGN

The qualitative phase in the study focused on explaining the results of the statistical tests obtained in the quantitative phase to interviewees. Each participant received the interview questions prior to the scheduled calling time, and was informed that typed notes were being taken during the interview.
Creswell (2007) categorizes qualitative data collection into four broad categories: observations, interviews, documents, and audiovisual materials. Within each category, there are many subsets and examples of specific data that can be collected. The researcher prepared a series of sub questions based on the quantitative results. These subset questions examined the president’s role and thoughts regarding fundraising. The qualitative sub questions the researcher asked of the presidents were:

*Research Question 1:* In reviewing the quantitative data results, all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges six leadership competencies differently. Presidents ranked “Communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “Community College Advocacy” highest, and chief development officers ranked “Collaboration” the highest. Why do you think this occurred?”

*Research Question 2:* What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

*Research Question 3:* What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?

*Research Question 4:* The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?
SELECTED OF SAMPLE

The sample of phase two consisted of interviewing presidents at five community colleges in Michigan. The researcher used the purposive sampling method to identify participants. Merriam (1998) defined purposive sampling as the method used to “select a sample from which the most can be learned” when the researcher wants to “discover, understand, and gain insight” (p. 61). Purposeful sampling increases the value of the information that is obtained from small samples and “the researcher decides what kind of information he/she needs then searches for information-rich key informants, groups, places or events to study” (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993, p. 133).

For this qualitative phase, the researcher selected five community colleges with varying characteristics that included a diverse group of participants (male vs. female), size of the institution (small, medium, and large), and the setting (urban vs. rural), that includes their total net assets of fundraising contributions as reported by GuideStar (2013) and represented in Table 1. The researcher, when creating the survey, defined size of the institution (small, medium, and large) into three categories for convenience. The settings (urban vs. rural) follow Carnegie classification (Carnegie Foundation, 2012) definitions.

Table 1: Characteristics of Qualitative Study Participants’ Colleges and Gender of Respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT CODE</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>FY 2012 NET ASSETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College A</td>
<td>Large two year</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$16,039,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College B</td>
<td>Large two year</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$30,020,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPANT CODE</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>SETTING</td>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>FY 2012 NET ASSETS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College C</td>
<td>Large two year</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$4,858,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College D</td>
<td>Medium two year</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$2,269,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College E</td>
<td>Small two year</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$6,538,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GuideStar (2013)

DATA ANALYSIS

Once the interviews in the study were completed, the researcher began analyzing the data gathered. The first step was deciding whether to use “open coding” or “focused coding.” Open coding, according to Esterberg (2002), involves working intensively with the data line by line and identifying themes and categories. The researcher is open to all categories and themes at this point. Focused coding also includes going through the data line by line, but focusing on the key themes that have been identified during the open coding. For the purposes of this study, the researcher employed the technique of open coding following the data collection (see Appendix I).

LIMITATIONS

Research designs generally contain particular weaknesses and strengths. Researchers must critically analyze the specific challenges related to their topic of interest and design their study in a way that will either eliminate or reduce these challenges so that reliable and valid data are received. While some research obstacles are inevitable, it is imperative that researchers consider these obstacles in order to
strengthen their research design. This section addresses the specific weaknesses and strengths of research design for this study.

Strengths

The strengths of this research design related to sampling, the method of data collection, and the topic of inquiry. With purposive sampling, the researcher went directly to the respondents who, based on their roles within their colleges, would likely be knowledgeable regarding the topic. Respondents may have found it satisfying to share their insights and perceptions about the topic of inquiry. This survey provided the respondents with that opportunity. The survey method itself contains several advantages. Researchers are able to collect large amounts of data in a relatively short time frame and may do so at a reasonable cost. Electronic survey methods also allow respondents to complete questionnaires at their own convenience and in privacy.

Weaknesses

Phase 1, the quantitative phase, used self-administered, electronic surveys to collect data, and there are several inherent weaknesses within this method. For instance, researchers are not able to explain the study in person. Explaining the research study in person would provide the researcher an opportunity to answer any questions or alleviate any concerns that respondents may have. In addition, the researcher would be able to more explicitly convey that the research study was intended to benefit the profession. The researcher attempted to accomplish this by stating in the introduction to the survey and cover email letter the purposes and nature of the research inquiry.
Another concern that is a common challenge for researchers using the on-line quantitative survey method is garnering sufficient response rates. Members of the sampling frame may choose to disregard an email survey that is sent to them. If response rates are too low, then validity of the findings is impacted.

Finally, because the researcher did not have a random sample, the researcher has reduced the ability to generalize the findings.

The Researcher’s Biases and Assumptions

In a qualitative study the researcher becomes the primary instrument through which all information and analysis are filtered and are therefore subject to the researcher’s views, values, and perspectives (Merriam, 1998). Along with the filtering of the information, the researchers’ own biases and assumptions can skew the outcome and undermine the internal validity of the study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). Experts emphasize researchers must clearly address their implicit thoughts and perspectives in the study to completely inform the reader of potential threats to validity (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Merriam, 1998). By disclosing the researcher’s biases, a more open and honest description of the study’s results can be reported (Creswell, 2003). An underlining bias the researcher brought to the study was a close association with one of the institutions. However, these ties can be considered useful and positive rather than a disadvantage (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2000).
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

Presented in the next two sections are the research questions and analysis of each research question.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Two primary research questions are addressed in the study. The research questions are as follows:

Research Question 1: What are the similarities and/or differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?

Research Question 2: To what extent do the rankings of competencies differ by chief development officers and their length of tenure?

QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

Survey Response Rate

Due to the low response rate achieved in this study, making statistical inferences is tenuous. Results from the investigation are best seen in an exploratory context.
Eighty-five participants were sent an invitation using the valid email address identified in the Directory of Michigan Public Community Colleges (Michigan Workforce Development Agency, 2012) as their business account. This action resulted in 100% of the total population having an invitation arrive to their email inbox to participate in this research on October 31, 2012. Of the 85 email invitations delivered to these addresses, 25 respondents participated to some degree, which resulted in a response rate of 29%. Eleven (44%) of the returned surveys were from presidents, five (20%) were from chief academic officers, and nine (36%) were from chief development officers (Table 2).

Table 2: Survey Participants by Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Development Officer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Several survey items were included to further describe characteristics, or demographics of the sample. These items included position title, age, gender, ethnicity, highest degree obtained, to whom the chief development officer reports, size of respondent’s current institution, and length of respondent’s tenure in position. The following tables present the frequencies, percentages, and measures of central tendency for these variables.
Demographic Profile of the Respondents

As presented in Table 3, the data reveal that of the 25 survey respondents, 12 were males (48%) and 12 were females (48%). One participant declined to answer the gender question. In terms of gender by position, there were seven (63%) male presidents, four (36%) female presidents, four (80%) male chief academic officers, one (20%) female chief academic officer, one (11%) male chief development officer, and seven (77%) female chief development officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Development Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presidents’ ages ranged from 51 to over 65 years old. The chief academic officers’ ages ranged from 46 to 60 years old. The chief development officers’ ages ranged from younger than 35 to 55 years old (Table 4).
Table 4: Survey Participants by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>51–55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56–60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61–65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56–60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Development Officer</td>
<td>35 or younger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41–45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46–50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                | 25          | 100       |

In terms of educational level, 10 of the 11 president respondents indicated that they have doctoral degrees as their highest degree (Table 5). All five (100%) chief academic officer respondents hold doctoral degrees as their highest degrees. Of the chief development officer respondents, one (11%) holds a doctoral degree as their highest degree, followed by five (55%) with master’s degrees as their highest degree and three (33%) with bachelor’s degrees as their highest degree.
Table 5: *Survey Participants’ Highest Education Level and Degree Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>DEGREE</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Development Officer</td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                                   | 25       | 100.0    |

Regarding the respondents ethnicity, 92% surveyed were White/Caucasian. Of the 25 respondents in this study, one (4%) president self-identified as Native American/Alaskan Native, one participant did not respond to the ethnicity question, and none of the respondents was Asian, Black/African American, Hispanic or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (Table 6).

Table 6: *Survey Participants by Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 represents to whom the chief development officer reports. Eighteen report directly to the president of the college, while six chief development officers report to the following areas: Director of Marketing, Executive Director of Institutional Advancement, Foundation Board, Foundation Board Chair, Foundation Board Executive Committee, Vice President for College and Student Relations, and the Vice President of Marketing and Enrollment. One survey participant did not answer this question.

Table 7: Chief Development Officer Reporting Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the distribution of respondents by enrollment size of institution.

Fourteen respondents (56%) are employed by small community colleges, three respondents (12%) are employed by medium community colleges, and eight respondents (32%) are employed by large community colleges.
Table 8: Distribution of Participants by Enrollment Size of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Size of Institution</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (1,000–4,999)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (5,000–9,999)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (10,000 or more)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINDINGS**

Core Competency Measurements

The survey was analyzed for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha. As Clark and Watson (1995) note, the issue of internal consistency reliability assessment is complicated by the fact that “there are no longer any clear standards regarding what level . . . is considered acceptable” for Cronbach’s alpha (p. 315). In the past, criteria have ranged from .80 or .90 alpha coefficients, down to .60 or .70 alphas. According to Rubin and Babbie (2010), a cut off of .60 is common in exploratory research. Researchers have found Cronbach’s alpha to be too sensitive to number of measures/items, and prefer the use of the raw mean correlation as a statistical marker of internal consistency. In their research, Briggs and Cheek (1986) found that “the optimal level of homogeneity occurs when the mean correlation is in the .2 to .4 range” (p. 114), Whereas Clark and Watson (1995) recommend that
the average correlation fall in the range of .15–.50... if one is measuring a broad higher order construct such as extraversion, a mean correlation as low as .15–.20 probably is desirable; by contrast, for a valid measure of a narrower construct such as talkativeness, a much high mean intercorrelation might be in .40–.50 range. (p. 316)

Reliability measures for each of the six AACC leadership competencies ranged from .55 (Community College Advocacy) to .85 (Professionalism). Thus, these alphas indicate that the 45 specific dimensions within the AACC leadership competencies are generally measuring the same concept or construct (see Table 9).

Table 9: Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability of Survey Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Cronbach α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Strategy</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Advocacy</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Research Questions

The analysis plan used in this investigation began with calculating descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, and standard error to address the question below.
Research Question 1

What are the similarities and/or differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?

Table 10 illustrates the mean score of importance for each community college leader competency by respondent category.

Table 10: Mean Score of Importance for Each Community College Leader Competency by Participant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>ORG. STRATEGY</th>
<th>RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>COMM.</th>
<th>COLLABORATION</th>
<th>COMM. COLLEGE ADVOCACY</th>
<th>PROFESS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mean 3.6061</td>
<td>3.5438</td>
<td>3.7273</td>
<td>3.6023</td>
<td>3.5152</td>
<td>3.5455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>Std. Deviation .44890</td>
<td>.36188</td>
<td>.30977</td>
<td>.38250</td>
<td>.45003</td>
<td>.37921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Mean 3.2667</td>
<td>3.5250</td>
<td>3.6000</td>
<td>3.5250</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>3.4545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 5</td>
<td>Std. Deviation .19003</td>
<td>.33541</td>
<td>.41833</td>
<td>.35795</td>
<td>.36132</td>
<td>.40656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDO</td>
<td>Mean 3.4259</td>
<td>3.5139</td>
<td>3.8519</td>
<td>3.9028</td>
<td>3.6296</td>
<td>3.8687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 9</td>
<td>Std. Deviation .75971</td>
<td>.74855</td>
<td>.19444</td>
<td>.19543</td>
<td>.26058</td>
<td>.12945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean 3.5293</td>
<td>3.5293</td>
<td>3.7467</td>
<td>3.6950</td>
<td>3.5933</td>
<td>3.6436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 25</td>
<td>Std. Deviation .51018</td>
<td>.51018</td>
<td>.30092</td>
<td>.34813</td>
<td>.36667</td>
<td>.35201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidents ranked the Communication leadership competency at the highest level of importance ($M = 3.73$) and ranked the Community College Advocacy leadership competency at the lowest level of importance was ($M = 3.52$). However, the mean scores only differed by 0.2 points, and were still at the Very Important level.
The chief academic officers ranked the Community College Advocacy leadership competency at the highest level of importance \((M = 3.70)\) and the Organizational Strategy leadership competency \((M = 3.27)\) at the lowest level of importance.

The chief development officers ranked the Collaboration leadership competency at the highest level of importance \((M = 3.90)\) and the Organizational Strategy leadership competency \((M = 3.42)\) at the lowest level of importance.

Specific Competency Analysis. A detailed analysis was completed to assess the degree of importance for each dimension within each AACC leadership competency. This process included calculations of the mean scores for each competency. The results for each competency are reported in the following section.

