

**Presidential Satisfaction with Development Programs in Research and Doctoral
Universities**

A Comparison of Results from Surveys in 1990 and 2000

Becky Nesbit*, Patrick Rooney**, Gary Bouse***, Eugene R. Tempel****

*Doctoral Student, School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University,
Bloomington, Indiana.

** Director of Research, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University and
Associate Professor of Economics and Philanthropic Studies, Indiana University-Purdue
University Indianapolis (IUPUI).

***VP, Development, Indiana State University

****Executive Director, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

Contact: Patrick Rooney, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University

550 West North Street, Suite 301, Indianapolis, IN 46202-3272

Phone: 317-684-8908; Fax: 317-684-8968; Rooney@iupui.edu

Abstract

The increasing costs of higher education and the decreasing willingness of taxpayers to support it have amplified the importance of fundraising in the modern university. The (dis)satisfaction of the university president with his/her development program can have profound ramifications for the success of the program and the careers of the development professionals. This paper addresses a gaping hole in the academic and practitioner knowledge base: what makes presidents satisfied and/or dissatisfied with their institution's development efforts and how do they evaluate the performance of the development program.

Keywords: university, fundraising, president, development

Presidential Satisfaction with Development Programs in Research and Doctoral Universities:
A Comparison of Results from Surveys in 1990 and 2000

Fundraising continues to be a primary responsibility of college and university presidents (Worth, 2002). While fundraising has long been an obligation of presidents of private institutions for centuries, it is a newer responsibility for presidents of public universities. According to information from the American Council on Education, over half of the presidents of public universities would prefer more training in fundraising than additional experience in any other single area, including administrative or faculty positions (New York Times, July 15, 2001).

Over the past decade, university presidents have often indicated in casual conversations that there is a high level of dissatisfaction with their institutions' fundraising program. Such dissatisfaction has major implications for the functions of the fundraising staff. Some of the implications are: 1) presidents may distance themselves from the development staff and/or the fundraising process, contributing further to dissatisfaction and lower productivity; 2) presidents may force unrealistic goals, adversely impacting staff morale; and 3) presidents may terminate fundraising staff who are performing well in their position in absolute terms, but may not be able to meet unreasonable goals, thereby increasing turnover of fundraising staff, disrupting institutional relationships and lowering productivity. However, no empirical evidence indicates that a high level of dissatisfaction actually exists. Studies funded by the Indiana University Center on Philanthropy were conducted in 1990 and 2000 researching the satisfaction levels of college and university presidents with their fund raising programs.

The purpose of this exploratory study was to examine college and university presidents of research and doctoral granting institutions to determine the change in levels of satisfaction with

their development programs over the decade of 1990-2000 and examine factors that might affect their level of satisfaction. This paper will not explain university president's role in fundraising, which has been the subject of previous writings (Flawn, 1990; Slinker, 1988), or what methods college presidents use in evaluating their institution's fundraising effort over this period of time, since a wealth of information already exists on evaluative methods used in educational fundraising and other non-academic offices in higher education (e.g., Elton, 1995; Gaither, 1994; Heppner and Johnston, 1994; Wergin and Braskamp, 1987; Worthen and Sanders, 1987). This paper compares the data from the 1990 and 2000 surveys and examines the changes in university presidents satisfaction with fundraising between those years. The researchers also use the data to make comparisons between the satisfaction of public and private university presidents with fundraising at their universities.

Literature Review

Several different factors make research on university presidents and their satisfaction with fundraising an important area of inquiry. These factors include: 1) the continued interest among political leaders in moving educational expenditures from the public to the private sector, and the increasing need for fundraising at public universities; 2) the changing role of the university and college president from that of academic leader to chief fundraiser (Glass & Jackson, 1998; McLaughlin, 1996).

For the last 20 years, fundraising efforts on campuses have grown dramatically (Brittingham and Pezzullo, 1990; Duronio and Tempel, 1996). The most recently available data estimate that fundraising income in education today exceeds \$31 billion dollars (AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, 2002), which is triple what it was in 1980 (\$10.4 billion) in real (inflation

adjusted) dollars. While these estimates from Giving USA 2002 include all of education, they are predominately gifts going to higher education. Fundraising will become even more important as universities attempt to maintain budgets—not to mention improve them--in the face of falling state support (Healy, 1999) and increased risks of declining federal support (DeLoughry, 1991; Brainard, 1999). These limited funding sources forces increased competition among universities for financial support (Nicklin 1994), especially as private foundations are beginning to funnel more money into elementary and secondary education and away from higher education (Pulley 2002). Therefore, more universities are starting capital campaigns or increasing their campaign goals in order to gain necessary funds (Nicklin 1992; Strosnider 1997; Mercer 1998; Gamley 1999; Smiles 2002).

The roles of the university president are complex, numerous and ever changing (Lilly, 1987). One of the most striking changes in these roles of the university president is the president's need to devote huge amounts of time to fund raising (Cook 1997). Uncertainties in federal and state economies continue to force presidents to be more fiscally and politically oriented, underscored almost two decades ago in a study of the perceived importance of presidential roles where fundraiser and financial manager ranked 4th and 5th respectively in importance out of 18 presidential roles (Cote, 1985). The ability to raise funds has also become a necessary skill of presidential candidates for employment (Greenwood and Ross, 1996). Many presidents must have a greater knowledge of tax laws, planned giving, and the mechanical aspects of fund raising in order to be successful (Cook 1997). The challenge of locating financial resources is one of the five biggest challenges for academic leaders in the 21st century (Penney 1996).

Purpose of the Study

The primary objectives of this study are to examine the changes in levels of satisfaction among university presidents with their institutions' fundraising efforts over the period of 1990-2000, to determine if a change has taken place in the same period in what specific criteria impact university president's satisfaction with his or her institution's fundraising efforts, and to address any changes in orders of importance among these criteria, based upon studies conducted on the determinants of presidential satisfaction with fund raising (Rooney, Bouse and Tempel, 2002; Bouse, 2001). The model used in these two studies was derived from Rand's (1964) theory of job satisfaction, which bases satisfaction on one's value judgment of perceived objects (or situations) (Locke, 1976). In the studies, the research estimated the relative influence of each of the determinants in predicting the president's general satisfaction. Additionally, the study also examines differences in the level and type of involvement of university presidents in their institutions' fundraising efforts, and their level of understanding of the fundraising process and of philanthropy in general.

Theory & Hypotheses

Most of the literature on job satisfaction within higher education has been conducted on faculty and students rather than administrators (Volkwein and Parmley, 2000). According to Volkwein and Parmley (2000), the few studies existing on administrative satisfaction in higher education have focused on the nature and level of global satisfaction, and have not examined the factors that produce outcomes, such as turnover and productivity. Stretcher (1989) conducted a study of job satisfaction of 89 presidents of public two-year colleges. He found that the prestige associated with being a college president made the most positive contribution to job satisfaction, followed closely by power and influence. Satisfaction increased with the length of service an

individual served as president, as well as the number of presidencies previously held.

A review of the job satisfaction research in higher education reveals the absence of scholarly work on job satisfaction of presidents at research and doctoral granting institutions. Furthermore, aside from our earlier paper, there is no research on their satisfaction with fundraising. Several dissertations written within the past several years have discussed presidents and fundraising at small liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and two-year colleges (Mathis, 1998; Miller, 1997; Roney, 1993). While all have addressed presidents and fundraising, none has examined the impact of fundraising on the job satisfaction of the president. Volkwein and Parmaley's (2000) research on administrative satisfaction of public and private universities did not focus specifically on presidents, nor did it include fundraising as an independent variable.

According to Rand's (1964) theory, if an individual appraises or judges a perceived object to be in relative agreement with his/her own value standards, he/she will experience a positive emotion towards the object or situation (satisfaction). If a person believes, based on his/her own perception, that the object conflicts with his/her own values, that person will show a negative emotion toward the object (dissatisfaction). Using this approach to explain satisfaction, several possibilities exist as the basis for presidential satisfaction with fundraising.

First, the president may value highly activities associated with academic culture, and s/he may be unfamiliar and/or uncomfortable with institutional advancement (Fisher and Koch, 1996). According to a panel of presidents and scholars on the changing role of presidents, "American college and university presidents have less time than ever for the traditional role of acting as the academic leader of their institutions. Instead, they are fundraising, lobbying..." (Terry, 1996, p. 14). The differences in academic and development cultures could result in a negative emotion toward fundraising or in dissatisfaction with the fundraising program.

Second, presidents may value highly having their own fundraising programs be as productive as those of peer institutions. In a national videoconference on the changing role of college and university presidents, a current university president noted that he spends at least three-quarters of his time on fundraising activities, stating, “Shrinking budgets mean we spend more time on fundraising and the dollars are more readily available for institutions that already have an established record of excellence (Terry, 1996, p. 14).” If presidents perceive their fundraising programs as less productive than those at peer institutions, they may value them less leading to a negative emotional response to the program, resulting in dissatisfaction.

Third, the presidents may value more highly productivity of a fundraising program, which meets institutional needs. The theory of perceived needs expresses that individuals might not be satisfied if a specific perceived need is not satisfied. Presidents could become dissatisfied with the fundraising program if private funding for priority needs were not raised, even though the overall productivity of the fundraising program might have increased measurably.

Methodology

Definition of Variables

The major dependent variable in this research is the global satisfaction of the college or university president with the fundraising program at his or her institution, referred to as level of presidential satisfaction with fundraising. To measure the amount of global satisfaction, presidents were asked to identify their level of satisfaction in several different ways using a Likert Scale (1-5). Specifically, they were asked about their overall satisfaction with the following development groups: the fundraising staff, the fundraising board, and the fundraising volunteers, as well as their overall satisfaction with the fundraising program.

The major independent variables to be analyzed arose from the research questions. The following represents a list of the independent variables studied:

Presidential Comfort with Fundraising Activities: The survey asked presidents to rate their level of comfort with four specific fundraising activities: visiting current/prospective donors; and soliciting individuals/corporations for major gifts.

Presidential Evaluation of Fundraising Staff: Presidents were asked to rate the expertise, professional conduct, external image and internal image of their fundraising staffs.

Presidential Understanding and Performance in Fundraising: The questionnaire surveyed presidents about their level of knowledge of the fundraising process, and their perceptions of their own performance as a fundraiser.