Organizational Strategy Competency. The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 11). The highest scoring illustration had a mean score \((M = 3.80)\) with a standard deviation of .408: “Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes” (Illustration D). The lowest scoring illustration under the Organizational Strategy leadership competency (Illustration A) had a mean score of 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.04: “Assess, development, implement and evaluate strategies regularly to monitor and improve the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Illustrations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to monitor and improve</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to solve problems, make decisions, and plan strategically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization,</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to changing demographics, and to the economic, political, and public health needs of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources and assets.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resource Management Competency.** The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 12). The highest scoring illustration had a means score \((M = 3.72)\) with a standard deviation of \(.678\): “The concept of ensuring accountability in reporting” (Illustration A). The lowest scoring illustration under Resource Management leadership competency (Illustration F)
had a mean score of 3.08 with a standard deviation of .954: “Human resources system that fosters professional development and advancement of all staff.”

Table 12: Mean Scores of the Resource Management Leadership Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY ILLUSTRATIONS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Ensure accountability in reporting.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of reporting systems and databases.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition, and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems and that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communication Competency. The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey
respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 13). The highest scoring illustration had a means score \( M = 3.88 \) with a standard deviation of .332: “Projecting confidence and responding tactfully” (Illustration F). The lowest scoring illustration under Communication leadership competency (Illustration B) had a mean score of 3.36 with a standard deviation of .757: “disseminate and support polices and strategies.”

### Table 13: Mean Scores of the Communication Leadership Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Illustrations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiences, appropriately matching message to audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disseminate and support policies and strategies.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies and stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collaboration Competency.** The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 14). The
highest scoring illustration had a means score ($M = 3.44$) with a standard deviation of .821: “Demonstrate cultural competency relative to a global society” (Illustration B). The lowest scoring illustration under Collaboration leadership competency (Illustration D) had a mean score of 3.84 with a standard deviation of .374: “Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.”

**Table 14: Mean Scores of the Collaboration Leadership Competency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Illustrations</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Facilitate shared problem solving and decision-making.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community College Advocacy Competency. The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 15). The highest scoring illustration had a means score ($M = 3.76$) with a standard deviation of $.436$: “Advocate the college mission to all constituents and empower them” (Illustration D). The lowest scoring illustration under Community College Advocacy leadership competency (Illustration C) had a mean score of $3.32$ with a standard deviation of $.802$: “Promote equity, open access, teaching and learning, while seeking to understand how these change over time.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY ILLUSTRATIONS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Advance lifelong learning and support a learner-centered and learning-centered environment.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professionalism Competency. The survey instrument asked respondents to assign a level of importance, using a Likert-like scale, to each illustration of leadership contained within the six leadership competencies. Using data collected from all survey respondents, the mean scores of each illustration were calculated (see Table 16). The highest scoring illustration had a means score ($M = 3.92$) with a standard deviation of .277: “Promote and maintain high standards for integrity, honesty, and respect people” (Illustration H). The lowest scoring illustration under Professionalism leadership competency (Illustration I) had a mean score of 3.24 with a standard deviation of .779: “Using influence and power to facilitate teaching and learning.” However, Illustration K also had the low mean score ($M = 3.24$), but the standard deviation of .597 “contribute to the profession through professional development and organizational leadership.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY ILLUSTRATIONS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Self-assess performance regularly using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Support lifelong learning for self and others.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Understand the impact of perceptions, worldviews, and emotions on self and others.</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching and learning process and the exchange of knowledge.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publication.</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between community college presidents, chief academic officers, and the chief development officers’ viewpoints regarding the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer. According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), an ANOVA is used to compare the amount of variance between groups. The level of
significance .05 is used in statistical analysis, which is consistent with commonly used statistical practices.

**Organizational Strategy.** Within the organizational strategy domain of the AACC’s Competencies for Community College Leaders, no statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding this leadership competency as it relates to the chief development officer. This competency includes assessing, developing, implementing and evaluating strategies to monitor and improve the quality of education and long-term health of the organization, and using a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization, to changing demographics and to the economic needs of students and the community. See Table 17 for detailed results.

Table 17: ANOVA Score of Importance for Each Community College Leader Competency by Participant Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6.777</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.204</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>6.242</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.247</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1.962</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.173</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>3.027</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Management. Within the resource management domain of the AACC's Competencies for Community College Leaders, no statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of the president, chief academic officer, and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding this leadership competency as it relates to the chief development officer. This competency includes ensuring accountability, supporting operational decisions, managing resources, taking an entrepreneurial focus, supporting employee professional development and advancement, and managing conflict and change. See Table 17 for detailed results.

Communication. Within the communication domain of the AACC’s Competencies for Community College Leaders, no statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding this leadership competency as it relates to the chief development officer. This competency focused on developing and communicating a shared mission and vision, creating open communication, and basic communication skills of listening, speaking, including and writing. See Table 17 for detailed results.
Collaboration. Within the collaboration of the AACC's *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, no statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of the president, chief academic officer, and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding this leadership competency as it relates to the chief development officer. This competency includes embracing and promoting diversity, equity, and cultures; building networks; and decision-making. See Table 17 for detailed results.

Community College Advocacy. Within the community college advocacy domain of the AACC’s *Competencies for Community College Leaders*, no statistically significant differences were found between perceptions of the president, chief academic officer, and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding this leadership competency as it relates to the chief development officer. This competency includes demonstrating a passion for and commitment to the mission of community college and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning. See Table 17 for detailed results.

Professionalism. The professionalism construct variable was found to be statistically significant at the *p*-value of < .05. The *p* value for the professionalism construct was *p* = 0.043. Results between groups showed: sum of squares (SS) = .741, degrees of freedom (df) = 2, the mean square (MS) = .370, f-ratio = 3.648, and the significance (*p*) = 0.043. Chief development officers rated Professionalism (*M* = 3.87, *SD* = .129) higher than presidents (*M* = 3.55, *SD* = .379) and chief academic officers (*M* = 3.45, *SD* = .407).
Research Question 2

To what extent do the rankings of competencies differ by chief development officers and their length of tenure? The purpose of this question was to determine how chief development officers rank the six Competencies for Community College Leaders (AACC, 2005) as important to the position of chief development officer and to examine differences based on their length of tenure.

Data were collected regarding the length of tenure as a chief development officer for each respondent. For the purposes of data analysis, the researcher then defined two tenure categories for the number of years reported by participants: 0 to 3 years \((N = 5)\), and 4 or more years \((N = 4)\). To test for difference between these two categories, the researcher used an ANOVA test. Using \(p < .05\) (which is consistent with commonly used statistical practices), the researcher found no statistically significant differences in the ranking of the competencies by length of tenure, as illustrated in Table 18.

Table 18: ANOVA Score of Importance for Each Competency by Chief Development Officer Based on Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

The data collected and analyzed in this chapter were studied to determine the similarities and/or differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer. Further, the researcher was investigating the extent to which the ranking of the competencies differed by chief development officers and their length of tenure.

The findings indicated that a difference did exist in the ranking of the leadership competencies among presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer.

Presidents ranked Communication the highest level of importance \( (M = 3.73) \) and ranked Community College Advocacy the lowest level of importance was \( (M = 3.52) \).
However, the mean scores only differed by 0.2 points, and were still at the Very Important level (Table 10).

The chief academic officers ranked Community College Advocacy the highest level of importance \( (M = 3.70) \) and Organizational Strategy \( (M = 3.27) \) the lowest level (Table 10).

The chief development officers gave Collaboration the highest level of importance \( (M = 3.90) \) and Organizational Strategy \( (M = 3.42) \) the lowest level of importance (Table 10).

No statistically significant difference existed among the rankings of presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers with regard to the categories of Organizational Strategy, Resource Management, Communication, Collaboration, and Community College Advocacy. A significant difference existed in the ranking of the Professionalism competency between the groups.

Length of tenure as a chief development officer did not affect the ranking of the competencies by chief development officers. No significant difference existed by length of tenure in the rankings of Organizational Strategy, Resource Management, Communication, Collaboration, Community College Advocacy, or Professionalism.

**QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS**

The qualitative research data was gathered from five Michigan community college presidents. The primary technique used was in-depth semi-structured telephone interviews. The interviews included four open-ended questions that were grounded in
the quantitative results in order for the researcher to gather information that would enhance the quantitative data already collected. The qualitative portion of this study allowed the researcher to solicit feedback and collect attitudes, feelings, likes, dislikes, and opinions that could not be measured by a predetermined scale. The five Michigan community college presidents responded to these four questions:

*Research Question 1:* In reviewing the quantitative data results, all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges six leadership competencies differently. Presidents ranked “Communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “Community College Advocacy” highest, and chief development officers ranked “Collaboration” the highest. Why do you think this occurred?

*Research Question 2:* What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

*Research Question 3:* What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?

*Research Question 4:* The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?

For the purposes of this study, the five participating community colleges were labeled Community College A, Community College B, Community College C, Community College D, and Community College E. While maintaining anonymity in the reporting of results, it was important to gain a clear picture of the perceptions that were studied.
The following section offers an analysis of the qualitative data gathered in response to the four qualitative questions. The findings are primarily represented with direct quotes from the presidents of the community colleges. In this way, the researcher could present the presidents’ perspectives verbatim.

The narrative identifies the commonalities and differences in the data by describing the themes that were analyzed and coded from the interview transcripts.

PRESIDENTIAL INTERVIEWS

Community College A

Community College A is a large campus located in an urban setting with three campuses serving over 48,000 students annually. While the president has more than 40 years’ experience at Community College A, teaching social science, political science, and economics, the president has held this position for 5 years.

Community College B

The president of Community College B has more than 30 years in higher education, has held numerous teaching, counseling and administrative positions, and has served as president at another community college. Community College B is a large urban community college with two campuses in addition to a number of regional centers and off-campus locations.
Community College C

Community College C is a large rural college with more than 16,000 students with three off-campus centers. Before joining Community College C, the president served as the president of a rural medium-sized community college for nine years.

Community College D

The president of Community College D has more than 20 years’ experience in community colleges, serving first as dean and then vice president before moving through the ranks to the presidency. Community College D is medium-sized, serving more than 7,000 students annually located across three campus locations in a rural area.

Community College E

Community College E is a small, rural college and its president has held this position for more than 10 years. Prior to becoming president, Community College E’s president once served as the dean of student services and as a dean of student personnel services.

Research Question 1

In reviewing the quantitative data results, all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges 6 leadership competencies differently. Presidents ranked “communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “community college advocacy”
highest, and chief development officers ranked “collaboration” the highest. Why do you think this occurred?

*Community College A*

Community College A’s president understood why presidents at community colleges would select communication as the most important leadership competency for chief development officers. As the president of a large institution, this individual believes that presidents have to think methodically about the community they serve. Presidential skills require communication and the ability to persuade people.

Larger community colleges have different views than smaller ones, communication is important. Also in a large community college you don’t just run things, you persuade people to do things, like board members, faculty and administration.

This president recognized that the other positions (chief academic officer and chief development officer) play different roles regarding fundraising and thus their (chief academic officers and chief development officers) ranking of the six competencies would be different.

The chief academic officer is coming from the faculty point of view not really from an administration viewpoint, such as the chief development officer and president. Chief development officers have a strong need regarding collaboration in order to try and raise money from donors. Chief development officers also work in a broader sense of the community, and thus need collaboration as a way to raise money.

This president also talked about the lack of state appropriations, and how presidents must now be fundraisers in order to help offset the cost of attending college and delivering other educational services.
Community College B

This president believed those involved with fundraising in their various roles (president, chief academic officer and chief development officer) would most certainly rank the competencies differently due to the nature of their positions. Community College B president stated CEOs need to be able to communicate effectively across a wide spectrum of internal and external constituents from taxpayers to students to governing board members and faculty, whereas the chief development officer primarily focuses on a sub-set of constituents (donors, alumni, volunteers, etc.).

CDOs deal with different constituents in order to raise funds, whereas CAOs deal mostly with academics on a daily basis, thus CDOs picked collaboration as their most important leadership competency.

Community College C

The president of community college C placed a high priority on communication. According to this president, an effective president should be able to relate and converse with diverse groups of people.

Communication is the top priority for presidents. They need to be able to relate to so many diverse groups. Not just faculty, but student services, physical plant, administration, and external constituents.

While president C felt strongly about the ability to tell the story to internal and external stakeholders, the president also mentioned maintaining transparency when communicating about the college.

Presidents have to be good storytellers. Serving on boards and representing the college, not only verbally, but having the ability to give presentations, and being succinct and clear. Additionally, presidents need to be able to shift gears quickly in order to make the best of the situation. They also have to make sure internally that communication is transparent.
Community College D

The president of Community College D believes that communication is a vital skill for presidents. To do so effectively, the president mentioned the importance of having an understanding of the entire college and its workings, and also cited the importance of transparency.

Being president means that you have to have a broader perspective of the institution than anyone else. But at the end of the day, at a certain level, the president knows the most. Most don’t understand that presidents are stretched and need to be able to communicate. It’s important for presidents to establish transparency and be able to communicate.

Community College E

Community College E’s president indicated that acquiring the skill set of communication is learned on the job as a person advances in their career.

A lot of it has to do with your advancement within the community college; when you advance (move up the ladder), your thinking process changes with each position.

According to this president, the perspectives from chief academic officers and chief development officers on fundraising are different due to the roles within the college. The chief academic officer is focused on academics and believes advocacy is the most important leadership competency for chief development officers to possess, whereas the chief development officer needs to be able to work with donors and various external and internal stakeholders and believes collaboration is the most important leadership competency for the CDO to possess.

When you are in a position as a CAO, you think differently, because you are always trying to work with faculty and others across campus, and thus have to
collaborate with folks. CAOs are projecting their current position, not the job they will be going into.

CDOs need those necessary skills, but at the president’s level, I believe that communication is the highest because at this level, I have to champion the community college. As the president, my job calls me to be able to communicate. The dean of students leads her people well and it’s not just her job to do this, but she needs to collaborate. I can really see why these groups answered this way. They are different and this is why.

Research Question 2

What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

*Community College A*

While this president discussed the importance of institutions having the leadership, capacity, and infrastructure to compete for and secure gifts, he also discussed presidents needing to have training in order to be successful in fundraising. The president also stressed the importance of knowing potential donors, their needs, and the community in which they reside. Community College president A focused on retirees and also views students as a source of potential revenue. The president indicated that colleges should not model or mirror four-year institutions when it comes to fundraising, but instead create a fundraising plan that is tailored to the community it serves.

Presidents need to prepare themselves, and not just take the general models of fundraising and adapt them to their college.

This president opined that larger Michigan community colleges typically have longer histories of philanthropy than smaller community colleges.
Community College B

Fundraising for president B has been an expectation in previous jobs that prepared him well.

As a president, I was prepared differently because I worked in the four-year institution sector for almost 40 years, the last of which (5-8 years) I was involved in fundraising. It was an expectation.

This president described working with the chief advancement officer to raise funds.

As a chief of staff, I have called on many donors, and I have worked collaboratively with the fundraiser.

Community College C

During the interview, president C reinforced the importance of professional development and indicated previous exposure to community-based fundraising as helpful. The president also talked about the importance of being a good communicator and the ability to collaborate with others.

I think I was fortunate. I got involved in fundraising like United Way and the Chamber early on. Even if you are a vice president or dean, you should start engaging early. I tell people, even as a parent you should get involved in small efforts and then move up (i.e. Boys and Girls Club, shelters, YMCA, your kids’ sports/school activities, etc.) This begins to stress communication, supporting something important, and why we need to do this. You begin to understand fundraising and the need to collaborate and to be a communicator.

Community College D

President D expressed understanding of the importance of fundraising and the president’s role therein. President D supports professional development and recognizes its importance to the success of the college’s fundraising efforts.
I went to the League of Innovation 10 years ago, and fundraising was mentioned. Questions asked were “how do you prepare for it, how do you go about it?” I hadn’t really thought about fundraising before. I was thinking things like millage, not traditional fundraising. But now I am. We are currently in a campaign, and are using a consultant. I would have prepared earlier and been more strategic if I had known the importance of fundraising.

As the leader of the college, this president perceives the president’s role as the “living logo” of the college and understands the importance of building relationships.

I have begun to build strong lasting relationships with the community and I’m always out there. I now know that I need to get to know people, because it is vital to the success of our fundraising efforts.

*Community College E*

This president reported working closely with the foundation office as views this as critical to fundraising success.

Fundraising has increased since I started in 2001. My first year we raised $21,000, but last year we raised over $200,000. This is reflective of how important this role has grown. Because we have to raise more money if we are going to successful, I have spent more time with the foundation than previous presidents and others have done. For example, we need to raise $5.2 million for the science center. If someone had told me I had to raise this amount when I first started, I would have said no way can we do this.

This president was also aware of the need for and importance of professional development. The president sought opportunities to work with development professionals to learn fundraising and the support from her peers.

Resources are limited and we need to explore every opportunity we can. I believe we need to spend time with folks who are really good at what they do. I have spent a lot of time with a recently retired vice president of development from a Michigan community college, and she has taught me well.

That belief—the ability to ask people for support—was a key part of the qualities, skills, and talents that this president saw as necessary for success as a fundraiser.
I seek out folks like this and spend time with them and learn the skills I need to acquire. It’s nothing that I have learned from my master’s or doctorate.

As the chief fundraiser for Community College E, the president estimated spending 35% time on fundraising.

Research Question 3

What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?

Community College A

President A stated that key attributes, skills, and/or abilities that need to be learned for successful fundraising are having a vision and the ability to articulate it.

Those that go into or aspire to be a president need to know it’s not just about fundraising, but having a vision and being able to articulate this.

This president also stated that you have to dedicate time for fundraising.

This role is increasingly important to the community college and is beginning to take a lot of our time. In fact, fundraising for presidents takes more time than any other thing in our positions. It’s difficult to be good at this, because of the time commitment. You need to understand how to balance this.

Community College B

The president of Community College B wholeheartedly supports professional development and advises those aspiring to become presidents to seek out opportunities to work with the advancement office/staff.

I tell people, if you any chance of professional development, do it. Work with the fundraising office every chance you get. Help with the drafting or actually write a case for support for a particular program, anything that helps you understand
the need and then advocate for that need. Even taking a student with you to do fundraising is a learning experience.

*Community College C*

President C emphasized the importance of learning the art of fundraising through professional development. To accomplish this, the president offered a deeper explanation for serving on boards within the community and participating in professional development, both informal and formal.

It’s important to serve on boards, like community boards or foundation boards. Foundation boards are different than community boards, and you are able to practice on making “the ask.” Get involved with the Council for Resource Development (CRD) and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) as well.

President C emphasized other skill sets vital to the success in the presidential fundraising role including carving out time to cultivate donors. This president recognized the importance of leading the college, but also acknowledged the importance of working as a team with the foundation office and using a donor database.

Other areas that are important to the profession is time management. Get with the development office and spend time with them. Go out and meet with donors and your employees from the foundation. You don’t make “the ask” the first time, but spend time at dinners and lunches with donors. If you need help, ask for help from your foundation employees.

This president also noted that having good data improves the fundraising process and is an important component of the planning process.

You need knowledge of the data banks that the foundation office uses in order to recall personal information about the donor (i.e., how many kids does this potential donor have, or where did they go to school, played sports, etc.) this will help with the relationship. Also important is being familiar with alumni relations and what that means. How do you communicate with your alumni and get to know/understand your data bank?
Additionally, president C recognized the value of knowing student needs in order to tell the story, but more importantly, having good listening skills to listen for the gift.

You need to become familiar with your student needs, have good listening skills, make “the ask,” and ask open-ended questions (i.e., what is the potential donor passionate about?). This will help you to find where you can put that donor’s money where they are happy and you have a need. Listening is very important!

Community College D

President D noted the route to the presidency is changing. This president self-described taking a non-traditional path to the presidency:

We will be seeing the path of the president become more expansive. I’ve had a lot of experience in workforce development and not much on the true, as we say, “academic side.” In time, I believe we will see multiple routes to the role of president. It is changing in response to the rapidly changing environment.

This president indicated that those who aspire to the presidency must realize that in essence, they are the chief fundraiser, and from this president’s personal experiences, many chief academic officers are uncomfortable making “the ask.”

VPs need to ask themselves is this a role (fundraising) I can play? I have asked many, and they have run away. Some are not willing, and others are uncomfortable. But, it’s important that people know this role of fundraising is important and vital to the success of the college.

This president said that having the ability to ask people for money is a key skill necessary for the presidency. President D felt that it was the president’s responsibility to make “the ask,” especially for major gifts. President D also stressed the importance of having capable fundraising staff and working together as a team.

You need the skill set for it, even if that means you have to learn it. You cannot avoid it, because at some point, if you are asking for a large sum of money, the president needs to be a part of the discussion and possibly the ask. Donors
expect this. You need an advancement office that is competent and you must trust them to do the job. But you need to work with them; it’s a team.

Community College E

This president remarked on the importance of professional development for those aspiring to the presidency. President E called attention to the importance of learning the art and science of making “the ask”:

It’s nothing that I have learned from my master’s or doctorate degrees. I was at a disadvantage. I think folks need to spend time learning this, because it’s not an easy thing to do and you need thick skin. It takes many “asks” to get the money. It’s the nature of the beast.

Research Question 4

The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?

Community College A

Community College president A questioned if chief academic officers have the most direct route to the presidency.

I’m not sure this is the case. This used to be the research, but my view is that the presidency role will start being filled with experts from workforce development backgrounds that want to run a community college, or it could be a person who has a strong sense of community or business from a large corporation.

This president also discussed the position of the chief academic officer and other college staff regarding their role in the fundraising process.

It is important for all leadership including the chief academic officer to understand fundraising, which includes the foundation and participate. It doesn’t
mean that they have to go around asking for money, but the chief academic officer needs to be ready to make the ask at any time. For example, during a capital campaign, “the ask” needs to be framed around the academic side, and thus, the person should be able to talk about what we are doing academically and know the programs. It’s important.

This president views fundraising from individual donors and foundations as an important means for alternative revenue.

The challenge for community colleges today, is that students want more on-line classes Four-year schools are seeking funds to build buildings, but it may not be necessary for us. For us, seeking funds for a writing center, focusing on student success, or giving students access to things will be needed. Those seem more important to me.

Community College B

This president acknowledged that in the past, chief academic officers were the most direct route to the presidency position, but believes that this statement is no longer the case.

Only if they aspire to be a president. Today, I think things have changed a little in that most chief academic officers don’t want to be a president.

Community College C

Although the president believes the direct route to the presidency was once the chief academic officer, that route is changing.

Yes, but I also see a lot of vice presidents of student services increasingly being appointed or elected to the presidency. We are also seeing institutional advancement folks being appointed to the presidency and vice presidents of finance as well, but not as much. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) research does show this.

President C articulated the importance of fundraising experience for those aspiring to the presidential position.
It is important for anyone who aspires to be a president to participate in fundraising. There is a tendency to stay on campus and let the president do this. Sometimes vice presidents make those connections though, on their own, meaning they see the importance of fundraising. And they should be involved. At our college they are asked to be involved with the Chamber and network with community. Find out what are the needs in industry and then they are in a place to ask for money or equipment for their programs.

*Community College D*

President D described the chief academic officer’s role as responsible for academics and did not place a priority on the CAO engaging in fundraising unless he/she expressed an interest in seeking a presidency.

Our vice president does participate in fundraising events, but very little. He is always supportive. CAOs’ goals are different from others on campus. Their first focus is academics and that is the core of their role. That should be their strongest focus. If they say, I love my job, but I want to become a president, that’s when you need to work with them to help them learn fundraising. This will help them develop those core competencies.

*Community College E*

From this president’s perspective, the chief academic officer position is not always the most direct route to the presidency. President E felt that other positions within the college could fill the presidency depending on their skill set.

I believe that the CAO is often the most direct to proceed the presidency, but this is changing. I would look at the skill set for their current position. There are other areas than the CAO position, such as a business officer or even student services that are pathways to the presidency.

In regard to the skills and abilities that help the college’s CEO to fundraise effectively, the president referred to communication and collaboration as credible qualities.
Community colleges are more student-focused and are looking more closely at those who are willing to take a risk, like technology or innovation. We need someone that can get rid of all the dead weight (firing people). We need someone who is communicator and collaborator who can bring our community college up the ranks. Someone who can create a since of community and do this outside the college as well.

More emphasis on communication and collaboration are needed. It doesn’t matter where you come from. You only need to be able to do multiple things including fundraising. This is becoming a very important skill. We spend a lot time on this and we have to go after this hard.

**SUMMARY OF QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS**

Qualitative research data were gathered from five Michigan community college presidents via semi-structured telephone interviews. These presidents, both male and female, represented small, medium, and large colleges located in rural and urban settings.

To interpret the qualitative data obtained from respondents, the researcher first coded the responses. According to Saldana (2009), “[A] code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data” (p. 3). Each of the questions asked in this research yielded different degrees of responsiveness. The qualitative portion of this study allowed the researcher to solicit attitudes and opinions that were not measured in the quantitative portion of this study. Based on the analysis of the codes from the qualitative interviews conducted with presidents, the researcher found a number of overall themes (see Appendix I). Keats (2009) points out: “Studying narrative texts aids the researcher in understanding how
participants experience, live, and tell about their world” (p. 181). The following section offers a summative synthesis of the qualitative data gathered in response to the four questions asked in the qualitative portion of this study.

Common Themes

*Research Question 1*

In reviewing the quantitative data results, all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges six leadership competencies differently. Presidents ranked “Communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “Community College Advocacy” highest, and chief development officers ranked “Collaboration” the highest.

Why do you think this occurred?

According to the presidents interviewed, communication skills are the most important skills to have as a president. Presidents must be able to communicate effectively with both internal and external stakeholders. Persuasion and motivation were the two most often-cited objectives of presidential communication. The president, as chief spokesperson and story-teller for the institution, must be adept at offering a compelling vision for the future of the college, explained in terms that compel donors, taxpayers, government officials, students and other external stakeholders to contribute, vote, make favorable policy and enroll. Similarly, the president, as communicator-in-chief, must persuade and motivate faculty, staff, board members and other volunteers
to plan, develop and deliver quality programs and services to learners and other internal and external constituents.