Satisfaction with Specific Aspects of the Institution's Fundraising Performance Relative to Campus Priorities: Presidents were surveyed as to their satisfaction to which the development effort met goals for priority projects versus non-priority projects.

Satisfaction with the Institution's Fundraising Performance Relative to that of Peers: Presidents were asked to give their level of satisfaction of their institutions fundraising effort as it relates to peer institutions.

Presidential Involvement in Fundraising: Presidents were asked about the level of information they received about fundraising, as well as their preferred level. They were also asked to rate whether they spent too much or too little time on fundraising and how that compared to the development staff's expectations. They were also asked to estimate the number of hours they typically spend per month in cultivation and solicitation activities.

Data Collection

The longitudinal data used in this paper are actually a merger of two separate datasets, one collected in 1990 and the other collected in 2000. Each of these two datasets was collected from the same population and used an almost identical survey instrument.

The researchers used a mailed questionnaire to obtain the 1990 data, which contains 166 responses. The 2000 dataset was also obtained from a mailed questionnaire, and the researchers used Dillman's (1978) methodology of numerous follow-ups to obtain a high response rate. As a means of further enhancing the response rate, the office of the president at each university was contacted to verify the name and spelling of each university president and to request the assistant's help in ensuring that each president received the survey when it arrived. After that, the surveys were mailed to the presidents of all the doctoral and research universities in the United States. Ten days later, a postcard was sent to remind the presidents to fill out the questionnaire. This was followed by two rounds of survey re-mailings and phone calls to all those presidents who did not respond to the original mailing. A 50 percent response rate was obtained through this methodology, yielding a total of 124 responses in the 2000 dataset. All the data for the 2000 dataset were collected by the Indiana University Public Opinion Lab at IUPUI.

The data from the 1990 and 2000 surveys were combined to form two primary datasets. The first dataset consists of all the responses to questions from either the 1990 or 2000 questionnaires pooled into one dataset of 290 responses. Using the organization codes from each dataset, we matched up the universities that responded to both surveys and used this data to create the second dataset. This dataset contains the responses of 92 universities to both the 1990 and 2000 questionnaire.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the mean, median, and standard deviation for all the variables of interest in the pooled dataset. The only variable omitted from this table is the number of years of experience that the president has in fundraising. This variable is omitted because it was only asked on the 2000 survey and not on the 1990 survey.

Insert Table 1 about here

Characteristics of Presidents and Their Institutions

In the pooled dataset, the average length of time that a university president has been in the position is almost 6.5 years (median = 5). These presidents also spent an average of 4.5 years (median = 3) as the president of another university. And of the 97 percent of these presidents who also spent time as the chief academic officer, the average time in that office was 11.6 years (median = 10).

Table 2 records information about the universities in the pooled dataset.

Insert Table 2 about here

Sixty-eight percent of the universities in the pooled dataset are public universities with the remaining 32 percent being private universities. Because the 1990 survey did not ask if the private universities were religiously affiliated, we could not break down the private universities into those that are religiously affiliated and those that are not.

Presidential Satisfaction with Dollars Raised

Table 3 depicts the percentage of university presidents who are satisfied or very satisfied with the variables of interest for the pooled dataset.

Insert Table 3 about here

Sixty-seven percent of presidents in the pooled data are satisfied or very satisfied with the total amount of funds raised in the past year, but almost 14 percent are dissatisfied with the amount of funds they have raised. Similarly, 65 percent of presidents are satisfied or highly satisfied with the amount of funds that they have raised for priority projects, with only 10 percent being dissatisfied. However, the presidents are not quite as satisfied with their fundraising performance when compared to their peer institutions with 61 percent being satisfied and 19 percent being dissatisfied. When asked about the level of detail to which the presidents prefer to be informed, 49 percent report that they want to know all or almost all of the details, and another 41 percent prefer a moderate amount of detail. This corresponds very strongly with the involvement of the presidents in fundraising given that 57 percent say they are very involved and 34 percent claim to be involved in the fund-raising process.

Presidential Satisfaction with the Development Program and Staff

Overall, 66 percent of the university presidents are satisfied or very satisfied with their universities' fundraising programs, but 15 percent report being unsatisfied with their programs. When asked about their fundraising staff, 74 percent report that they are satisfied or very

satisfied. But again, a significant proportion—11 percent—are not satisfied with their staff. Specifically, the presidents are satisfied with the expertise of their staff (4.1/5.0), the professional conduct (4.4/5.0), and their external image (4.1/5.0). Presidents aren't quite as satisfied, however, with the internal image of their fundraising staff (3.8/5.0). Table 3 also indicates that 72 percent of university presidents are satisfied with their fundraising staff overall. This is striking considering that only 54 percent of presidents are satisfied with their fundraising board and volunteers.

Changes from 1990 to 2000

One of the most interesting aspects of this analysis is viewing the changes that have transpired in presidential satisfaction over the past decade. Table 4 reports the means, median, and standard deviation for the 1990 and 2000 data as well as the results of an independent samples t-test on the means.

Insert Table 4 about here

Changes in Characteristics of Presidents and Their Universities

As seen in the table, the average tenure of the university presidents at their current university increased from almost 6 years in 1990 (median = 4.5) to over 7 years in 2000 (median = 5.5). Interestingly, the university presidents tenure as president at another university decreased from almost 7 years in 1990 (median = 6) to just over 3 years in 2000 (median = 0). In addition to this, of the university presidents who previously served as chief academic officer, the average time as CAO also decreased from almost 15 years in 1990 (median = 15) to 5.5 years in 2000

(median = 5). Independent sample t tests on these means find that the changes in all three of these variables were statistically significant. For the 2000 data, the average years of university president fundraising experience is reported to be over 15 years (median = 15 years), but because this question was not asked on the 1990 survey, we can't make any statements about the changes in this variable. It is interesting to note that average fundraising experience of these presidents is greater than their average tenure as president at their university. In general, the presidents report that they are very knowledgeable about the fund-raising process. In 1990, their mean rating was 4.25/5.0 and in 2000 it was 4.61/5.0, and this increase was statistically significant.

Table 2 also describes the characteristics of the universities in both 1990 and 2000. Institutionally, approximately two-thirds of the participating universities are public universities, with the remaining third being private universities. In 1990, 68 percent of the universities were public, but in the 2000 sample the percent of public universities responding to our survey decreased to only 64 percent. Similarly, the percent of private universities increased from 32 percent in 1990 to 35 percent in 2000. The 2000 study distinguished between private religious universities and private non-religious universities, with private religious universities making up 8 percent of all universities in the sample and private non-denominational forming 27 percent of the universities in the sample.

Changes in Presidential Satisfaction with Dollars Raised

Table 5 shows the percentage of university presidents who are satisfied or very satisfied with the variables of interest for both the 1990 and 2000 data.

Insert Table 5 about here

In 1990, 62 percent of the university presidents reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the amount of funds raised in the past year. This proportion of satisfied presidents increased to 73 percent in the 2000 dataset. The proportion of presidents who were dissatisfied with the amount of funds raised in the past year decreased slightly from over 14 percent in 1990 to 13 percent in 2000. Satisfaction compared to peer institutions shows a similar trend with 59 percent being satisfied or highly satisfied in 1990 and 63 percent being satisfied or highly satisfied in 2000.

The surveys also asked the university presidents about the level of detail that they prefer to be informed about fundraising at their university as well as the level of detail that they actually receive. In 1990, 61 percent of the presidents say that they prefer to have a high level of detail, and another 30 percent want a moderate level of detail. However, only 55 percent of these presidents actually reported receiving a high level of detail and 33 percent claim to receive moderate amounts of detail. In 2000, university presidents expressed similar preferences as to the level of detail that they want to be informed about fundraising. Sixty percent wanted a high level of detail and 35 percent prefer a moderate level of detail. There was a substantial difference, however, in the level of detail that the presidents actually reported receiving. Only 32 percent believe that they received a high level of detail of information about fundraising, and 57 percent of presidents claimed to receive only moderate detail.

Changes in Presidential Satisfaction with Development Program and Staff

General satisfaction with the university development programs increased from 59 percent in 1990 to 75 percent in 2000. Satisfaction with the development staff also increased slightly

from 72 percent in 1990 to 77 percent in 2000. The presidents' ratings of the expertise of their fundraising staffs increased from 3.9/5.0 to 4.35/5.0. Similarly, the professional conduct rating increased from 4.3/5.0 to 4.6/5.0, and the ratings of the external image of the staff rose from 3.9/5.0 to 4.3/5.0. The internal image of the staff improved as well with presidents' ratings going from 3.6/5.0 to 4.0/5.0. Satisfaction with the fundraising board and staff both increased from 52 percent in 1990 to 57 percent in 2000. In general, university presidents were more satisfied with their development programs and staff in 2000 than they were in 1990.

Differences between Public and Private Universities

Table 6 depicts a breakdown of the survey responses by year and by the public/private status of the university.

Insert Table 6 about here

This table indicates that there are some slight differences in the mean responses between public and private university presidents in 1990, but fewer differences in 2000. In 1990, the average president of a public university had served for approximately 5 years, while their private university counterparts served almost 8 years ($t = -3.25, p < .001$). By 2000, the gap had been closed with public presidents serving an average of 7 years and private presidents still around 8 years (not statistically significant). In 1990, the private university presidents indicated that they were more comfortable visiting prospective donors (4.7/5.0) than the public university presidents (4.4/5.0, $t = -2.32, p < .05$). However, in 2000 there was no statistically significant difference between their responses (4.6/5.0 public and 4.7/5.0 private). In 1990, public and private

university presidents rated themselves similarly in terms of their knowledge of the fund raising process (4.2/5.0 public and 4.3/5.0 private). Although presidents at both public and private universities felt that their knowledge of the fundraising process had increased from 1990 to 2000, the private university presidents rated themselves significantly higher than the public university presidents rated themselves (4.5/5.0 public and 4.8/5.0 private, $t = -2.12$, $p < .05$). On the other comfort variables as well as the university presidents' ratings of their current fundraising performance, there were no statistically significant differences between public and private universities in 1990 or 2000.