**Research Question 2**

What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

Presidents who participated in this qualitative study did not question “if” they should engage in fundraising for their institutions. They recognized the importance of philanthropic funds as an increasingly vital component of the college’s overall revenue mix. Therefore, respondents stressed the importance of getting started early with learning how to fundraise in preparation for the presidency given that fundraising is becoming a more essential component and expectation of the president’s role. They also emphasized that their own continued professional development in this area was critical to the overall success of the college’s fundraising program. Adjunct to this theme was a clear recognition of the importance of developing and strengthening relationships with donors. Increasingly, presidents now realize the importance of knowing their community and tailoring the college’s fundraising plans to fit community needs, including working with the foundation and understanding that fundraising requires their personal time and commitment.

**Research Question 3**

What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?
Aspiring presidents should seek and participate in formal training to prepare for their fundraising role. In addition, the presidents interviewed recommended that aspiring presidents capitalize on the opportunity to be involved in fundraising earlier in their careers while on the pathway to the presidency. They indicated that both formal training and on-the-job fundraising experiences prior to becoming a president would have increased the likelihood of having arrived prepared for this aspect of the job and may have even given them a competitive edge. Presidents also emphasized the importance of understanding the time commitment required to build and sustain donor relationships and to engage in fundraising campaigns.

*Research Question 4*

The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?

What has long been considered the “traditional” route to the presidency—through the academic pathway—has changed according to the presidents who participated in the qualitative portion of this study. Respondents mentioned multiple pathways to the community college presidency that included experience in business, and experience in areas from within the college including finance, student services, workforce development, and institutional advancement. While the chief academic officer’s position is mainly focused on academics, the presidents expressed the value of chief academic officers participating in fundraising and working with the foundation, including others in leadership who aspire to the CEO position. The presidents also
conveyed that those who are in leadership positions within the college should understand the vital importance of fundraising and show their support through participation in fundraising campaigns and events. Similarly, respondents acknowledged that chief academic officers engaging in fundraising must learn the importance of having the ability to create a sense of community.
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, KEY FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a summary of the purpose and need for this research study, a discussion of the key findings drawn from research results, related implications and recommendations for further research.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE RESEARCH STUDY

The purpose of this research study was to identify the key leadership competencies, characteristics and professional skills of the community college chief development officer through the perceptions of Michigan community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers. More specifically, the following quantitative research questions were explored:

Research Question 1: What are the similarities and/or differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?

Research Question 2: To what extent do the rankings of competencies differ by chief development officers and their length of tenure?
The following four open-ended qualitative questions were utilized in follow-up telephone interviews with five Michigan community college presidents in order to gather information that would enhance the data already collected in the quantitative portion of the study:

*Open-ended Research Question 1:* In reviewing the quantitative data results, all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges six leadership competencies differently. Presidents ranked “Communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “Community College Advocacy” highest, and chief development officers ranked “Collaboration” the highest. Why do you think this occurred?

*Open-ended Research Question 2:* What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

*Open-ended Research Question 3:* What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?

*Open-ended Research Question 4:* The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?

The American Association of Community College’s (AACC) *Competencies for Community College Leaders* (AACC, 2005) were used as the framework for this study. An extensive review of the literature suggested that community colleges can no longer afford to do more with less (Hebel, 2003). Because funding has shifted away from state
and federal support (Palmer, 2012), tuition rates are on the rise, and the country’s community colleges are struggling to fulfill their mission of access and affordability while facing stifling budget constraints (Miller, 2013). The traditional forms of community college funding are no longer sufficient leading community colleges to pursue private funding sources to maintain basic services and programs while also instituting new ones (Hearn, 2003). Because of these funding conditions, fundraising from private sources has become increasingly critical to the financial wellbeing of community colleges (Boyd, 2010).

As more community colleges step up their fundraising efforts, they find themselves at a tipping point of sorts. As Lanning (2008) said, “The momentum exists to take advantage of the growing public awareness of the challenges community colleges face and the benefits they provide.” Lanning indicates that while fundraising may seem like a daunting task, fundraising is about planning for the future. Community colleges need to take the necessary steps that enable them to foster relationships with individual donors, businesses and foundations that can build scholarships, fund operations and create faculty endowments in order to begin to provide long-term financial strength and sustainability. But this strategy requires hiring capable fundraisers with the necessary leadership competencies to create and build successful fundraising campaigns and programs.
KEY FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study of community college chief development officers sought to identify and articulate chief development officer leadership competencies based on the American Association of Community Colleges’ (2005) six leadership competencies from the perspective of Michigan community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers.

In completing this study, the researcher used a conceptual framework based on the American Association of Community College’s (AACC) Competencies for Community College Leaders (AACC, 2005). Participants’ demographic characteristics and their perceptions of the competencies as they relate to the chief development officer were examined. Additional qualitative data were collected from five Michigan community college presidents. The study provides additional insight with respect to community college fundraising leadership within the college by identifying specific experiences that contribute to the development of fundraising competencies as seen from the vantage point of five presidents.

Of the 85 email invitations delivered to these addresses, 25 respondents participated which resulted in a response rate of 29%. Eleven (44%) of the returned surveys were completed by presidents, five (20%) by chief academic officers, and nine (36%) by chief development officers.
Demographics

Respondent demographics from the quantitative portion of this study revealed that the majority of the presidents who responded were white males between the ages of 51 and 60 years, who hold doctorates as their highest degree earned. The majority of the chief academic officers who responded were white males between the ages of 56 and 60 years, and who hold doctorates as their highest degrees. In regard to the chief development officer, the majority who responded were white females between the ages of 35 and 55 years, with a master’s as their highest degree earned.

These demographic data are consistent with other studies that have gathered demographic information related to these same positions at colleges and universities. For example, findings for the presidents indicate that little has changed over the last decade with regard to presidential demographics (Duree, 2007; Rabey, 2011; Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2013), more than 60% of the nation’s community college presidents are between the ages of 55 and 64 years of age, with 86% holding doctorates as their highest degree earned. In addition, only 12% of the nation’s community college presidents are of color, while the 81% are white/non-Hispanic. According to Eddy (2010), the ethnicity of community college presidents, has remained virtually unchanged for the last decade. Moreover, women are still underrepresented in the presidency position. Between the years 1991-2006, there was approximately a 20% increase in the number of female community college presidents, yet, the growth in the number of female community college presidents has slowed considerably since 2006 and it appears that the gender
balance movement may have reached a peak (Thomas, 2013). In fact, the most current AACC figures show a decline by 1% in the number of female community college presidents since 2006 (AACC, 2013).

Likewise, demographic information from this study is similar to other studies that have gathered demographic information related to the chief academic officer position (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Amey, VanDerLinden, & Brown, 2002; Eckel, Cook, & King, 2009; Keim & Murray, 2008; McKenney & Cejda, 2000; Murray, Murray, & Summar, 2000; Vaughan, 1990). According to Price’s (2012) study, chief academic officers at public community colleges in the United States are in their mid-fifties. In 2010, the Council for Independent College and Universities conducted a survey of individuals serving as chief academic officers at public two-year institutions. The Council received responses from 428 chief academic officers. Of the respondents, only 14% were persons of color. Interestingly, 42% of the chief academic officers reported earning a Ph.D. and 30% an Ed.D. (Hartley & Godin, 2011).

This study also substantiates similar findings that concern the chief development officer. According to Lanning’s (2007) study of fundraising at four-year institutions, those that are employed in higher education as chief development officers tend to be Caucasian females between 41 and 60 years of age. Walker’s (2012) study of chief development officers at four-year institutions was similar to the findings of this study regarding educational attainment. His study concluded that over 50% of chief development officers in his sample had earned a master’s degree and an additional 25% had obtained a doctorate, illustrating since “over 75% of the chief development officers
sampled had earned an advanced degree . . . education seems to be a valuable trait of the chief development officers position at public institutions across the nation” (p. 109).

According to the CASE 2013 Compensation Survey, only 9% of the development officers in higher education located in North America were of color (CASE, 2013). Similarly CASE found that their membership was comprised of 70% females. While only 6% of those women surveyed held the top posts in fundraising (CASE, 2013). This statistic of female leaders as the chief development officer is not encouraging given that the public community college’s image is one that embraces and promotes diversity. Further, it does not reflect the predominantly female student population at community colleges, wherein female students make up over 55% of the entire student body (AACC, 2014).

Participants of this study were also surveyed regarding whom the chief development officer reports. Of the 25 respondents, 18 reported that the chief development officer reports directly to the president of the college. Six chief development officers reported to other than the president: Director of Marketing; Executive Director of Institutional Advancement; Foundation Board; Foundation Board Chair; Foundation Board Executive Committee; Vice President for College and Student Relations; and the Vice President of Marketing and Enrollment. One survey participant did not answer this question. Again, results from this study are similar to other studies that focus on the chief development officer in community colleges. Patterson, Justice, and Scott (2012) surveyed community college chief development officers whose institutions were members of the Council for Resource Development (CRD) from 2008-
Of the 128 responses received, 6.3% of chief development officers reported to the chancellor and 85% to the president of their institution. The remainder reported to a provost (0.80%), vice president (6.3%), dean (0.80%), executive director (0.80%), or foundation board (2.36%). McGinnis’ (1980) study found several basic organizational patterns with regard to fundraising organizational structures in the 20 institutions he reviewed. The most common organizational pattern McGinnis found was the chief development officer reporting to the president of the institution. According to the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (2013), any discussions concerning resource development strategies and implementation must be held directly between the chief development officer and the institution’s leader. Additionally, the chief development officer should be a member of the highest-level senior management team, which would also enable him or her to become conversant with the institution’s overall strategy and to advise how it might successfully relate to fundraising purposes and strategies (CASE, 2013). Likewise, Brumbach’s 2005 study (Brumbach, 2006) found that community college chief development officer job descriptions often included a direct reporting line to the president and membership on the president’s cabinet. This direct reporting relationship to the president opens the door for more presidential involvement in fundraising. By having the campus leader involved, the Development Office is more likely to be endorsed on campus, which can positively influence the internal and external reputation of the resource development function. The reputation of the Development Office also has a direct influence on annual giving and total giving from all sources. According to the Council for Advancement and Support of Education
(2013), a positive reputation on campus can be interpreted as a beneficial relationship between the Development Office and the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Not only are these groups potential donors, they also have relationships and communication with alumni, friends, and other prospective donors. A positive reputation off campus can influence gifts from external constituent donor groups, such as alumni, parents, corporations, and foundations.

**PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHIEF DEVELOPMENT OFFICER’S LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES**

Research question 1 asked, “What are the similarities and differences between the perceptions of the president, chief academic officer and the chief development officer’s viewpoints regarding the AACC’s leadership competencies as they relate to the chief development officer?”

The results of participants responses for each of the six competencies: organizational strategy; resource management; communication; collaboration; advocacy; and professionalism indicated that presidents believe *Communication* is the most important as it relates to the chief development officer whereas the chief academic officers ranked *Community College Advocacy* the highest and the chief development officers ranked *Collaboration* as the highest level of importance. There are several observations that can be drawn from these results. First, presidents are the ambassadors of the institution, and are expected to articulate how donors’ charitable gifts will enhance the institution. Thus, presidents must be gifted at articulating the case for institutional support to internal and external sources (Hodson, 2010). Further, to be
successful with external relationships, the president must be a visible, charismatic, engaged and accessible leader and he or she must communicate a vast number of ideas including institutional priorities to stakeholders (Hodson, 2010). Eddy (2010) states, “Communication” is a leadership competency area that is important due to the ability of “framing the message” effectively.

Secondly, the chief academic officer position is considered responsible for setting the academic vision for the institution and promoting academic quality through oversight of curriculum and academic programs, and supervising and managing academic personnel (Cook & Kim, 2012). The “Community College Advocacy” leadership competency mirrors the relationship between academic affairs officers and presidents. Specifically, presidents are encouraged to be conspicuous in the community, actively and regularly sharing information about their college’s mission(s), whereas academic affairs officers are more inclined to turn their attention inward and focus on the curriculum, faculty issues and student success (Eddy, 2010).

Because the chief development officers must carry out many of the daily responsibilities and challenges of the institutional fundraising endeavors, while focusing on the methods of structuring, maintaining, improving, and enhancing the relationship of the institution with society and selected entities that can help support the institution's mission (Glass & Jackson, 1998a); it is perhaps an indication why they ranked Collaboration more important than did presidents and chief academic officers. The results of the “Collaboration” leadership competency indicate that managing conflict and building relationships are very important (Eddy, 2010).
These findings are also consistent with Momin’s (2003) research and Glass and Jackson’s (1998a) study. Momin found that, for an institution to realize its fundraising potential, the key institutional players such as the president, the chief development officer, and others must clearly understand and effectively interpret their roles. While some areas of responsibility are and should remain the exclusive domain of the president, the board, or the development staff, all call for understanding, cooperation, and teamwork between and among these parties. Glass and Jackson determined that there are certain leadership responsibilities pertaining to fundraising. First and foremost is communication. Second is to garner support from the board, staff, and faculty, in other words, collaboration.

Although there was lack of agreement among the three groups as to which of the competencies was most important as it relates to the chief development officer’s leadership competence, there was similarity in the ranking of the competencies as least important. Chief academic officers and chief development officers both ranked Organizational Strategy as the least important. Intuitively, this makes sense as respondents in this study considered and viewed all of the AACC competencies from different perspectives. For example, the description of organizational strategy in the AACC document reads,

An effective community college leader strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends. (AACC, 2005, p. 4)
This language, with its emphasis on “the institution” and “the organization,” suggests a much broader perspective than may exist at the chief development officer and the chief academic officer’s levels. The AACC (2005) document does not provide the title or rank of its participants, although it does mention that those involved were “participants in the [Leading Forward] leadership summits and . . . members of the Leading Forward National Advisory Panel” (p. 2). Additionally, the AACC document does not present its competencies in any rank order or indicate that one competency is more important than another. The activities associated with this competency are more closely related to presidents. Eddy (2010) described this competency as being “primarily concerned with management issues associated with operations, human resources, and strategy, which when done well can lead to the creation of a positive culture and work environment” (p. 92).

To determine a ranked assessment of importance of the AACC Competencies in this study, a one-way ANOVA analysis was performed using the three respondent groups as independent variables, and the importance rating for each of the six competencies as dependent variables. For the Professionalism competency, a significant difference ($p < .05$) was found between the importance ratings based on the three groups (presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers). Tukey’s post hoc test was conducted on the significant findings to determine the direction and strength of the difference. The post hoc test results showed that the Professionalism competency was rated significantly higher by chief development officers than by the presidents and chief academic officers.
This finding is not surprising considering that the *Professionalism* competency (e.g., works with others, understands others, is highly visible) (AACC, 2005) is reportedly developed through a variety of experiences that directly relate to the many functions of a leader within the community college including interpersonal interaction, persuasion and coordination (Zacarro, 2001). Due to the chief development officer’s position of having to carry out the daily responsibilities and challenges of institutional fundraising, this may explain why chief development officers ranked the *Professionalism* competency significantly more important than presidents and chief academic officers. For example, there are a number of roles integral to the success of the resource development office: seeking available and additional fundraising sources, conducting research to prepare the president, communicating with potential donors, and developing new relationships (Ryan & Palmer, 2005). Additionally, chief development officers must also organize the time, resources, and data of the college’s fundraising team, and oftentimes provide valuable public relations work (Townsend, 1991). Furthermore, in community colleges, resource development officers should be able to contact foundation directors and trustees, sometimes acting as ambassadors on behalf of the president, addressing possible issues before they arise (Russell & Wynn, 1996). Another important role is to control interactions between the president and possible donors so that meetings and any events held will be impressive and maintain institutional integrity (Hodson, 2010). This includes briefing the president on important information about the donor, including background details and interests, controlling the
environment of the initial meeting, and scheduling additional communication efforts like letters, phone calls, or additional meetings (Hodson, 2010).

**LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES AND LENGTH OF TENURE**

The leadership competencies of chief development officers who lead the institution’s fundraising efforts are important in order to maximize private financial support from the college’s constituents. Research question 2 asked, “To what extent do the rankings of competencies differ by chief development officers and their length of tenure?” The responses from the chief development officers were not significantly different based on their reported length of tenure.

Fundraising has become a complicated and sophisticated activity (Levine, 2012). Development officers must operate with more than a series of skills or a checklist of tasks. They must have curiosity, innovation, a willingness to challenge the status quo, and keen analytical perspectives (Burk, 2003). The position also involves specific skills and traits related to securing resources to advance the mission and purposes of the college in service to students and the communities it serves (planning and strategy development, fiscal resource management), including people skills such as strong interpersonal skills, collaboration, teamwork, relationship development and written and verbal communication.

While research on the development profession remains underdeveloped, existing literature does describe a skill set much broader than merely soliciting funds. Croteau and Smith’s (2012) leadership competency model for chief development
officers that included 14 competencies are similar to that of the AACC’s (2005), as noted in Chapter Two. Accordingly, Croteau and Smith’s (2012) *Strong Interpersonal Skills* competency is closely linked to AACC’s *Collaboration* competency. Chief development officers with *Strong Interpersonal Skills* obtain commitment from their followers and build bridges across campus. AACC (2005) defines an effective collaborator as one who “develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships” (p. 6).

Regarding *Community College Advocacy*, the AACC (2005) defines an effective leader as one who “understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college” (p. 6). Croteau and Smith’s (2012) definition of *A Passion for the Mission of Their Organization* states, “Chief development officers are concerned much more with the mission and goals of their organization . . . and making an impact on the institution” (p. 196).

Croteau and Smith’s (2012) *Effective Communication Skills* and AACC’s *Communication* competencies are closely linked. Croteau and Smith (2012) define *Effective Communication Skills* as being able to listen and communicate in clear, concise, and appropriate ways that establish credibility among diverse constituencies, including learning as much as possible about the organization in order to articulate and communicate the college’s mission, vision, and goals. The AACC (2005) defines *Communication* as using “clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission” (p. 6).
AACC (2005) defines a leader competent in organizational strategy as one who "strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends" (p. 3). This closely relates to Croteau and Smith’s (2012) Thoughtfulness about Organizational Culture competency, wherein chief development officers “are always thinking of ways to enhance culture and operating environment in an effort to improve productivity and morale, while moving their organization and institution forward toward strategic goals and outcomes” (p. 194).

Tied closely with organizational strategy is how resources are managed and allocated. AACC (2005) express the Resource Management competency as “an effective community college leader equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community college” (p. 3). Croteau and Smith (2012) outlined their Ability to Think Strategically competency as follows: managing “the expectations of multiple constituent groups effectively” while staying focused on the vision of both the development office and the institution (pp. 196-197). Finally, the AACC (2005) states Professionalism involves an effective community college leader who works ethically to set high standards for self and others, while continuously improving self and surroundings, by demonstrating accountability to and for the institution, and ensuring the long term viability of the college and community (p. 6). Similarly, Croteau and Smith’s (2012) definition of Focus on Excellence states that a chief development officer’s
main focus “is to promote excellence in an effort to improve organizational value to the campus, while balancing short-term initiatives and long-term objectives” (pp. 194-195).

Responses to this research question suggest that successful fundraising is a product of building relationships, and it takes time to develop trusted relationships. The longer a chief development officer has been in place at one institution, the more likely fundraising will be successful given the opportunity to create and deepen relationships with staff, faculty, board members, volunteers, alumni and friends. This implies that experience at multiple institutions by a chief development officer is not necessarily a predictive indicator of fundraising success. The shorter the length of time a chief development officer remains with an institution, the less time he or she has to create meaningful and productive relationships on behalf of the institution.

**ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS**

In this section, key findings are discussed along with related conclusions drawn from the responses to four open-ended questions asked of five Michigan community college presidents in the qualitative portion of this study. The open-ended questions were grounded in the quantitative results in order for the researcher to gather information that would enhance understanding of the quantitative data collected.

**Theme 1 — Communication as a Skillset**

Good communication skills are essential to strong leadership.
Introduction

A review of the literature on communication suggests that an effective community college president must use clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community (AACC, 2005). The president needs effective listening and feedback skills; effective writing skills; ability to develop and communicate a vision; conflict resolution, mediation, and negotiation skills; understanding of the two-year college mission; understanding of interpersonal communication and effective public speaking skills (Brown, Martinez, & Daniel, 2002). By ranking communication the highest level of importance as compared to the other six competencies, the presidents interviewed believe that leaders' communication is essential to leading.

Key Findings

This research question sought to identify why presidents ranked communication the highest of all AACC leadership competencies when compared to the rankings of the AACC leadership competencies assigned by chief academic officers and chief development officers. In follow-up telephone interviews with the presidents they underscored the importance of communication skills. While each president had a unique perspective, the commonality among all of the presidents was the emphasis they placed on how well a president must be able to communicate with his or her constituency. The literature supports this common theme which indicates community college presidents must be able articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and
values internally and externally (Boggs, 2004; Pielstick, 1998; Weisman & Vaughan, 2002). As one president interviewed in this study said,

> Communication is the top priority for presidents. They need to be able to relate to so many diverse groups...not just faculty, but student services, physical plant, administration, and external constituents.

Similarly, within AACC’s (2005) communication competencies were key words that are part and parcel to effective communication: articulating a shared vision, being a good listener, projecting confidence, open communication, disseminating and supporting policies. These skills are essential for the institution’s primary spokesperson. Another president noted,

> Presidents have to be good story tellers because of their responsibilities. We serve on various boards representing the college and give numerous presentations. We have to be very succinct and clear.

The “Communication” leadership competency is reinforced by the work of Eddy (2010) on the importance of “framing the message” for effective leadership. Eddy points out when a college president grasps his or her role in framing the message, he or she can draw on information to advance the college. According Eddy, “framing is a powerful tool and one that should always be used for the benefit of the campus and its constituents” (p. 72).

**Conclusion**

In order to garner much-needed financial support, presidents must talk about the college in terms of the opportunities it creates for learners while educating the public about the challenges and opportunities colleges face. They must also appropriately frame their requests for help with donors, partners, voters and elected
and appointed officials. Gregg (2004) believes that community college presidents should have good public speaking skills, when she states “in determining competencies for effective college presidents, those who were most successful exhibited outstanding communication and public speaking skills” (p. 26). Likewise Schmitz (2008) in a study on leadership preparation and career pathways of community college presidents’ states:

The importance placed on communication is consistent with the presidents’ rating of communication-related challenges such as faculty relations, board relations, and community involvement, which were rated as challenging or very challenging by more than 50% of the presidents. The high rating of the importance of a strong skill set in the communication domain is an excellent sign that community college presidents recognize its value not only for themselves but for future leaders as well. (p. 120).

Theme 2 — Presidential Fundraising Preparedness

Fundraising professional development for presidents contributes to successful fundraising programs.

Introduction

The role of today’s two-year college president is especially challenging due to inadequate resources to fund programs and services for learners while maintaining affordable tuition (Pierce & Pedersen, 1997). This situation leaves many colleges struggling to find relevance in a global economy while providing competency-based programs and navigating new funding challenges (Hockaday & Puyear, 2000). Because there has been a pattern of reduced funding from local and state sources, there is now a move to have presidents engage in more fundraising (Hammons & Miller, 2006) even though research has clearly demonstrated that many community college presidents do
not feel adequately prepared to seek alternative funding. In a 2005 *Chronicle of Higher Education* survey of 764 community college presidents, the majority of CEOs indicated that they were not adequately prepared to pursue alternative funds. Similarly, McNair, Duree, and Ebbers (2011) also reported that community college presidents lacked sufficient training in fundraising. Stanley (2008) observed that community college presidents are not adequately prepared to identify and secure alternative funding, but he claimed that the next generation of CEOs must begin to look beyond conventional sources of funding and pursue non-traditional funding.

**Key Findings**

Presidential fundraising preparedness was cited as important in the interviews with all five presidents. Each talked specifically about professional development in this area as critical to the success of the college’s fundraising program. For example,

*I went to the League for Innovation 10 years ago, and fundraising was mentioned. I hadn’t really thought about fundraising before. But now I am. We are currently in a campaign, and are using a consultant. I would have prepared earlier and been more strategic if I had known the importance of fundraising.*

Another president opined,

*I tell people to work with the fundraising office every chance they get. Help with the drafting or actually write a case for support for a particular program, anything that helps them understand the need and then advocate for that need. You also need knowledge of the data banks that the foundation office uses in order to recall personal information about the donor (i.e., how many kids does this potential donor have, or where did they go to school, play sports, etc.). This will help with relationship development. Also important is being familiar with alumni relations and what that means to the college and to the alumni.*

Presidents do not have to be technical experts in the field, but they do need to understand basic philanthropic principles and fundraising trends to provide leadership.
in this area of growing importance to presidents and their colleges (Bock & Sullins, 1987; Fisher, 1986, 1989; Fisher & Koch, 1996; Pray, 1981). According to Pinchback (2011), community college leaders have had to teach themselves how to fundraise or have taken part in formal training such as conferences and seminars. Likewise, Satterwhite (2004) found that while community college presidents are critical to the success of the college’s fundraising efforts, many have had little or no formal training in this specialized area. Valuable fundraising skills and competencies recommended for today's leaders include personalized communication and the ability to build lasting relationships with a variety of constituents (Brunen, 2012).

Other areas presidents discussed regarding preparedness was that aspiring presidents should be aware of the importance of community college fiscal management and fundraising as areas of focus in their overall professional development plans. One president interviewed for this study offered this perspective,

> It is important for all leadership including the chief academic officer to understand fundraising, which includes the college’s foundation. It doesn’t mean that they have to go around asking for money, but the chief academic officer or those who seek the presidency, need to be ready to make the ask at any time.

This is supported by Duree’s (2007) study that indicated that, “there has been a shortfall in leadership preparation that adequately develops the competencies essential to effectively address funding related issues” (p. 119). Likewise, Chappell (2009) suggests that while community college presidents have not been adequately prepared to fundraise, the time has come for them to begin “stepping up their fundraising efforts.” Fundraising is no longer an option for today’s community college presidents; it has
become a necessity and it is vital to the community college’s future vitality (Lanning, 2008).