Private university presidents rated their fundraising staff higher on all variables than the public university presidents rated their fundraising staff. These differences were apparent in both 1990 and 2000, and they were often marginally significant. In terms of satisfaction with funds raised or the level of detail the presidents receive or prefer, there were no statistically significant differences between public and private universities, although the ratings of private universities were consistently higher. In 1990, private university presidents were more confident that the time they spent on fundraising was about right (2.8/5.0 public 3.0 private, $t = -2.32$, $p < .05$). In 2000, there was no statistically significant difference between public and private university presidents because private university presidents' ratings of their confidence that the time spent on fundraising is right actually decreased. In 1990, public university presidents spent over 28 hours on fundraising in a month and the private university presidents were spending 34 hours on fundraising ($t = -1.86$, $p < .10$). By 2000, the public university presidents were spending 39 hours a month on fundraising, but the private university presidents were still spending about 34 hours on fundraising. However, this difference was not statistically significant.

There were also a few significant differences between public and private university

presidents in terms of their satisfaction with various aspects of fundraising. In 1990, private university presidents were significantly more satisfied with their fundraising program (3.4/5.0 public and 3.9/5.0 private) and staff (3.7/5.0 public and 4.0/5.0 private). By 2000, there were no statistically significant differences between public and private university presidents in their ratings on fundraising program and staff.

In summary, Table 6 shows that private university presidents were generally more satisfied or comfortable with various aspects of fundraising compared to public university presidents. Private university presidents were presidents longer than the public university presidents. Their greater satisfaction with their development programs and staff might be due to the fact that they have worked with them longer and are more conformable with them and with fundraising in general. In addition, by 2000, public university presidents were spending more time on fundraising than the private university presidents. In 1990, many of these differences were statistically significant. By 2000, only a few of these differences were statistically significant. This decrease in response differences between public and private university presidents is perhaps a result of the changes in the funding environment over the last decade and the increase in competition for university funds as states have been pouring less money into their universities. Public universities must be more like private universities in terms of fundraising attention and prowess.

Satisfaction Changes of Continuing Presidents

Ninety-two universities responded to both the 1990 and 2000 surveys, and of those twenty-seven presidents reported tenures at their universities of ten or more years in 2000. Therefore, we interpolated that these presidents responded to both surveys. We divided the

ninety-two universities into a set of continuing presidents (n=27) and different presidents (n=65). Table 7 reports the changes in attitudes and satisfaction for the continuing presidents and different presidents as well as t-tests comparing the continuing presidents to the different presidents and on the changes in the continuing presidents from 1990 to 2000.

Insert Table 7 about here

Table 7 shows that there are no significant differences between the continuing presidents and the different presidents in terms of the comfort in visiting donors and soliciting gifts. The continuing presidents did exhibit a significant increase in their knowledge of the fundraising process (4.1/5.0 1990 and 4.7/5.0 2000, $t = -3.47$, $p < .01$) and their ratings of their personal fund raising performance (3.7/5.0 in 1990 and 4.7/5.0 in 2000, $t = -6.19$, $p < .01$). The different presidents showed no statistically significant increase in their knowledge of the fundraising process, but their ratings of their current performance did increase (3.8/5.0 in 1990 and 4.4/5.0 in 2000, $t = -3.75$, $p < .01$).

In their ratings of the fundraising staff, there were no statistically significant differences between the continuing presidents and the different presidents. And both sets of presidents' ratings of their staff increased significantly from 1990 to 2000. In particular, the largest increases were the continuing presidents' ratings of the expertise and professional conduct of their fundraising staff. The continuing and the different presidents also exhibited similar trends in their satisfaction with the amount of funds raised. There were no significant differences between continuing and different presidents in their satisfaction with the funds raised, and both continuing and different presidents exhibited an increase in their satisfaction rates from 1990 to

2000. The biggest difference was that the different presidents' satisfaction with the funds raised for priority projects increased more than the continuing presidents' satisfaction with funds raised for priority projects. Both the continuing presidents and different presidents indicated that they preferred to have less detail about fundraising in 2000 than in 1990, but for the different presidents this decrease was statistically significant.

When asked about the time spent on fundraising, there were again no major differences between the continuing and different presidents. Both sets of presidents increased the amount of time they spent on fundraising per month from 1990 to 2000, but the continuing presidents did not increase their hours as much as was evident in the changes made by the other presidents. Perhaps the lower amount of time spent fundraising in 1990 is the, or one of the, reasons there were increases in the presidents' satisfaction with other aspects of fundraising. In terms of general satisfaction with elements of fundraising, the continuing presidents were less satisfied with their fundraising board and volunteers than the different presidents. One noticeable difference between the continuing and different presidents is the continuing presidents' satisfaction with the fundraising program, board, and volunteers increased much more from 1990 to 2000 than did the similar ratings of the different presidents.

In summary, Table 7 shows that there were few differences between continuing presidents and different presidents in terms of their actual ratings on the surveys in 1990 and 2000 and the changes from 1990 to 2000. Although the continuing presidents' satisfaction with various aspects of fundraising did increase from 1990 to 2000, there were few instances where those satisfaction increases were not mirrored by the different presidents. The noticeable exceptions were that the continuing presidents rated their own knowledge of the fundraising process increased from 1990 to 2000 more than it did for the different presidents. The

continuing presidents also increased more in their satisfaction with the fundraising program, board, and volunteers.

Bivariate Analysis

This section of the paper examines the bivariate relationships of the more important variables in the pooled dataset. We limit this discussion to those relationships that are statistically significant Pearson correlation (unless otherwise specified, the correlations discussed are all significant at the .01 level. Due to the large number of correlations and description in the text, we have not included these tables, but they are available upon request.).

Presidential Comfort with Fundraising/Satisfaction with Development Staff

There is a high degree of correlation between a president's comfort with visiting current donors and the president's comfort with visiting prospective donors (Pearson correlation = 0.88). Another strong correlation exists between a president's comfort in soliciting major gifts from individuals and from corporations (0.83). In fact, all the variables related to a president's comfort with visiting current and prospective donors and soliciting major gifts are correlated (all above .65). However, these variables are not correlated with the overall satisfaction variables.

The four ratings of fundraising staff—expertise, professional conduct, external image, and internal image—are also correlated with each other (all .60 and higher). These staff rating variables are also correlated with the satisfaction variables. For instance, they are all correlated with overall satisfaction with the development program (all .50 and higher) as well as general satisfaction with the staff (all .55 or higher). The ratings of the staff are also correlated with the president's satisfaction with the fundraising board (all .37 and higher) and fundraising volunteers

(all .37 and higher). A weaker correlation is evidenced between the staff rating variables and a president's perception of her own performance at fundraising (all .35 and higher).

Fundraising Knowledge, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction

A weak correlation exists between a president's knowledge of the fundraising process and his comfort in soliciting individuals for major gifts (.18). Stronger correlations are evident between a president's evaluation of his own performance as a fundraiser and the amount of funds raised in the past year (.56), the amount of funds raised for priority projects (.54) and non-priority projects (.45), and the amount of funds raised compared to peer institutions (.46). A president's evaluation of her personal performance as a fundraiser is also strongly correlated with all of the main satisfaction variables—overall satisfaction with the development program (.42), satisfaction with fundraising staff (.35), fundraising board (.31), and fundraising volunteers (.29).

Information Sharing and Satisfaction

The level of detail a president is informed about fundraising and the president's rating of the expertise of the staff are correlated (.33). The level of detail received is also highly correlated with the president's evaluation of her own performance (.31). In fact, the level of detail a president is informed about fundraising is strongly correlated with several of the main satisfaction variables, such as satisfaction with the total amount of funds raised in the past year (.22), satisfaction compared to peer institutions (.20), overall satisfaction with the fundraising program (.35), and satisfaction with the fundraising staff (.33), board (.22), and volunteers (.25).

Time Spent Fundraising and Satisfaction

A president's rating of her own performance as a fundraiser is strongly correlated with several other variables. For instance, performance is highly correlated with the variable rating whether the amount of time a president spends on fundraising is right (.27). The evaluation of time spent on fundraising is also weakly correlated with the president's satisfaction with the total amount of dollars raised (.21), satisfaction with the fundraising staff (.27), satisfaction with the fundraising program overall (.29), satisfaction with the fundraising board (.20), and satisfaction with the fundraising volunteers (.24).

The general satisfaction variables are also correlated with each other. For instance, overall satisfaction is correlated with the length of time as president (.18), expertise of the fundraising staff (.69), professional conduct of fundraising staff (.55), satisfaction with funds raised last year (.63), satisfaction compared to peer institutions (.62), and satisfaction with the fundraising board (.50), volunteers (.50), and staff (.82).

Multivariate Analysis

The multivariate analysis of this paper consists of logistic regressions. Ordinary least squares regression would be inappropriate in this context because the dependent variables are not continuous. The researchers collapsed the main satisfaction variables from the original five point satisfaction scale into a dichotomous variable where responses of satisfied and very satisfied were both coded together, and responses of neutral, dissatisfied and very dissatisfied were coded together. Logistic regression is the most appropriate way to analyze these collapsed, dichotomous satisfaction variables (see, for example, Kennedy, 1981).

Two main models comprise the multivariate analysis of fundraising satisfaction. The

first model replicates the work done by Rooney, et. al. (2002). Because a small sample size precluded running a regression with all the variables of interest, Rooney, et. al. divided their analysis up into six different groupings of variables. This replication follows these same groupings. For each of the six groupings, the model was run five times, each time using a different measure of satisfaction as the dependent variable—overall satisfaction with the fundraising program, satisfaction with fundraising staff, satisfaction with fundraising board, satisfaction with fundraising volunteers, satisfaction with dollars raised in the past year, and satisfaction with dollars raised compared to peer institutions. The second model uses only overall satisfaction with the fundraising program as the dependent variable, and it incorporates several of the significant variables from the previous analysis into one regression to determine if similar trends exist when the variables are combined.

Both sets of regression models were also run using different sub-samples of the data. The first time the regressions were run using the pooled dataset (n=290). The second time, the regressions were run separately for public (n=196) and private universities (n=93). Finally, the third sub-sample consisted of the trends from 1990 to 2000 which were calculated by subtracting the presidents' answers in 2000 from their answers in 1990. This was only done for those universities that appeared in both samples (n=92). This section of the paper reports the results of all these regressions.

Fundraising Knowledge, Effectiveness, and Satisfaction

The first grouping of variables looks at the effect of a university president's fundraising knowledge and perceived fundraising effectiveness on the president's satisfaction with fundraising at his/her institution. We anticipate that the higher the president rates himself/herself

on knowledge of fundraising, and the higher he/she rates his/her own performance in fundraising, the higher that president will rate his/her satisfaction with the overall fundraising program.