The presidents in this study also discussed how their personal background and leadership characteristics helped them as they built relationships or asked for support. As one president shared,

I have begun to build strong lasting relationships with the community and I’m always out there. I now know that I need to get to know people, because it is vital to the success of our fundraising efforts.

This theme resonates in the literature. Hall’s (2002) research into the impact of relationships on fundraising explored specific examples at community colleges and reviewed existing literature to determine the ways in which relationships may impact fundraising, how to measure the strength of a relationship, and to examine the different types of fundraising relationships. Hall’s research indicated that colleges and their presidents needed to be focused on developing donor relationships rather than raising money. If there is a strong relationship, the money will follow. According to Abernathy (2014), one of the essential functions of the president is to build relationships with donors and one goal of the president must be to nurture a lasting relationship between the donor and the institution, not the donor and the president. Eckert and Pollack (2000) cautioned that a president must recognize that the importance of a donor’s relationship with the institution far exceeds that of the relationship between the president and the donor.
Conclusion

The literature indicates that given the historic reliance on public funding and without backgrounds in fundraising or public relations, community college leaders may not be prepared for the increasing need to raise funds for their institutions (Weinrich & Reid, 2003). Several studies confirm the importance of the president’s involvement in fundraising (Glass & Jackson, 1998b; Lanning, 2008; Miller, 2013; Satterwhite, 2004). Furthermore, Walker’s (2012) study found that having campus leaders involved with fundraising serves as an endorsement for the Development Office, which in turn influences the internal and external reputation of the Development Office (p. 103). Walker notes, the reputation of the Development Office also has a direct influence on annual giving and total giving from all sources. Walker points out a positive reputation on campus can be interpreted as a beneficial relationship between the Development Office and the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Walker suggests that not only are these groups potential donors, they also have contact and communication with alumni, friends, and other prospective donors. A positive reputation off campus can be directly connected to an increase in gifts. Walker purports that if external constituent donor groups such as alumni, parents, corporations, and foundations hold the Development Office in a positive light, this trust and confidence and belief in the college’s reputation and case for support for fundraising will likely result in positive impact on contributions.
Theme 3— Fundraising Time Commitment

Successful fundraising requires being engaged in fundraising.

Introduction

The role of “fundraiser” is assuming more importance for most leaders in the community college movement (Wenrich & Reid, 2003) while occupying more of the president’s time. The community college presidency typically demands long hours, and the position can be extremely stressful (Zirkle & Cotton, 2001). Weisman and Vaughan (2007) reported that the average community college president spends nearly 60 hours per week on work-related activities. These hours often include evening or weekend commitments. Also, presidents only used 60% of their allotted annual leave and roughly 80% claimed that they conducted college-related work while on vacation (Weisman & Vaughan, 2007). The presidency is an all-consuming and demanding 24-hour position.

Key Findings

This key finding demonstrates how presidential fundraising requires spending time to develop new relationships and/or foster existing ones for successful fundraising. It would appear that as more community college presidents embrace the role of fundraising, their time spent with individuals and business and industry leaders will increase, given that such investments of time in relationship-building can lead to donations, grants, and other forms of alternative funding. As one president explained,

This role is increasingly important to the community college and is beginning to take a lot of our time. In fact, fundraising for presidents takes more time than any other thing in our positions. It’s difficult to be good at this, because of the time commitment. You need to understand how to balance this.
Satterwhite (2004) has suggested that the president must be consistently available to prospective donors because it improves donor dedication. Interacting with donors is an imperative part of this process. As one president in this study stated,

I regularly dedicate time to go out and meet with donors and foundation members and spend time at dinners and lunches with donors.

Donaldson and Smith (1994) interviewed a number of community college presidents who explained their approaches to donor interaction. One president holds luncheons for small donor groups with similar interests. Shaw and Shaw (2008) articulate that presidents should be conspicuous at events for external entities in order to raise their profile as valued members of the community. Ryan and Palmer (2005) explain that time spent must include making time to recruit valuable foundation members, build social networks with community organizations, join external boards, and become a leader in numerous outside organizations while gaining visibility for their colleges. Milliron et al. (2003) found that most seasoned community college CEOs cited the increased time expectations and trustee pressures surrounding private fundraising. Similarly, Miller (2013) states it must be understood that while fundraising generates revenue for the college, it takes an investment of time and resources over time to do it effectively.

Conclusion

Community college presidents often have difficulty finding the time to add new responsibilities to their priority lists. But if fundraising is considered both urgent and important for the community college president, it must be given appropriate focus and effort. Boards of trustees have an important role to play in this shift of the president’s
attention. Trustees must develop their own understanding of the rationale for fundraising and incorporate it into their expectations of the presidents they hire. According to Hodson (2010), presidents should spend 25 and 50% of their time on fundraising. Even though reallocating that amount of the president’s time may be a challenge, the point is that presidents need to dedicate a specific amount of time to fundraising and hold that time as sacred. The more boards and presidents understand and embrace that expectation, the more successful the presidents will be as fundraising leaders (p. 46). The responsibility of fundraising falls to the community college president as the “fundraiser in chief” and is supported by the American Association of Community Colleges’ (2005) leadership competencies that community college presidents should possess. Among those competencies is resource management, which includes responsibility for seeking alternative revenue sources (AACC, 2005). Cook (1997) suggests this change has impacted the office of the presidency in that fundraising experience has become a requisite for those interested in presidential positions. As Cook noted, “when governing boards go hunting for presidents, it’s often the candidate’s fundraising rather than academic talents that catch the eye” (p. 74). Those wishing to become community college presidents did not enter the field expecting to raise money (Wenrich & Reid, 2003). Part of the president’s development of philanthropic insight is understanding the psychological needs of and rewards for the potential donor (Buechner, 1993, p. 119). Research suggests that donors who are giving major financial support to the college expect to personally engage in conversation with the president about the college’s mission and goals (Guy, 2002).
Theme 4— The Traditional Route to the Presidency Has Changed

Nonacademic positions within higher education institutions and positions outside of higher education are becoming the norm.

Introduction

Research on career pathways to the presidency is a subject of considerable discussion in the community college literature of the past decade. It appears that finding the next generation of community college presidents may be more difficult than imagined (Bumphus, 2012). According to the most recent AACC survey of community college presidents, 75% of community college CEOs plan to retire within the next 10 years and another 15% are scheduled to retire in 11 to 15 years (AACC, 2013). The AACC study highlighted that the average age of community college presidents in the U.S. is 60 years.

AACC reports that “there doesn’t appear to be a robust pipeline of candidates to move into those leadership positions. In fact, the pool of potential presidents is shrinking” (Phillippe, 2012). This may be due in part to the fact prospective replacements including community college vice presidents of academic affairs, student affairs, and business affairs are also aging and ready for retirement (Shults, 2001). Faculty members are also aging in a similar fashion and, consequently, a mass retirement of faculty is anticipated. The mass retirement of faculty also represents a critical loss of potential community college presidents since faculty, ascending to chief academic officer positions, have historically served as an important pipeline to the community college presidency (Shults, 2001).
Key Findings

In this study, the presidents consistently commented that the traditional route to the presidency is no longer assumed to be primarily from the academic ranks. As one president explained,

I believe that the chief academic officer is often the most direct to proceed to the presidency, but this is changing. There are other areas than the chief academic officer position, such as a business officer or even student services that are pathways to the presidency.

Another stated,

I also see a lot of vice presidents of student services increasingly being appointed to the presidency. We are also seeing institutional advancement folks being appointed to the presidency and vice presidents of finance as well.

While the chief academic officer continues to be the most frequently cited immediate prior position for community college presidents, this trend is slowly changing. According to ACE, The American College President 2012 (Cook & Kim, 2012), suggests that even a few years have made a difference in reported community college presidential career pathways. The study concludes by emphasizing the nontraditional pipeline:

Unlike the other institutions described, where about half of presidents come from senior positions in academic affairs, community college presidents have a somewhat more diverse route to the presidency. Many (44%) still come from academic affairs, but 13% come from other executive positions and 7% come from outside higher education. (p. 28)

Conclusion

Interestingly, presidents with backgrounds in development and other “non-academic positions” are more commonly found in community colleges than in other institutional types (Weisbrod, Ballou, & Asch, 2008). Non-faculty administrators who rise
through the college ranks tend to ascend to presidencies at less prestigious institutions (Birnbaum & Umbach, 2001), and the similarity in presidential background data for private four-year colleges and community colleges “suggests a similarity in openness to ‘non-traditional’ candidates and a likely need for external expertise” (Almanac of Higher Education, 2011). A Chronicle of Higher Education article predicted that fundraisers with advanced degrees will be well-positioned in the wake of the predicted presidential pipeline shortage (Masterson, 2010). The article argued that “Fundraisers who rise to the top position at a college are considered thought leaders who have an understanding of the academic enterprise and a talent for managing both finances and people.” In 2007, the Council for Resource Development (CRD) took an active interest in documenting the experiences of those rising from its advancement ranks to the presidency. The authors, Chitwood and Jones (2007), reported on the relevancy of experiences, citing collaboration, planning, advocacy, and communication as a crucial skill set for college presidents and a common skill set for advancement professionals. The report claimed that boards can easily find candidates with fundraising experience who also have solid academic backgrounds and faculty understanding; but mentioned it was more challenging to find academic candidates who could address today’s fundraising environment and demands for building partnerships.

**IMPLICATIONS**

Studies focusing on leadership competencies for community college chief development officers are vital because of the role chief development officers play in
private fundraising. As a result, this study was focused solely on identifying which of the American Association of Community College (2005) leadership competencies were the most important as it relates to the skill set of the chief development officer from the perspective of Michigan community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers. This study further examined if there were any significant differences in the rankings of leadership competencies by length of tenure of the chief development officers.

Chief Development Officers — The Big Picture

Community colleges are institutions of higher learning that offer an educational gateway to students who are seeking career training leading to immediate employment, transfer education leading to a baccalaureate degree, and courses that fulfill local community needs. These missions require that chief development officers have the broadest understanding of the entire college and the ability to interact with various stakeholders regarding how the college is meeting community needs and is a worthy target for donor investment. Increasing numbers of potential donors are beginning to understand and to give. The future fundraising potential of community colleges is limited only by a community college’s ability to convey the “case for support,” to nurture donor relationships and to channel their support. It should be noted that donors give to organizations (and to people) whom they trust will use their charitable gifts in a way that conforms to their values and interests; such trust is most often based on relationships formed between the leaders of the organization and the donors. Chief
development officers must “push themselves to become knowledgeable on topics that extend well beyond their formal training, education, and experience” (Croteau & Smith, 2012, p. 197). Not surprisingly, communication, community college advocacy, and collaboration were ranked highly as leadership competencies by all three groups in this study—presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers. Successful fundraising requires collaboration among various constituents and stakeholders and the ability to articulate a clear vision that motivates and inspires donors “in an effort to engage them with the mission, goals, and funding priorities of the institution” (Croteau & Smith, 2012, p. 198).

How then should chief development officers prepare for their leadership roles within in the institution? Given what has been learned in this study and what is known about the requirements for successful community college fundraising, individuals who desire to become community college chief development officers must have competencies in the areas of collaboration, communication, and community college advocacy. Further, those who are responsible for selecting candidates for the position of chief development officer should seek and select individuals who possess and demonstrate these attributes.

The qualitative portion of this study explored issues related to developing the fundraising capacity of incumbent and aspiring community college presidents. The analysis of these interview transcripts identified key themes that yielded valuable information from seasoned presidents representing community colleges of varying sizes in rural and urban settings. Their information provided insight with respect to
competencies and experiences they deemed most beneficial in their own professional development as fundraising presidents as well as advice to those who are seeking the presidency.

Those who aspire to become successful community college chief development officers can utilize the findings of this study as a guide to address areas in which to seek professional development related to leadership competencies. A prospective chief development officer can evaluate his/her own personal attributes, abilities, and professional experiences, and compare them to the findings of this study as a self-reflection tool and engage others in assisting with this evaluation as well.

While strong social skills in the realm of collaboration, communication and advocacy are important, having the ability to motivate, inspire, and influence are also significant. Chief development officers are expected to influence relationships on campus and within the external college community. “It is the responsibility of the chief development officer to leverage his or her social skills to engage faculty and other academic professionals with donors in meaningful ways, and vice versa” (Croteau & Smith, 2012, p. 199).

Those responsible for the hiring of chief development officers should also be involved in identifying the desired qualifications of a candidate to be placed on the position announcements. The findings from this research could be utilized as a starting point for discussions pertaining to the desired competencies.
Presidents — Communicators in Chief

Presidents and aspiring presidents who want to develop their fundraising “muscle” must be able to communicate effectively across constituent groups both inside and outside the college walls. As one study participant stated,

Presidents have to be good storytellers because of their responsibilities. We serve on various boards representing the college, and give numerous presentations. We have to very succinct and clear.

Presidents and would-be presidents who have weak communication skills must pay particular attention to strengthening them through a commitment to continuous learning by seeking professional development opportunities and effective practice.

Professional development opportunities could include formal leadership programs, mentorships and coaching, conferences, and community college leadership doctoral programs. Individuals must recognize that leadership and essential competencies can be learned and refined (Thomas, 2013). It is important for aspiring presidents to polish their communication skills because their ability to communicate effectively can inspire donors to support an aspirational future for the college that the donors cannot yet “see.”