Table 8 shows the results of this set of regressions.

Insert Table 8 about here

The researchers ran this grouping of variables five times—once for each of the main satisfaction dependent variables. For all five measures of satisfaction, there was a significant, positive effect on the president's assessment of his/her own fundraising performance ($p < .01$). The president's knowledge of the fundraising process was slightly significant ($p < .10$) when run with satisfaction compared to peer institutions as the dependent variable. However, president's knowledge of fundraising wasn't statistically significant when run with any of the other satisfaction variables.

These results suggest that the greater a president's satisfaction with his/her own performance, and to a tiny degree his/her knowledge of the fundraising process, the more likely that the president will be satisfied with the fundraising program. These results were consistent with the results reported by Rooney, et. al. (2002).

When these same regressions were run separately for public and private universities, the results were similar to that of the pooled data, but not as strong for private universities. For all five measures of satisfaction, the public university presidents' ratings of their own fundraising performance had a significant positive effect on their satisfaction (all $p < .01$, except board $p < .05$). A president's knowledge of the fundraising process was slightly significant in the regression with satisfaction compared to peers ($p < .10$) but not with any of the other satisfaction variables. For private universities, a president's rating of his/her own performance was only marginally

significant in the regressions using overall satisfaction, satisfaction with staff, satisfaction with volunteers and satisfaction compared to peer institutions (all $p < .05$), slightly significant with satisfaction with board ($p < .10$), and highly significant with satisfaction with dollars raised ($p < .01$). This indicates that a president's rating of his or her own performance seems to be less important for private universities, but not much.

When these same regressions were run using the satisfaction trends as the dependent variables, neither a president's rating of his/her own performance nor his/her knowledge of the fundraising process was significant in any of the regressions.

Fundraising Experience and Satisfaction

The second grouping of variables explores the effect of a university president's experience on satisfaction with fundraising. Experience is measured as the length (in years) of a president's tenure as president at the university. (In the study by Rooney, et. al. (2002), experience was also measuring using a president's number of years of fundraising experience. However, because this question was not asked on the 1990 survey, this variable is omitted from the present analysis.) Table 9 shows the results of this set of regressions.

Insert Table 9 about here

As with the previous set of variables, this variable set was run against the five different satisfaction variables. Years of presidency at the university was significant with most of the satisfaction variables—satisfaction with dollars raised ($p < .10$), satisfaction compared to peer institutions ($p < .10$), satisfaction with staff and volunteers (both $p < .05$), and overall satisfaction ($p < .01$). When ran with satisfaction with board as the dependent variable, the number of years as president was not statistically significant. These results suggest that the longer a president's

tenure at the university, the more likely the president will be satisfied with the fundraising program and other aspects of fundraising, probably because of the increased fundraising experience. These results also corroborate the results of Rooney, et. al. (2002).

These regressions were also run separately for public and private universities, which evidenced similar, though not as strong, results. For the public universities, years as president was significant when run against satisfaction with overall satisfaction and satisfaction with volunteers (both $p < .05$). For private universities, years as president was significant when run against overall satisfaction, satisfaction compared to peer institutions (both $p < .05$) and satisfaction with volunteers ($p < .01$).

When this set of regressions was run using the trend satisfaction dependent variables, years as president was significant when run against satisfaction with board ($P < .05$) and satisfaction with volunteers ($p < .01$), but not with any of the other satisfaction variables.

Time Spent Fundraising and Satisfaction

The amount of time that university presidents spend fundraising formed the third set of variables. The time spent was measured using two variables—the actual hours spent on fundraising and the years as president at the university. Again, the 2002 study used years of experience with fundraising as an additional variable, but that variable had to be omitted here because it was not in the 1990 data. It is anticipated that the more time the president puts into fundraising, the more satisfied that president will be. Table 10 shows the results of this set of regressions.

Insert Table 10 about here

After running this group of variables with the five dependent variables, it was obvious

that the connection between time spent and satisfaction was not strong. Hours spent on fundraising had a small, significant effect on the probability that the president will be satisfied with the fundraising staff and satisfied with the dollars raised in the past year (both with $p < .10$). Rooney et al. (2000) found that hours spent on fundraising was only a significant predictor of overall satisfaction but not of the other satisfaction variables. The number of years as president was a stronger predictor of satisfaction. It was strongly significant when run with overall satisfaction as the dependent variable ($p < .01$) and slightly significant when run with satisfaction with staff, satisfaction with volunteers, and satisfaction compared to peer institutions ($p < .10$). This suggests that the amount of time that a president spends on fundraising has a small influence on satisfaction, but not nearly as much of an effect as the number of years of the presidency. Perhaps university presidents with longer tenure in their jobs put in more quality fundraising hours than quantity fundraising hours.

The comparisons between public and private universities yield results similar to those produced by the regressions using the pooled data. For public universities, years as president was a statistically significant predictor of overall satisfaction ($p < .10$). Hours spent on fundraising was a less important predictor for public universities and was only significant for overall satisfaction, satisfaction with staff, satisfaction with volunteers (all $p < .10$). For private universities, years as president was a statistically significant predictor for overall satisfaction, satisfaction compared to peers (both $p < .05$), and with satisfaction with volunteers ($p < .10$). For private universities, hours spent on fundraising was not a significant predictor of any of the satisfaction variables. These results imply that years as president is a more important predictor for private universities and that hours spent fundraising is more important for public universities than it is for private universities.

When the satisfaction trend dependent variables were used in these regressions, a president's number of years as president was a statistically significant predictor of satisfaction with board and volunteers (both $p < .05$). The number of hours spent fundraising was not statistically significant in any of these regressions.

Comfort with Fundraising and Satisfaction

The fourth grouping of variables seeks to examine the relationship between several of the 'comfort' with fundraising variables and satisfaction. Specifically, we use a president's comfort with visiting prospective donors and his/her comfort with soliciting major gifts from individuals. Table 11 shows the results of this set of regressions.

Insert Table 11 about here

After running the logistic regressions, the researchers found that a president's comfort in visiting prospective donors was never statistically significant with any of the satisfaction dependent variables. Comfort in soliciting major gifts from individuals fared a little better. It was slightly significant ($p < .10$) in predicting satisfaction with staff and in predicting satisfaction compared to peer institutions ($p < .05$). These results seem to indicate that a president's comfort level with some of the major tasks of fundraising—visiting prospective donors and soliciting major gifts—has very little to do with the president's satisfaction with fundraising. Rooney et.al. (2000) found that none of the comfort variables was a statistically significant predictor of satisfaction.

For public university presidents, the comfort with visiting donors was a statistically significant predictor of dollars raised in the last year ($p < .05$). Comfort in soliciting major gifts was a statistically significant predictor of overall satisfaction ($p < .10$) and satisfaction with dollars raised in the past year ($p < .05$). For private universities, comfort with visiting donors was

a slightly significant predictor of satisfaction with the board ($p < .10$), and comfort in soliciting major gifts was a significant predictor of satisfaction with the board ($p < .10$) and satisfaction compared to peers ($p < .05$). These results indicate that comfort with visiting donors or soliciting major gifts are minor predictors of satisfaction.

When these regressions were run using the trend dependent variables, comfort in soliciting major gifts was a significant predictor of overall satisfaction ($p < .05$), but not with any other satisfaction variable.

Information Sharing and Satisfaction

The researchers also wanted to determine if the level of detail that a president prefers to receive about fundraising was a good predictor of satisfaction. Therefore, level of detail preferred formed the next grouping of variables. Table 12 presents the results of these regressions.

Insert Table 12 about here

As seen in Table 12, the results of the logistic regressions indicated that level of detail preferred was never a significant predictor of presidential satisfaction. This corroborates the findings of Rooney et. al. (2002). This was also true in the public/private regressions. However, when the trend dependent variables were used, the level of detail preferred was a significant predictor of satisfaction compared to peer institutions, but in the opposite direction (coefficient = -0.71, $p < .05$).

Satisfaction with the Development Staff and Program

The final grouping of variables seeks to examine if the president's perceptions of the

fundraising staff were good indicators of overall satisfaction with the staff. Because of a high level of correlation between the different measures of a president's perceptions of the staff (internal image, external image, etc), the researchers only use the perceived expertise of the staff as an independent variable in the regression. Table 13 shows the results of this set of regressions.

Insert Table 13 about here

And this variable was indeed a significant positive predictor of a president's satisfaction with the staff ($p < .01$), as it also was for Rooney et.al. (2002). This suggests that the university president's valuation of his/her staff's expertise and competency is an important predictor of presidential satisfaction. Expertise of staff was also a highly significant predictor of satisfaction with staff ($p < .01$) for both private and public universities. This was also true for the trends dependent variable.

Predictors of Overall Regression

In addition to replicating the analysis done in Rooney, et. al. (2002), this paper also looks at a model for predicting a president's overall satisfaction because the sample size of the pooled data allowed for such an analysis. The independent variables used in this regression were a president's current performance as a fundraiser, years as president, the hours spent on fundraising, the expertise of the staff, and the four comfort variables. Because of the high level of correlation among the four comfort variables, the regression was run four separate times, including only one of the comfort variables in each regression. Table 14 shows the results of these regressions.

Insert Table 14 about here

The results of all four logistic regressions indicated that a president's own performance and the expertise of the staff are good predictors of overall presidential satisfaction with fundraising. In all four regressions, both of these variables were significant at the $p < .01$ level. The other variables, including the comfort variables, were never statistically significant.

These regressions were also run separately to compare public and private universities, but the results were slightly different. For both public and private universities, expertise with staff was highly significant ($p < .01$). However, the president's rating of his/her own performance was only significant for public universities (all $p < .01$). For private universities, own performance was never significant, but years as president was slightly significant ($p < .10$). This implies that how a university president feels about his/her own performance is more important for public university presidents than for private university presidents.

When using a trend dependent variable of overall satisfaction, the results were again slightly different. Expertise of staff was still important ($p < .01$) as well as own performance ($p < .05$), but this time hours spent on fundraising was also slightly significant ($p < .10$).

The second model was run using the independent variables of a president's years as president, the hours spent on fundraising, the expertise of the staff, and comfort soliciting major gifts. The dependent variable was still overall satisfaction. Then the regression was run three more times using one each of three satisfaction variables (dollars raised, priority projects and compared to peers) as an additional independent variable. Table 15 shows the results of these regressions.