The credentials earned by community college students accumulate value over time, and the impact of the college on a community is similarly evolutionary and long-term. Asserting a sense of importance and urgency about an aspirational goal for which donor investment is sought requires (in addition to planning and effective implementation) the ability to communicate a long-term vision that excites, inspires and motivates immediate action on the part of donors.
Presidents — Fundraisers in Chief

Today’s community college presidents are increasingly expected to raise private funds as a portion of the college’s overall revenue mix thus making professional development in this area critical to the success of the college’s fundraising program. Aspiring presidents should understand the importance of and sharpen their relationship building skills in order to be successful at attracting and raising funds for their institutions.

As the “living logo” of the college, the president is an essential member of the fundraising team because no other leader in the college can create the vision, establish college-wide priorities or communicate the case for support with as much gravitas and authority as the president. As the primary spokesperson for the institution, the president is expected to articulate how donors’ gifts can improve the college while inspiring internal and external constituents.

Members of the fundraising team include, but are not limited to, the development staff, the foundation and its volunteers, and deans or vice presidents who serve academic and administrative roles. Because the traditional responsibility of a dean or vice president is to ensure the quality of the educational programs, this is something of great interest to donors. Likewise, faculty can be enormously helpful in fundraising and the dean or vice president and president should engage faculty as partners in fundraising, asking them to join donor visits. Further, faculty can also be helpful with crafting the case for support and cultivating alumni who have the potential to give. As
noted in the literature alumni tend to give as a result of their gratitude for the way they were treated by individual faculty members.

Prospective donors at all giving levels must come to know the president as an engaged and vibrant leader and member of the fundraising team. Individuals who have great wealth or who manage resources on behalf of a corporation or foundation often respond best when talking with the president. Being solicited for a gift by the president carries special meaning, as does receiving a personalized thank-you from the president.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

If college completion, seamless education and career systems, stackable credentials or any other stretch goal for community colleges is to be attained, resources beyond currently available public dollars and tuition and fees will be required. As a sector, community colleges need to become much more skilled and aggressive in attracting private philanthropic support. With notable exceptions, community colleges have yet to be the fundraising champions that their missions and aspirations for service to students and the community demand.

The present study was limited to Michigan community colleges and to a selection of presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers. Although the research was conducted with those who had insight into the leadership qualities of a successful chief development officer, the value of the research could be enhanced by a study that would expand to a larger population and sample size. Given the limited responses to this study there is need for additional research with regard to
leadership competencies for successful community college fundraising on the part of chief development officers and presidents. It would be interesting to repeat this study using (1) a general population of community college chief development officers, and (2) a general population of community college presidents in order to determine the level of congruence, or lack thereof, between the perceptions about leadership competencies offered by these two populations.

Fundraising Success and Implications for Higher Education Leadership Programs

Another recommendation for future research is a study of community college doctoral leadership programs. How many incorporate formal fundraising curricula and/or courses that reinforce the skill set required for successful fundraising by presidents? How future presidents are trained will have direct implications for how they carry fundraising into practice once they become presidents. Furthermore, if there continues to be a lack of formal fundraising training, there will continue to be a lack of skilled presidential fundraisers. As curricula is developed or updated in doctoral-level programs for aspiring community college leaders, it should incorporate fundraising coursework in order to better prepare highly qualified presidential applicants.

Fundraising Leadership Qualifications and Implications for Hiring

The final recommendation for future research is a study related to the implications for hiring chief development officers and presidents who can lead successful fundraising programs. The community college president and chief development officer must exhibit behaviors and actions that consistently affect
fundraising success. A study focusing on the characteristics and competencies of presidents and chief development officers who have achieved success in fundraising would provide community colleges information that could help them recruit and hire effective presidents and chief development officers. Fundraising is becoming a more significant component of the president's job responsibilities, and specifically identified characteristics and competencies known to positively affect fundraising success may increase in importance when hiring decisions are made. The same can be said for the chief development officer. If certain characteristics are common to successful fundraising presidents and chief development officers, the opportunity to create job profiles that include these characteristics and behaviors and emphasize them in hiring decisions could be significant.

**SUMMARY**

Community colleges will continue to be unique institutions serving a wide array of needs for the communities they serve. Fulfilling these needs is a challenge that must increasingly be met through alternative resources; foremost among them is philanthropic giving to community colleges. The necessity to increase philanthropic support to community colleges has never been greater.

Community colleges must first recognize the need for development staff and invest in competent leadership for fundraising. Just as crucial to recognizing this need is the importance of presidential leadership to an effective fundraising team. Both the
president and chief development officer have separate and distinct fundraising leadership roles; both cultivate relationships with potential donors and solicit gifts.

Community colleges are educating nearly half of the nation’s undergraduates. Now is the time to build strong relationships with students in order to better engage them as alumni. Now is the time to create lasting relationships with non-alumni individuals (the largest source of philanthropic gifts for community colleges nationwide), businesses, foundations, and faculty/staff to initiate and strengthen their habit of giving to community colleges. To do so, community college leaders must conspicuously communicate and advocate a clear and compelling message regarding their mission, programs, and services, as these are the building blocks for many to a brighter future.
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APPENDIX B: SURVEY (AACC’S COMPETENCIES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERS)
Competencies for Community College Leaders Survey

Introduction/what agreeing to text here

1. By clicking on the "I Agree" button, you are giving your permission to use your responses in an aggregate and confidential manner.
   - I Agree
   - I Do Not Agree

2. For each competency listed, please indicate your opinion about its importance and relevance for the Chief Development Officer position at the college. Please generalize your responses to the position of the Chief Development Officer not to the person who may currently serve in this position.

   Organizational Strategy: An effective community college leader strategically improves the quality of the institution, protects the long-term health of the organization, promotes the success of all students, and sustains the community college mission, based on knowledge of the organization, its environment, and future trends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess, develop, implement, and evaluate strategies regularly to monitor and improve the quality of education and the long-term health of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use data-driven evidence and proven practices from internal and external stakeholders to solve problems, make decisions, and plan strategically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a systems perspective to assess and respond to the culture of the organization, to changing demographics, and to the economic, political, and public health needs of students and the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a positive environment that supports innovation, teamwork, and successful outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and grow college personnel and fiscal resources and assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Align organizational mission, structures, and resources with the college master plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Resource Management:** An effective community college leader equitably and ethically sustains people, processes, and information as well as physical and financial assets to fulfill the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure accountability in reporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support operational decisions by managing information resources and ensuring the integrity and integration of reporting systems and databases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and manage resource assessment, planning, budgeting, acquisition, and allocation processes consistent with the college master plan and local, state, and national policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take an entrepreneurial stance in seeking ethical alternative funding sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement financial strategies to support programs, services, staff, and facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a human resources system that includes recruitment, hiring, reward, and performance management systems and that fosters the professional development and advancement of all staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ organizational, time management, planning, and delegation skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage conflict and change in ways that contribute to the long-term viability of the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Communication:** An effective community college leader uses clear listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue at all levels of the college and its surrounding community, to promote the success of all students, and to sustain the community college mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articulate and champion shared mission, vision, and values to internal and external audiences, appropriately matching message to audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate and support policies and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and maintain open communications regarding resources, priorities, and expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convey ideas and information succinctly, frequently, and inclusively through media and verbal and nonverbal means to the board and other constituencies and stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen actively to understand, comprehend, analyze, engage, and act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project confidence and respond responsibly and tactfully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Collaboration: An effective community college leader develops and maintains responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethical internal and external relationships that nurture diversity, promote the success of all students, and sustain the community college mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embrace and employ the diversity of individuals, cultures, values, ideas, and communication styles.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate cultural competence relative to a global society.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyze involvement and commitment of students, faculty, staff, and community members to work for the common good.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build and leverage networks and partnerships to advance the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work effectively and diplomatically with unique constituent groups such as legislators, board members, business leaders, accreditation organizations, and others.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage conflict and change by building and maintaining productive relationships.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, enhance, and sustain teamwork and cooperation.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate shared problem solving and decision making.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Community College Advocacy: An effective community college leader understands, commits to, and advocates for the mission, vision, and goals of the community college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value and promote diversity, inclusion, equity, and academic excellence.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate a passion for and commitment to the mission of community colleges and student success through the scholarship of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote equity, open access, teaching, learning, and innovation as primary goals for the college seeking to understand how these change over time and facilitating discussion with all stakeholders.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate the community college mission to all constituents and empower them to do the same.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance lifelong learning and support a learner-centered and learning-centered environment.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent the community college in the local community, in the broader educational community, at various levels of government, and as a model of higher education that can be replicated in international settings.</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Professionalism:** An effective community college leader works ethically to set high standards for self and others, continuously improve self and surroundings, demonstrate accountability to and for the institution, and ensure the long-term viability of the college and community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrate transformational leadership through authenticity, creativity, and vision.</th>
<th>1 Not Important</th>
<th>2 Minimally Important</th>
<th>3 Moderately Important</th>
<th>4 Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and endorse the history, philosophy, and culture of the community college.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assess performance regularly using feedback, reflection, goal setting, and evaluation.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support lifelong learning for self and others.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage stress through self-care, balance, adaptability, flexibility, and humor.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the courage to take risks, make difficult decisions, and accept responsibility.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the impact of perceptions, worldviews, and emotions on self and others.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote and maintain high standards for personal and organizational integrity, honesty, and respect for people.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use influence and power wisely in facilitating the teaching and learning process and the exchange of knowledge.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weigh short-term and long-term goals in decision-making.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to the profession through professional development programs, professional organizational leadership, and research/publication.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. We listed competencies about organizational strategy, resource management, communication, collaboration, community college advocacy and professionalism. Can you think of any additional competencies that are critical for Chief Development Officers?

I have asked you to share with me your views on what competencies you think are important, now I would like to know a little bit about you. Please remember your responses will be kept confidential. I am interested in this demographic information for statistical purposes only and will only use it for that purpose.
9. Title
   - President/Chancellor
   - Chief Academic Officer/Vice President of Academic Affairs
   - Chief Development Officer

10. Number of years in your current position
   - Less than 1
   - 1-3
   - 4-6
   - 7-9
   - 10-12
   - 13-15
   - More than 15

11. Who does the Chief Development Officer report to at your institution?
   - Chief Academic Officer/Vice President of Academic Affairs
   - President
   - Other
   - Please specify: [Box]

12. Your highest level of education
   - Bachelor's
   - Master's
   - Ph.D.

13. Your age
   - 35 or younger
   - 36-40
   - 41-45
   - 46-50
   - 51-55
   - 56-60
   - 61-65
   - Over 65

14. Your gender
   - Male
   - Female
15. Your ethnicity (Please select all that apply)
   - American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - Asian
   - Black/African American
   - Hispanic
   - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
   - White/Caucasian
   - Prefer not to respond

16. Size of your institution
   - Small (1,000-4,999)
   - Medium (5,000-9,999)
   - Large (10,000 or more)

17. Please use this space for additional comments.

Thank you for your time and input.
APPENDIX C: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL
To: Dr. Kathleen Guy & Ms. Yolanda Barnes
From: C. Meinholdt, IRB Chair
Re: IRB Applications #121001 (Title: Chief Development Officers in the Community College
  Perceptions of Their Competencies, Characteristics and Professional Skills from the
  Perspective of Presidents, Chief Academic Affairs and Chief Development Officers)
Date: October 19th, 2012

The Ferris State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed your application for using human subjects in the study, “Chief Development Officers in the Community College” Perceptions of Their Competencies, Characteristics and Professional Skills from the Perspective of Presidents, Chief Academic Affairs and Chief Development Officers” (#121001) and approved it as exempt – 1C from full committee review. This approval has an expiration date of three years from the date of this letter. As such, you may collect data according to procedures in your application until October 20th, 2015. It is your obligation to inform the IRB of any changes in your research protocol that would substantially alter the methods and procedures reviewed and approved by the IRB in this application. Your application has been assigned a project number (#121001) which you should refer to in future applications involving the same research procedure.

We also wish to inform researchers that the IRB requires follow-up reports for all research protocols as mandated by the CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) 45, Title 46 for using human subjects in research. Thank you for your compliance with these guidelines and best wishes for a successful research endeavor. Please let me know if I can be of future assistance.
APPENDIX D: EMAIL MESSAGE ENCOURAGING PARTICIPATION FROM CHAIR
October 28, 2012

Dear Community College Colleagues,

I am writing to encourage your participation in an important study in the field of community college leadership being conducted by Yolonda Barnes, a doctoral student at Ferris State University. The study seeks to examine the way presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers view the leadership competencies, characteristics, and professional skills identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC, 2005) as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer.

You have been selected as a participant in this study because you possess the knowledge and experiences to understand the extent of the identified leadership competencies and their relevancy to the chief development officer. We are seeking responses from Michigan’s community college leaders whose insight may prove beneficial to those seeking to hire and work collaboratively with chief development officers or those preparing for a career in fundraising at a community college.