Insert Table 15 about here

As seen in Table 15, years as president was still a significant predictor of overall satisfaction. And each of the three satisfaction variables were highly significant predictors of

overall satisfaction ($p < .01$). When satisfaction compared to peer institutions was used as an independent variable, then the president's knowledge of fundraising was slightly significant as well ($p < .10$).

These regressions were also run to compare public and private universities, and the results changed somewhat. For public universities, years as president was only slightly significant ($p < .10$) when satisfaction with priority projects was used as an independent variable. Comfort with soliciting major gifts was also significant when there was no satisfaction variable in the equation as well as when satisfaction compared to peers was entered in (both $p < .10$). Knowledge of fundraising was a marginally significant predictor when no satisfaction variable was in the equation ($p < .05$). For private universities, years as president was more important and was a significant predictor when there was no satisfaction variable in the equation and when satisfaction with priority projects was entered in (both $p < .05$), and slightly significant with funds raised in past year ($p < .10$). All three satisfaction variables were still highly significant ($p < .01$) for both public and private universities.

When the trend form of overall satisfaction was used as the dependent variable, years as president was never significant. Comfort with soliciting major gifts was slightly important ($p < .10$ for all three satisfaction variables), and all three satisfaction variables were significant (priority $p < .05$, dollars raised and peers $p < .01$).

The results of these regressions seem to indicate that the most important indicators of a president's satisfaction are the president's evaluation of his/her own performance, the number of years as president, and his/her evaluation of the expertise of the fundraising staff. They also indicate that for private university presidents, years as president is a more important predictor than the president's rating of his/her own performance. And for public universities the opposite

is true. In addition, the hours spent on fundraising is an important predictor of overall satisfaction for public universities.

Discussion

The increasing costs of higher education and the decreasing willingness of taxpayers to support it have amplified the importance of fundraising in the modern university. The (dis)satisfaction of the university president with his/her development program can have profound ramifications for the success of the program and the careers of the development professionals. This paper addresses a gaping hole in the academic and practitioner knowledge base: what makes presidents satisfied and/or dissatisfied with their institution's development efforts and how do they evaluate the performance of the development program. The findings of this research have implications for university boards, presidents and vice presidents of development. First of all, it is important to note that fourteen percent of university presidents are dissatisfied with amount of funds raised, nineteen percent are dissatisfied compared to their peer institutions, and fifteen percent are dissatisfied with their fundraising staff. These dissatisfactions are possibly a source of turnover, change and possible disengagement of university presidents and their development staff. University boards should be aware of these dissatisfactions and be concerned with remedying them.

Interestingly, the average university president's tenure has increased from less than six years in 1990 to more than seven years at the university in 2000. Tenure as president at another university has decreased from less than seven years to just over three years. University presidents on average have more than fifteen years of fundraising experience, which implies that they devote considerable energy to fundraising before becoming president of the university.

These results taken together imply that current university presidents are younger, newer and that they have a great deal more fundraising experience than they have in the past. This implies that deans and provosts are more engaged in fundraising as well, which could be another change that occurred during the last ten years.

The increase in university presidents' ratings of their personal knowledge of fundraising from 1990 to 2000 reflects the long experience and the emphasis on fundraising at different university positions. Presidents probably have better understanding of fundraising expectations and how to set ambitious fundraising goals as evidenced by the increase in satisfaction with the amount of funds raised from sixty-two percent in 1990 to seventy-three percent in 2000. Universities might be faring better at fundraising despite the competition for funds.

The increase in satisfaction with the fundraising staff indicated that these staff are probably more professionalized than they were in the past. Staff members need to take special care to make sure that the university president is involved in fundraising, informed about fundraising issues and is pleased with staff efforts. The president's rating of the expertise of the fundraising staff was an important predictor of satisfaction with fundraising at the university.

In general, there were few differences between public and private universities, especially in 2000. Private university presidents tend to be somewhat more satisfied with various aspects of fundraising. For private university presidents, years as president is a more important predictor of overall satisfaction than the president's rating of his/her own performance. And for public universities the opposite is true. In addition, the hours spent on fundraising is an important predictor of overall satisfaction for public universities. Public university presidents were putting in far more hours per month fundraising in 2000 than they were in 1990, perhaps reflecting a structural shift in funding to increased emphasis on securing private philanthropy in public

universities.

Overall, the most important predictors of overall satisfaction are the president's rating of his/her own performance, number of years as president of the current university, and the expertise of the staff.

References

- AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy (2001). Giving USA 2001. M. Brown (ed.), Indianapolis, IN: AAFRC Trust.
- Bouse, G. (2001). Factors Related to Levels of Presidential Satisfaction with Fund Raising at Selected Colleges and Universities. MA Thesis. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Brainard, J. (1999, August 6). House appropriations plan would reduce budget for NSF. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 35.
- Brittingham B. E. and Pezzullo, T. R. (1990). The campus green: Fundraising in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1, Washington D.C.: George Washington University.
- Cook, W. Bruce (1997). Fund raising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty. *Journal of Higher Education* 68(1): 53-87.
- Cote, L. S. (1985). The relative importance of presidential roles. *Journal of Higher Education* 56(6): 665-676.
- DeLoughry, T. J. (1991, January 16). New Congress plans to ask colleges tough questions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 1.
- Dillman, D.A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.
- Duronio, M. A. and Tempel, E. R. (1996). Fund raisers: Their careers, stories, concerns, and accomplishments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Elton, L. (1995). Enterprise in higher education: issues in evaluation. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 49: 146-61.
- Fisher, J. L. & Koch, J. V. (1996). The Presidency. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Flawn, P. T. (1990). A Primer for University Presidents: Managing the Modern University. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gaither, G. H. (1994). Measuring up: The promises and pitfalls of performance indicators in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 5, pp. 1-125.

- Gamley, Susan (1999). Colleges start fund-raising campaigns or increase goals for them. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 46(15): A41.
- Greenwood, J. D. and Ross, M. (1996). So you want to be a college president. *Educational Record* 77(2-3): 26-27.
- Healy, P. (1999, August 6). Growth in state spending on colleges is likely to slow down, report says. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. 38.
- Heppner, M. J. & Johnston, J. A. (1994). Evaluation elements of career planning centers: Eight critical issues. *Journal of Career Development*, 21(2): 175-183.
- Kennedy, P. (1981). *A Guide to Econometrics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lilly, E. R. (1987). The American college president: The changing roles. *Planning and Changing* 18(1): 3-15.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- McLaughlin, Judith Block (1996). The perilous presidency. *Educational Record*, 77(2-3): 12-17.
- Mathis, H. R. (1998). *Leadership strategies of effective presidents in fundraising programs at small, private colleges*. New York: The Union Institute.
- Mercer, Joye. (1998, May 15). Johns Hopkins U. raises goal of fund-raising campaign to \$1.2-billion. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A44.
- Miller, M. F. (1997). *An analysis of selected public community college foundations in Michigan*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
- New York Times (2001, July 15). Public universities and private money. Available at nytimes.com.
- Nicklin, Julie L. (1992, September 30). U. of Michigan's \$1-billion capital campaign is biggest ever for a public university. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A27.
- Nicklin, Julie L. (1994, May 18). Tough fight for donations. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A31.

Penney, Sherry H. (1996). 5 challenges for academic leaders in the 21st century. *Educational Record* 77(19-23).

Pulley, John L. (2001, May 4). College fund raising reached record \$23.2-Billion in 1999-2000. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A28-A30.

Pulley, John L. (2002, March 29). Crumbling support for colleges. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A28-A29.

Roney, K. F. (1993). Private fund-raising in Alabama two-year colleges. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL.

Rooney, P., Bouse, G., and Tempel, E. (2002). Presidential satisfaction with development programs in research and doctoral universities. *The CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 3(2): 133-148.

Slinker, J. M. (1988). The role of the college or university president in advancement activities. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.

Smiles, Robin V. (2002). Howard launches \$250 million fund-raising campaign. *Black Issues in Higher Education* 19(2): 16-17.

Stretcher, G. D. (1989). An analysis of perceptions of selected presidents of public two-year colleges regarding job satisfaction factors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University, TX.

Strosnider, Kim. (1997, March 14). A public-college president focuses on raising funds from private sources. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A31.

Terry, D. G. (1996). Videoconference examines changing role of today's college president. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13(19): 14-15.

Volkwein, J. F. & Parmley, K. (2000). Comparing administrative satisfaction in public and private universities. *Research in Higher Education*, 41(1): 95-116.

Wergin, J. F. & Braskamp, L. A. (1987). Evaluating administrative services and programs. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 56: 3-14.

Worth, M. J. (1993). Educational Fundraising. Phoenix: American Council on Education and the Oryx Press.

Worthen, B. R. & Sanders, J. R. (1987). Educational evaluation. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman, Inc.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Pooled Data (n=290)			
Variables	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Experience			
Years president at current university	6.48	5	5.90
Years president elsewhere	4.49	3	5.14
Years worked as CAO	11.64	10.00	7.86
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising			
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	4.72	5	0.93
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	4.55	5	0.96
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	4.46	5	0.94
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	4.49	5	0.92
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	4.41	4	0.70
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	4.10	4	0.85
Ratings of fundraising staff			
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	4.07	4	0.90
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	4.44	5	0.78
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	4.07	4	0.89
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	3.75	4	1.00
Satisfaction with funds raised			
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	3.88	4	1.13
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	3.81	4	1.02
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	3.80	4	0.96
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	3.78	4	1.20
Level of detail about fund raising information			
To what level of detail are you informed about FR at your institution (1-5)	4.46	5	0.72
To what level of detail do prefer to be informed about FR? (1-5)	4.38	4	0.68
Time spent on fund raising			
Is the time you spend on FR/month about right? (1-5)	2.83	3	0.72
How does your FR staff view the time you spend on FR/month? (1-5)	2.78	3	0.70
In a typical month, how many hours do you spend on FR (# hours)	57.83	30	152.47
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers			
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	3.69	4	1.05
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	3.86	4	0.94
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	3.67	4	1.05
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	3.59	4	0.99

Table 2: Institutional Characteristics of Universities in Samples

	1990 Data (n=166)	2000 Data (n=124)	Pooled Data (n=290)
Percent Public	68%	64%	68%
Percent Private	32%	35%	32%
Non-Denominational		27%	
Religiously Affiliated		8%	
No answer		1%	
Total	100%	100%	100%