This week you will receive a 17-item questionnaire sent to you on behalf of Ms. Barnes by Ms. Amy Otteson, Research Analyst, in the Institutional Research and Testing Office at FSU. I encourage you to take 20 minutes to complete the survey. All responses will be kept confidential.

Thank you in advance.

Cordially,

Kathleen E. Guy, Ph. D., CFRE
Adjunct Faculty, Ferris State University Doctorate
in Community College Leadership Program
APPENDIX E: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL MESSAGE WITH AN ACCOMPANYING LINK TO THE SURVEY
Good Day,

You are being invited to participate in a research study. That study is entitled, “Chief Development Officers in the Community College: Perceptions of Their Competencies, Characteristics and Professional Skills from the Perspective of Presidents, Chief Academic Affairs and Chief Development Officers”.

In 2004, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) designed a survey to ensure that the critical areas of leadership competencies required by community college professionals had been addressed. The completed study was subsequently published in a document titled, competencies for Community College Leaders (2005). The purpose of this study is to examine what inferences can be made in the way presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers view the leadership competencies, characteristics, and professional skills identified by the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) (2005) as they relate to the skill set of the chief development officer. This study is being conducted by Yolonda Barnes, from the Doctorate in Community College Leadership program at Ferris State University.

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you possess knowledge, skills and experiences that can be shared with those who aspire to understand the extent of the identified leadership competencies and their relevancy to the chief development officer. We are seeking responses from 100 community college leaders whose insight may prove beneficial to those preparing for a career in fund raising at a community college.

There are neither known risks nor costs to you if you decide to participate in this research study. The information you provide will contribute to the growing body of academic research of community college chief development officers. The questionnaire will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The information collected may not benefit you directly, but the information learned in this study should provide more general benefits.

This survey is anonymous. Reports of research findings will not permit associating your name or your college with specific responses or findings. In addition, the data is being collected in such a way that one institution cannot be compared with another. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study. This data will be maintained and kept confidential with password protected computer files that erases 12 months after the completion of the study.
Your participation in this study is voluntary. By completing the survey, you are voluntarily agreeing to participate. You are free to decline to answer any particular question you do not wish to answer for any reason. The survey deadline is November 14, 2012.

To access the survey, simply click on the link below, complete the survey and click the “Submit” button (clicking Submit must be done for your completed survey to be received and included in the aggregate data). If you experience any technical difficulties, please forward your entire e-mail to Amy S. Otteson at ottesona@ferris.edu along with the problem you are having and she will be happy to assist you. http://www.snapsurveys.com/swh/surveylogin.asp?k=135169263376&i=43E0DD

If you have any questions about the study or would like a copy of the survey results, please contact me at barnesy@ferris.edu. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Note: Ferris State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed my request to conduct this project. If you have any concerns about your rights in this study, please contact the Institutional Review Board Office at (231) 591-2759 or IRB@ferris.edu. SSKH:135169263376
APPENDIX F: REMINDER EMAIL MESSAGE FOR PARTICIPATION
On October 31, 2012, I emailed you an invitation to participate in a survey for my doctoral dissertation research regarding the competencies for community college leaders. Please consider responding to this survey and assisting with my dissertation research.

The significance of your contribution is vital to the overall findings and usefulness of this study. The survey should take 10-15 minutes of your time. The survey deadline is **November 14, 2012**.

Please rest assured that information that you provide on the survey will be handled in confidence and will never be associated to you by name or college. In addition, the data is being collected in such a way that one institution cannot be compared with another and chief development officers are not evaluating each other.

Participation in the study is voluntary. You may end your participation by not responding to the survey. Completion and return of the survey implies that you agree to participate and that your data may be used in this research.

If you have any questions about the study or need another survey package e-mailed to you, please feel free to contact me at (231) 591-3664 or email me at barnesy@ferris.edu. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Yolonda E. Barnes
Doctoral Candidate, Ferris State University
APPENDIX G: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL MESSAGE TO PRESIDENTS REQUESTING PARTICIPATION
Participants were approached via email with an invitation to participate in the study. There were multiple emails and phone conversations to make meeting arrangements. However, the first email generally explained the purpose of the research and outlined the parameters for the study. The following is an example of a typical initial email:

Dear XXXXX:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Doctorate in Community College Leadership program at Ferris State University. I’ve completed my coursework and am in the process of researching and writing my dissertation.

Last fall, I surveyed Michigan’s community college presidents, chief academic officers, and chief development officers on the topic of leadership competencies, characteristics and professional skills of the Chief Development Officer in the Michigan community college. Perhaps your responses are among the data that I have already collected—thank you! Based on these data, my research plan now calls for conducting a select number of qualitative interviews to deepen and enrich my investigation of topics related to the leadership competencies of Chief Development Officers from the President’s perspective.

The purpose of this email is to ask you to participate in a 20-minute telephone interview with me sometime in the next 30 days. For your convenience, I will send the questions one week prior to the scheduled interview.

Are you willing to participate in this phone interview? If so, who should I contact in your office to schedule our conversation?

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yolonda

Yolonda Barnes, Program Chair/Faculty
Professional Technical Education/Administrative Support Program
College of Western Idaho
APPENDIX H: REMINDER EMAIL MESSAGE TO PRESIDENTS INCLUDING QUALITATIVE QUESTIONS
Participants were approached via email with an invitation to participate in the study. There were multiple emails and phone conversations to make meeting arrangements. However, the first email generally explained the purpose of the research and outlined the parameters for the study. The following is an example of a typical initial email:

Dear XXXX:

Thank you again for allowing me to interview you tomorrow. As promised, below are the questions that I will be asking you.

1. In reviewing my quantitative data results, I found it very interesting that all three groups (presidents, chief academic officers and chief development officers) ranked the American Association of Community Colleges 6 leadership competencies differently (here is the web page of the competencies your convenience http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/competencies/Documents/competenciesforleaders.pdf). Presidents ranked “communication” highest, chief academic officers ranked “community college advocacy” highest, and chief development officers ranked “collaboration” the highest. Why do you think this?

2. What might you do differently to prepare/professionally develop yourself for your role in fundraising?

3. What might you recommend to aspiring presidents to prepare/professionally develop themselves for the role in fundraising?

4. The chief academic officer is most often the direct line to succeed the presidency, do you think that academic officers should participate in fundraising and/or be more effective in helping with bringing resources to the college?

This survey is anonymous. Reports of research findings will not permit associating your name or your college with specific responses or findings. In addition, the data is being collected in such a way that one institution cannot be compared with another. No one will be able to identify you or your answers, and no one will know whether or not you participated in the study. This data will be maintained and kept confidential with password protected computer files that erases 12 months after the completion of the study. Ferris State University Institutional Review Board has reviewed my request to conduct this project. If you have any concerns about your rights in this study, please contact the Institutional Review Board Office at (231) 591-2759 or IRB@ferris.edu.

Thank you again, and I look forward to speaking with you tomorrow.

Yolonda Barnes, Program Chair/Faculty
Professional Technical Education/Administrative Support Program
APPENDIX I: CODES/CATEGORIES/THEMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Codes Categories</th>
<th>Reasons for Different Rankings of Competencies RQ1</th>
<th>Preparation for Presidential Fundraising Role RQ2</th>
<th>Recommendations to Aspiring Presidents Regarding &amp; the Fundraising Role RQ3</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers Role in Fundraising and their Route to the Presidency RQ4</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CC A**                  | Communication is important for presidents as well as being  
- Persuasive  
- Motivating  
CDOs need to have collaborative skills to engage (3 times):  
- Community (2 times)  
- Alumni  
- Activities  
CAOs need to be able to advocate curriculum  
- Faculty advocate | Professional development is important  
CC fundraising is different from 4 yr institution fundraising (2 times)  
- Fundraising should be tailored to community (2 times)  
- Know your community  
- Retirees most committed with money  
- Students revenue source | President provides vision  
Fundraising is more important now  
- Big time commitment (3 times)  
- Articulate story  
- Learn balance time/life/ work | Route to presidency has changed  
- No longer filled by CAO  
- Filled with persons with background in business  
- Strong sense of community  
- Workforce development  
Importance of fundraising  
- All cc leadership needs to understand fundraising  
- All cc leadership needs to understand foundation  
- All cc leadership needs to participate | 1. Fundraising is important and is a time commitment  
2. Communication is an important skill for presidents including having a vision and articulating that vision  
3. A strong need for a broad perspective of one’s college |
| **CC B**                  | CDOs need to be able to collaborate  
- Relationships | Presidential fundraising is important  
- Expectation to fundraise  
- Raise money (2 times)  
- Importance of | Training and development important  
- Professional development  
- Work with fundraising office  
- Learn to sell yourself/ college  
- Students need to learn to fundraise | Route to presidency has changed | 1. Important to know how to collaborate in order to build relationships  
2. Presidential role in fundraising is important  
3. Professional development is important  
4. Presidency route has changed |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Codes</th>
<th>Reasons for Different Rankings of Competencies RQ1</th>
<th>Preparation for Presidential Fundraising Role RQ2</th>
<th>Recommendations to Aspiring Presidents Regarding &amp; the Fundraising Role RQ3</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers Role in Fundraising and their Route to the Presidency RQ4</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC C Large Rural</td>
<td>Communication is most important skill for presidents (3 times) • Story teller • Transparent • Adaptability</td>
<td>Start engaging in fundraising early Professional development is important • Get involved (2 times) • Learn to collaborate • Learn to communicate (2 times)</td>
<td>Data mining is vital • Data banks (2 times) • Use to build relationships Training/development • Practice making the ask (3 times) • Learn to listen for the gift (2 times) Build relationships • With staff (2 times) • With donors • With volunteers • Alumni (2 times)</td>
<td>Route to presidency has changed • Institutional advancement • VPs of Finance Dept. Participation in fundraising is important to presidency • VPs need recognize this • Get involved (3 times) • Connect with industry • What are needs of community • What are needs of CC</td>
<td>1. The president must be able to have good communication skills 2. Professional development is important for fundraising 3. Creating strong relationships with donors, community, alumni, and industry are key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions Codes Categories</td>
<td>Reasons for Different Rankings of Competencies RQ1</td>
<td>Preparation for Presidential Fundraising Role RQ2</td>
<td>Recommendations to Aspiring Presidents Regarding &amp; the Fundraising Role RQ3</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officers Role in Fundraising and their Route to the Presidency RQ4</td>
<td>Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CCD Medium Rural           | Communication is the most important skill set for presidents (6 times)  
  • Transparent  
  • Collaborate  
  • Advocate  
  • Strategic | Presidential fundraising has changed over the years  
  • Events  
  • Campaigns (2 times)  
  • Consultants  
  • Relationship building (2 times)  
  • Strategic  
  • Advocate  
  • Tell the story | Presidential career more expanse  
  • Workforce development  
  • Multiple routes to presidency  
  • Route is changing (3 times) | CAO provides direction for academics  
  • Academics is their focus (2 times) | 1. President is the face of the community college |
|                           | Fundraising is important  
  |                   |                                                                 | Fundraising is important (3 times)                                                                                     |                                                                                   | 2. Presidents need to be good story tellers for college |
|                           | Professional development  
  |                   |                                                                 | Professional development  
  • Right skill set                                                                                                           |                                                                                   | 3. President needs a broad view of the college |
|                           | President must make the ASK  
  |                   |                                                                 | President must make the ASK  
  • Be a part of the discussion                                                                                                    |                                                                                   | 4. Communication is the most important skill for presidents |
|                           | Advancement office role  
  |                   |                                                                 | Advancement office role  
  • The need to work with them (2 times)  
  • Hire competent CDO/staff  
  • Trust them                                                                                                                     |                                                                                   |        |
|                           |                                                                 |                                                                 |                                                                                                                              |                                                                                   |        |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions Codes Categories</th>
<th>Reasons for Different Rankings of Competencies RQ1</th>
<th>Preparation for Presidential Fundraising Role RQ2</th>
<th>Recommendations to Aspiring Presidents Regarding &amp; the Fundraising Role RQ3</th>
<th>Chief Academic Officers Role in Fundraising and their Route to the Presidency RQ4</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC E</strong></td>
<td>President is champion of the college</td>
<td>Fundraising is a new revenue source</td>
<td>Professional development is important</td>
<td>Route to presidency has changed</td>
<td>1. President needs a varied skill set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td>• Communication is vital (6 times)</td>
<td>• Campaign (2 times)</td>
<td>Fundraising takes time</td>
<td>• Finance</td>
<td>2. Communication is the most important skill for the presidency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>• Must communicate with donors/staff/faculty/students</td>
<td>• Limited resources</td>
<td>• Many Asks</td>
<td>• Student Services</td>
<td>3. Fundraising takes practice/training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAOs must work with others in order to raise money</td>
<td>• Important for survival</td>
<td>• Balance your time</td>
<td>Presidential skill set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaboration (3 times)</td>
<td>• 35% of time (2 times)</td>
<td>Communication skills are key</td>
<td>• Communicator (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborator (2 times)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn the skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can multitask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaborate with those who fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Willing to take risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create a sense of community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Student focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Presidents need a varied skill set
2. Communication is the most important skill for the presidency
3. Fundraising takes practice/training