Table 3: Satisfaction Rates for Pooled Data (n =290)		
Variables	Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising		
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	93%	6%
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	91%	5%
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	88%	5%
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	88%	4%
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	89%	1%
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	76%	3%
Ratings of fundraising staff		
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	76%	5%
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	88%	2%
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	74%	5%
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	59%	10%
Satisfaction with funds raised		
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	67%	14%
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	65%	10%
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	62%	7%
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	61%	19%
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers		
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	66%	15%
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	74%	11%
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	54%	12%
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	54%	13%

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on 1990 and 2000 Data

Variables	1990 (n=166)			2000 (n=124)			T Test on 1990 and 2000 means
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	
Experience							
Years president at current university	5.87	4.5	4.93	7.31	5.5	6.93	-2.07**
Years president elsewhere	6.69	6	3.95	3.34	0	5.33	4.50***
Years worked as CAO	14.90	15	7.27	5.55	5	4.67	11.97***
Years of experience with university fundraising (FR)				15.40	15	7.17	
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising							
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	4.73	5	0.80	4.69	5	1.08	0.38
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	4.51	5	0.87	4.61	5	1.06	-0.94
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	4.40	5	0.88	4.54	5	1.01	-1.23
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	4.47	5	0.84	4.52	5	1.02	-0.50
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	4.25	4	0.68	4.61	5	0.67	-4.47***
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	3.82	4	0.79	4.48	5	0.79	-6.95***
Ratings of fundraising staff							
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	3.93	4	0.94	4.25	4	0.80	-3.01***
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	4.30	5	0.86	4.62	5	0.63	-3.63***
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	3.89	4	0.89	4.30	4	0.85	-3.93***
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	3.55	4	0.98	4.01	4	0.96	-3.96***
Satisfaction with funds raised							
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	3.68	4	1.10	4.15	4	1.12	-3.59***
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	3.58	4	0.97	4.12	4	1.02	-4.57***
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	3.64	4	0.93	4.00	4	0.95	-3.17***
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	3.64	4	1.15	3.97	4	1.25	-2.29**
Level of detail about fund raising information							
To what level of detail are you informed about FR at your institution (1-5)	4.41	5	0.78	4.53	5	0.63	-1.44
To what level of detail do prefer to be informed about FR? (1-5)	4.52	5	0.68	4.19	4	0.65	4.12***
Time spent on fund raising							
Is the time you spend on FR/month about right? (1-5)	2.86	3	0.80	2.81	3	0.59	0.58
How does your FR staff view the time you spend on FR/month? (1-5)	2.77	3	0.70	2.80	3	0.71	-0.35
In a typical month, how many hours do you spend on FR (# hours)	30.47	30	19.02	37.30	30	30.23	-2.98***
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers							
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	3.59	4	1.08	3.82	4	1.00	-1.84*
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	3.83	4	0.95	3.90	4	0.91	-0.65
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	3.55	4	1.05	3.83	4	1.04	-2.26**
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	3.55	4	1.08	3.65	4	0.86	-0.95

* = significant at .10 level
 ** = significant at .05 level
 *** = significant at .01 level

Table 5: Percent Satisfied or Very Satisfied		
Variables	1990 (n=166)	2000 (n=124)
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising		
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	95%	90%
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	92%	90%
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	87%	89%
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	89%	87%
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	87%	91%
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	70%	85%
Ratings of fundraising staff		
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	71%	82%
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	84%	92%
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	69%	80%
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	52%	69%
Satisfaction with funds raised		
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	62%	73%
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	58%	73%
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	60%	65%
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	59%	64%
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers		
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	59%	75%
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	72%	77%
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	52%	57%
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	52%	57%

Table 6: Comparison of Public and Private Universities

Variables	1990 (n=166)			2000 (n=124)			ANOVA
	Public Mean (n=113)	Private Mean (n=53)	T Test	Public Mean (n=83)	Private Mean (n=40)	T Test	F Test
Experience							
Years president at current university	4.95	7.83	-3.25***	7.04	8.03	-0.74	4.80***
Years president elsewhere	7.16	5.72	1.28	3.22	3.69	-0.42	5.87***
Years worked as CAO	15.13	14.38	0.59	5.28	6.33	-0.67	37.16***
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising							
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	4.70	4.80	-0.79	4.63	4.85	-1.08	0.73
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	4.41	4.70	-2.32**	4.57	4.73	-0.77	1.63
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	4.35	4.50	-1.01	4.46	4.73	-1.63	1.60
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	4.42	4.57	-1.12	4.46	4.68	-1.11	0.88
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	4.21	4.34	-1.16	4.53	4.80	-2.12**	8.97***
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	3.77	3.93	-1.19	4.46	4.53	-0.44	16.81***
Ratings of fundraising staff							
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	3.80	4.20	-2.61**	4.16	4.43	-1.75*	5.68***
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	4.22	4.46	-1.74*	4.57	4.73	-1.30	5.32***
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	3.81	4.05	-1.80*	4.20	4.48	-1.67*	6.87***
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	3.50	3.66	-1.02	3.89	4.25	-1.96*	6.89***
Satisfaction with funds raised							
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	3.62	3.80	-1.03	4.13	4.18	-0.20	4.32***
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	3.57	3.61	-0.22	4.04	4.28	-1.13	7.31***
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	3.62	3.69	-0.39	3.98	4.05	-0.40	3.36**
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	3.61	3.71	-0.57	3.92	4.05	-0.56	1.81
Level of detail about fund raising information							
To what level of detail are you informed about FR at your institution (1-5)	4.35	4.52	-1.28	4.49	4.63	-1.08	1.74
To what level of detail do prefer to be informed about FR? (1-5)	4.56	4.43	1.13	4.22	4.15	0.53	6.06***
Time spent on fund raising							
Is the time you spend on FR/month about right? (1-5)	2.75	3.05	-2.32**	2.77	2.88	-0.91	1.67
How does your FR staff view the time you spend on FR/month? (1-5)	2.73	2.73	-0.88	2.75	2.90	-1.41	0.77
In a typical month, how many hours do you spend on FR (# hours)	28.51	34.49	-1.86*	39.05	34.42	0.77	3.89***
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers							
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	3.44	3.89	-2.60**	3.76	3.95	-0.98	3.50**
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	3.72	4.05	-2.35**	3.87	3.98	-0.61	1.54
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	3.54	3.57	-0.21	3.94	3.60	1.70*	2.64*
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	3.64	3.36	1.61	3.72	3.50	1.35	1.86

* = significant at .10 level
 ** = significant at .05 level
 *** = significant at .01 level

Variables	1990			2000			Paired T Test 1990 to 2000 Continuing Presidents	Paired T Test 1990 to 2000 Different Presidents
	Continuing Presidents (n=27)	Different Presidents (n=65)	T Test	Continuing Presidents (n=27)	Different Presidents (n=65)	T Test		
Comfort, knowledge & performance with fundraising								
Comfort with visiting current donors (1-5)	4.78	4.71	-0.41	4.74	4.69	-0.20	0.16	0.14
Comfort with visiting prospective donors (1-5)	4.56	4.49	-0.35	4.67	4.62	-0.21	-0.53	-1.13
Comfort with soliciting individuals for major gifts (1-5)	4.52	4.28	-1.49	4.63	4.49	-0.58	-0.59	-1.65
Comfort with soliciting corporations for major gifts (1-5)	4.63	4.43	-1.42	4.48	4.51	0.11	0.60	-0.68
Knowledge of fund raising process (1-5)	4.11	4.37	1.79*	4.70	4.57	-0.86	-3.47***	-1.63
Current personal fund raising performance (1-5)	3.70	3.88	1.05	4.67	4.43	-1.26	-6.19***	-3.75***
Ratings of fundraising staff								
How rate the expertise of the FR staff (1-5)	3.67	3.97	1.44	4.33	4.28	-0.29	-3.34***	2.14**
How rate the professional conduct of the FR staff (1-5)	4.11	4.31	0.97	4.74	4.57	-1.17	-3.25***	-2.07**
How rate the external image of FR staff (1-5)	3.74	3.88	0.68	4.30	4.35	0.29	-2.85***	-3.48***
How rate the internal image of FR staff (1-5)	3.26	3.54	1.28	4.00	4.11	0.48	-2.92***	-3.71***
Satisfaction with funds raised								
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year (1-5)	3.41	3.72	1.25	4.15	4.29	0.59	-3.06***	-3.35***
How satisfied with meeting goals for priority projects (1-5)	3.70	3.52	-0.99	4.19	4.20	0.07	-1.87*	-4.12***
How satisfied with meeting goals for nonpriority projects (1-5)	3.56	3.70	0.75	4.07	4.02	-0.24	-2.40**	-2.06**
How satisfied with total amount of funds raised in past year vs. peer institutions (1-5)	3.44	3.58	0.61	4.04	4.15	0.44	-2.41**	-3.02***
Level of detail about fund raising information								
To what level of detail are you informed about FR at your institution (1-5)	4.56	4.45	-0.80	4.56	4.49	-0.42	0.00	-0.40
To what level of detail do prefer to be informed about FR? (1-5)	4.48	4.52	0.28	4.30	4.09	-1.35	1.22	4.19***
Time spent on fund raising								
Is the time you spend on FR/month about right? (1-5)	2.89	2.91	0.10	3.00	2.80	-1.41	-0.50	0.88
How does your FR staff view the time you spend on FR/month? (1-5)	2.96	2.63	-2.05**	2.85	2.83	-0.12	0.55	-1.56
In a typical month, how many hours do you spend on FR (# hours)	34.26	27.94	-1.41	43.00	37.59	-0.66	-1.08	-2.04**
Satisfaction with fund raising program, staff, board & volunteers								
How satisfied are you with the FR program? (1-5)	3.41	3.65	0.98	3.96	3.91	-0.25	-1.86*	-1.62
How satisfied are you with the FR staff? (1-5)	3.67	3.85	0.80	4.04	4.00	-0.18	-1.24	-1.08
How satisfied are you with the FR board? (1-5)	3.38	3.80	1.83*	3.85	4.02	0.72	-1.92*	-1.42
How satisfied are you with the FR volunteers? (1-5)	3.22	3.72	2.24**	3.93	3.74	-0.97	-3.32***	-0.09

* = significant at .10 level
** = significant at .05 level
*** = significant at .01 level

t

Table 8: Fundraising Knowledge, Effectiveness and Satisfaction																		
Independent Variables	Dependent Variables																	
	Overall Satisfaction			Satisfaction with Staff			Satisfaction with Board			Satisfaction with Volunteers			Satisfaction with Dollars Raised			Satisfaction Compared to Peers		
	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald
Pooled Data (n=290)																		
Knowledge of fund raising process	-0.05	0.52	0.010	0.39	0.49	0.620	0.60	0.49	1.460	0.01	0.48	0.00	-0.59	0.53	1.270	-0.92	0.53	3.08*
Current performance as fundraiser	2.04	0.36	31.84***	1.44	0.34	17.56***	0.70	0.33	4.46**	0.91	0.33	7.44***	2.12	0.36	34.04***	1.81	0.37	24.37***
Intercept	-2.84	0.95	9.03***	-2.16	0.89	5.83**	-2.18	0.92	5.63**	-1.49	0.88	2.86*	-1.79	0.91	3.87**	-0.91	0.90	1.030
Public Universities (n=196)																		
Knowledge of fund raising process	-0.19	0.30	0.41	0.07	0.29	0.07	0.25	0.26	0.89	-0.16	0.26	0.35	-0.36	0.31	1.38	-0.55	0.29	3.53*
Current performance as fundraiser	1.47	0.28	27.00***	1.02	0.26	15.76***	0.45	0.22	4.10**	0.64	0.23	7.99***	1.61	0.30	29.46***	1.21	0.26	21.05***
Intercept	-4.47	1.21	13.75***	-3.42	1.15	8.79***	-2.63	1.02	6.70**	-1.49	0.99	2.24	-4.06	1.24	10.76***	-1.92	1.09	3.07*
Private Universities (n=93)																		
Knowledge of fund raising process	-0.29	0.48	0.36	-0.76	0.55	1.95	-0.08	0.45	0.03	0.02	0.47	0.00	-0.54	0.54	0.99	0.16	0.47	0.11
Current performance as fundraiser	0.81	0.38	4.43**	1.08	0.43	6.27**	0.63	0.37	2.91*	0.79	0.40	3.93**	1.69	0.49	11.78***	0.91	0.40	5.16**
Intercept	-1.04	1.63	0.41	0.56	1.81	0.10	-2.10	1.52	1.91	-3.75	1.64	5.21**	-3.34	2.15	2.41	-3.83	1.90	4.06**
Trend Data (n=92)																		
Knowledge of fund raising process	0.41	0.40	1.06	-0.12	0.37	0.10	0.38	0.36	1.11	0.15	0.36	0.18	0.60	0.47	1.62	0.26	0.38	0.45
Current performance as fundraiser	0.46	0.35	1.72	0.40	0.34	1.44	-0.15	0.32	0.21	0.18	0.32	0.31	0.44	0.43	1.07	0.34	0.35	0.96
Intercept	0.86	0.28	9.49***	0.88	0.27	10.55***	1.05	0.29	13.40***	0.83	0.27	9.36***	1.61	0.34	22.40***	0.98	0.28	12.23***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 9: Fundraising Experience and Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables																	
	Overall Satisfaction			Satisfaction with Staff			Satisfaction with Board			Satisfaction with Volunteers			Satisfaction with Dollars Raised			Satisfaction Compared to Peers		
	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald
Pooled Data (n=290)																		
Years as President	0.10	0.03	10.32***	0.07	0.03	4.70**	0.03	0.02	2.11	0.05	0.02	4.27**	0.04	0.03	2.78*	0.05	0.03	3.73*
Intercept	0.13	0.20	0.390	0.69	0.21	10.24***	0.02	0.18	0.02	-0.11	0.19	0.370	0.53	0.20	7.02***	0.24	0.19	1.570
Public Universities (n=196)																		
Years as President	0.08	0.04	4.46**	0.04	0.03	1.55	0.03	0.03	1.23	0.07	0.03	4.04**	0.04	0.03	1.34	0.02	0.03	0.67
Intercept	0.14	0.24	0.33	0.66	0.24	7.64***	0.06	0.22	0.09	0.04	0.23	0.03	0.50	0.23	4.68**	0.39	0.22	3.18*
Private Universities (n=93)																		
Years as President	0.12	0.05	5.21**	0.10	0.06	2.71	0.04	0.04	1.33	0.07	0.04	3.13*	0.05	0.05	1.18	0.10	0.05	5.11**
Intercept	0.14	0.41	0.12	0.81	0.45	3.25*	-0.17	0.36	0.21	-0.85	0.38	5.11**	0.62	0.40	2.37	-0.20	0.39	0.28
Trend Data (n=92)																		
Years as President	0.01	0.03	0.16	0.01	0.03	0.07	0.09	0.04	5.75**	0.10	0.04	6.73***	0.05	0.04	1.14	0.02	0.03	0.55
Intercept	1.14	0.25	20.87***	1.08	0.25	19.46***	1.01	0.25	16.20***	0.86	0.24	12.59***	1.76	0.30	34.25***	1.18	0.25	22.09***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 10: Time Spent Fundraising and Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables																	
	Overall Satisfaction			Satisfaction with Staff			Satisfaction with Board			Satisfaction with Volunteers			Satisfaction with Dollars Raised			Satisfaction Compared to Peers		
	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald
Pooled Data (n=290)																		
Years as President	0.09	0.03	8.28***	0.05	0.03	3.22*	0.03	0.02	1.82	0.04	0.02	3.02*	0.03	0.03	1.59	0.04	0.03	2.74*
Hours Spent on Fundraising	0.01	0.01	1.47	0.01	0.01	3.39*	0.00	0.00	0.52	0.01	0.01	1.87	0.01	0.01	3.48*	0.00	0.00	1.42
Intercept	-0.07	0.27	0.06	0.32	0.30	1.07	0.01	0.19	0.00	-0.31	0.25	1.57	0.16	0.28	0.34	0.05	0.23	0.05
Public Universities (n=196)																		
Years as President	0.07	0.04	3.25*	0.03	0.03	0.88	0.03	0.03	0.89	0.05	0.03	2.52	0.03	0.03	0.73	0.02	0.03	0.46
Hours Spent on Fundraising	0.01	0.01	2.98*	0.02	0.01	3.05*	0.00	0.00	0.45	0.02	0.01	3.68*	0.01	0.01	2.37	0.00	0.00	1.07
Intercept	-0.26	0.33	0.63	0.24	0.34	0.47	0.08	0.22	0.13	-0.37	0.33	1.26	0.15	0.32	0.23	0.21	0.26	0.68
Private Universities (n=93)																		
Years as President	0.11	0.05	4.43**	0.09	0.06	2.12	0.05	0.04	1.60	0.07	0.04	2.74*	0.04	0.05	0.87	0.10	0.05	4.52**
Hours Spent on Fundraising	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.01	0.01	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.01	0.01	1.23	0.01	0.01	0.79
Intercept	0.14	0.43	0.10	0.61	0.65	0.88	-0.26	0.37	0.48	-0.91	0.40	5.14**	0.13	0.58	0.05	-0.59	0.56	1.13
Trend Data (n=92)																		
Years as President	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.08	0.04	4.15**	0.09	0.04	4.85**	0.03	0.04	0.44	0.02	0.03	0.28
Hours Spent on Fundraising	0.01	0.01	2.64	0.01	0.01	0.77	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.06	0.01	0.01	0.68	0.00	0.01	0.22
Intercept	0.94	0.26	13.29***	0.91	0.25	12.80***	0.96	0.26	13.18***	0.72	0.25	8.13***	1.70	0.32	29.12***	1.03	0.26	15.71***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 11: Comfort with Fundraising and Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables																	
	Overall Satisfaction			Satisfaction with Staff			Satisfaction with Board			Satisfaction with Volunteers			Satisfaction with Dollars Raised			Satisfaction Compared to Peers		
	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald
Pooled Data (n=290)																		
Comfort Soliciting Donors	-0.16	0.58	0.08	-0.18	0.61	0.09	-0.26	0.58	0.20	0.28	0.56	0.24	-0.79	0.64	1.52	-1.01	0.65	2.38
Comfort Soliciting Major Gifts	0.58	0.49	1.37	0.88	0.51	2.99*	0.04	0.50	0.01	-0.20	0.49	0.17	0.77	0.51	2.26	1.09	0.53	4.30**
Intercept	-0.09	0.90	0.01	-0.23	0.92	0.06	0.65	0.90	0.53	0.06	0.88	0.00	0.85	0.99	0.73	0.43	0.96	0.20
Public Universities (n=196)																		
Comfort Soliciting Donors	-0.12	0.21	0.30	0.02	0.21	0.01	-0.01	0.20	0.00	0.05	0.21	0.06	-0.49	0.25	3.89**	-0.39	0.24	2.50
Comfort Soliciting Major Gifts	0.38	0.21	3.33*	0.33	0.21	2.37	0.00	0.20	0.00	-0.07	0.20	0.10	0.52	0.22	5.47**	0.31	0.22	1.97
Intercept	-0.55	0.73	0.56	-0.61	0.74	0.68	0.30	0.73	0.17	0.47	0.73	0.41	0.69	0.80	0.74	1.00	0.82	1.46
Private Universities (n=93)																		
Comfort Soliciting Donors	0.26	0.35	0.57	0.38	0.37	1.10	-0.81	0.47	2.99*	-0.12	0.35	0.11	0.04	0.39	0.01	-0.31	0.42	0.54
Comfort Soliciting Major Gifts	-0.07	0.39	0.04	0.00	0.43	0.00	0.80	0.41	3.76*	0.48	0.37	1.63	0.30	0.38	0.63	0.94	0.38	5.99**
Intercept	0.06	1.57	0.00	-0.36	1.65	0.05	0.37	1.78	0.04	-1.95	1.64	1.41	-0.58	1.89	0.10	-2.25	2.01	1.25
Trend Data (n=92)																		
Comfort Soliciting Donors	-0.50	0.32	2.41	0.08	0.29	0.07	-0.20	0.31	0.40	0.11	0.27	0.17	-0.41	0.39	1.12	-0.08	0.30	0.07
Comfort Soliciting Major Gifts	0.85	0.34	6.10**	-0.08	0.28	0.08	0.06	0.28	0.04	0.03	0.27	0.01	0.31	0.35	0.81	0.09	0.29	0.11
Intercept	1.11	0.26	18.76***	1.12	0.25	20.06***	1.06	0.25	18.32***	0.93	0.24	15.32***	1.78	0.30	34.08***	1.20	0.25	22.57***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 12: Information Sharing and Satisfaction

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables																	
	Overall Satisfaction			Satisfaction with Staff			Satisfaction with Board			Satisfaction with Volunteers			Satisfaction with Dollars Raised			Satisfaction Compared to Peers		
	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald	B	St.Er	Wald
Pooled Data (n=290)																		
Level of Detail Preferred	-0.12	0.42	0.08	-0.08	0.46	0.03	0.34	0.42	0.66	-0.02	0.39	0.00	-0.80	0.51	2.43	-0.05	0.42	0.02
Intercept	0.92	0.81	1.28	1.22	0.88	1.93	-0.42	0.81	0.27	0.23	0.76	0.09	2.32	1.00	5.44*	0.64	0.80	0.64
Public Universities (n=196)																		
Level of Detail Preferred	-0.09	0.23	0.15	0.01	0.24	0.00	0.11	0.23	0.24	-0.17	0.23	0.53	-0.41	0.25	2.68	-0.16	0.23	0.48
Intercept	0.95	1.03	0.85	0.88	1.08	0.66	-0.24	1.02	0.06	1.15	1.02	1.28	2.53	1.13	4.99**	1.24	1.05	1.41
Private Universities (n=93)																		
Level of Detail Preferred	-0.01	0.32	0.00	0.05	0.36	0.02	0.45	0.30	2.23	0.23	0.29	0.60	-0.20	0.33	0.38	-0.14	0.30	0.21
Intercept	1.04	1.40	0.55	1.28	1.58	0.66	-1.78	1.33	1.79	-1.28	1.28	1.00	1.87	1.47	1.62	1.16	1.33	0.77
Trend Data (n=92)																		
Level of Detail Preferred	0.29	0.31	0.86	0.07	0.30	0.05	0.14	0.30	0.21	-0.11	0.28	0.14	0.18	0.37	0.24	-0.71	0.32	4.94**
Intercept	1.27	0.28	20.24***	1.12	0.27	17.82***	1.12	0.27	17.13***	0.89	0.25	12.85***	1.88	0.34	30.02***	1.05	0.26	16.36***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 13: Satisfaction with Development Staff			
Independent Variables	Satisfaction with Staff		
Pooled Data (n=290)	B	St.Er	Wald
Perceived Expertise of Staff	3.55	0.38	87.69***
Intercept	-4.86	0.64	56.82***
Public Universities (n=196)	B	St.Er	Wald
Perceived Expertise of Staff	2.55	0.38	46.10***
Intercept	-8.63	1.39	38.67***
Private Universities (n=93)	B	St.Er	Wald
Perceived Expertise of Staff	3.90	0.89	19.44***
Intercept	-13.48	3.31	16.64***
Trend Data (n=92)	B	St.Er	Wald
Perceived Expertise of Staff	1.37	0.34	16.58***
Intercept	1.00	0.29	12.18***

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 14: Predictors of Overall Satisfaction, Variable Set 1

Independent Variables	Pooled Data (n=290)			Public Universities (n=196)			Private Universities (n=93)			Trend Data (n=92)		
	<i>B</i>	<i>St. Er.</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>St. Er.</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>St. Er.</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>St. Er.</i>	<i>Wald</i>
Regression #1												
Years as President	0.07	0.03	5.63**	0.06	0.04	2.24	0.11	0.06	3.96**	0.00	0.03	0.00
Hours spent on fundraising	0.01	0.01	1.32	0.01	0.01	1.98	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.01	0.01	1.81
Knowledge of fundraising	0.64	0.48	1.73	0.49	0.24	4.09**	0.02	0.39	0.00	0.63	0.32	3.73*
Comfort with soliciting major gifts	0.40	0.41	0.99	0.26	0.15	2.8*	0.05	0.35	0.02	0.49	0.30	2.62
Intercept	-1.94	1.08	3.24*	-3.34	1.18	8.06***	-0.17	1.89	0.01	0.81	0.28	8.58***
Regression #2												
Years as President	0.07	0.03	4.43**	0.06	0.04	1.87	0.11	0.06	3.09*	0.00	0.03	0.00
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.01	0.01	1.29	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	1.55
Knowledge of fundraising	0.56	0.57	0.96	0.22	0.28	0.62	-0.91	0.57	2.50	0.36	0.37	0.95
Comfort with soliciting major gifts	0.38	0.49	0.60	0.23	0.18	1.65	-0.09	0.46	0.04	0.60	0.34	3.02*
Satisfaction with funds raised past year	2.59	0.33	62.49***	1.19	0.20	35.69***	1.34	0.35	14.45***	0.82	0.29	7.90***
Intercept	-5.84	1.40	17.28***	-6.47	1.50	18.68***	-0.25	2.31	0.01	0.57	0.31	3.39*
Regression #3												
Years as President	0.09	0.03	6.16**	0.05	0.04	1.48	0.20	0.08	6.09**	0.00	0.03	0.01
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.00	0.68	0.01	0.01	0.76	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	1.24
Knowledge of fundraising	0.09	0.55	0.03	0.26	0.27	0.89	0.00	0.56	0.00	0.31	0.36	0.76
Comfort with soliciting major gifts	0.12	0.46	0.07	0.14	0.17	0.67	-0.49	0.51	0.93	0.57	0.34	2.84*
Satisfaction with priority projects	2.05	0.31	43.59***	1.67	0.37	20.58***	3.07	0.72	18.34***	0.69	0.28	6.29**
Intercept	-3.66	1.22	8.93***	-4.35	1.30	11.14***	-3.03	2.52	1.45	0.68	0.29	5.41**
Regression #4												
Years as President	0.06	0.03	3.19*	0.05	0.04	1.42	0.08	0.06	1.77	0.00	0.03	0.00
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.01	0.63	0.01	0.01	1.59	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.01	1.28
Knowledge of fundraising	0.99	0.57	3.05*	0.35	0.29	1.48	-0.33	0.49	0.46	0.38	0.36	1.09
Comfort with soliciting major gifts	0.20	0.48	0.17	0.34	0.19	3.20*	-0.41	0.46	0.80	0.60	0.35	2.98*
Satisfaction compared to peer institutions	2.44	0.32	59.01***	1.25	0.20	39.73***	0.97	0.29	11.62***	0.74	0.27	7.70***
Intercept	-5.89	1.41	17.51***	-7.55	1.60	22.16***	0.31	2.11	0.02	0.68	0.30	5.11**

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01

Table 15: Predictors of Overall Satisfaction, Variable Set 2

Independent Variables	Pooled Data (n=290)			Public Universities (n=196)			Private Universities (n=93)			Trend Data (n=92)		
	B	St. Er.	Wald	B	St. Er.	Wald	B	St. Er.	Wald	B	St. Er.	Wald
Regression #5												
Current performance as fundraiser	1.70	0.40	17.83***	1.06	0.29	13.18***	-0.01	0.45	0.00	0.87	0.37	5.58**
Years as president	0.04	0.03	1.45	0.01	0.04	0.13	0.05	0.06	0.58	-0.02	0.03	0.49
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.01	0.62	0.01	0.01	0.42	0.00	0.01	0.15	0.03	0.01	3.90**
Expertise of staff	2.88	0.41	48.53***	1.90	0.33	32.11***	2.60	0.62	17.66***	2.06	0.54	14.45***
Comfort visiting with current donors	0.75	0.70	1.12	0.14	0.20	0.46	-0.76	0.83	0.84	0.09	0.39	0.05
Intercept	-9.23	1.85	24.98***	-11.93	2.00	35.43***	-6.33	4.17	2.31	0.65	0.38	2.93**
Regression #6												
Current performance as fundraiser	1.67	0.40	17.43***	1.05	0.29	12.92***	-0.01	0.45	0.00	0.86	0.37	5.43**
Years as president	0.04	0.03	1.59	0.01	0.04	0.14	0.04	0.06	0.48	-0.02	0.03	0.33
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.01	0.56	0.01	0.01	0.40	0.00	0.01	0.12	0.03	0.01	3.59*
Expertise of staff	2.88	0.41	49.14***	1.90	0.34	32.10***	2.54	0.60	17.62***	2.04	0.53	14.98***
Comfort visiting with prospective donors	-0.21	0.62	0.12	0.05	0.20	0.05	-0.61	0.58	1.13	0.25	0.39	0.41
Intercept	-7.33	1.51	23.52***	-11.46	1.89	36.89***	-6.92	3.70	3.50*	0.63	0.38	2.78*
Regression #7												
Current performance as fundraiser	1.70	0.41	16.87***	1.04	0.29	12.46***	0.11	0.46	0.06	0.76	0.38	3.92**
Years as president	0.04	0.03	1.60	0.02	0.04	0.15	0.05	0.06	0.53	-0.02	0.03	0.33
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.01	0.56	0.01	0.01	0.40	0.00	0.01	0.13	0.03	0.01	3.80*
Expertise of staff	2.88	0.41	49.14***	1.90	0.33	32.35***	2.57	0.61	17.46***	2.13	0.55	14.69***
Comfort soliciting individuals for gifts	-0.19	0.54	0.13	0.08	0.20	0.17	-0.53	0.52	1.07	0.60	0.42	2.09
Intercept	-7.41	1.33	30.96***	-11.57	1.88	37.93***	-7.96	3.30	5.84**	0.75	0.40	3.53*
Regression #8												
Current performance as fundraiser	1.68	0.40	17.55***	1.03	0.29	12.52***	0.24	0.51	0.22	0.87	0.37	5.52**
Years as president	0.04	0.03	1.62	0.02	0.04	0.17	0.04	0.06	0.38	-0.02	0.03	0.46
Hours spent on fundraising	0.00	0.01	0.54	0.01	0.01	0.42	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.03	0.01	3.79*
Expertise of staff	2.90	0.41	49.48***	1.89	0.33	32.00***	2.63	0.63	17.57***	2.07	0.54	14.86***
Comfort soliciting corporations for gifts	0.17	0.56	0.10	0.15	0.22	0.45	-1.11	0.72	2.38	0.17	0.32	0.29
Intercept	-8.10	1.47	30.35***	-11.80	1.93	37.46***	-5.91	3.37	3.07*	0.67	0.38	3.02*

Note: * = p<.10, ** = p<.05, *** = p<.01